

BOARD MEETING AGENDA

June 2, 2021 | 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. | Meeting No. 248

Click Link to Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/99892451717?pwd=NEJwQlIXTIRWSUNySXI2TIBLc3AwQT09>

Meeting ID: 998 9245 1717 | Password: 780404

1:00 p.m.	Call to Order	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome and Introductions 	
1:05 p.m.	Chairs Report	1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consent Agenda (Action) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of March 10, 2021 Meeting Minutes WIN Renewals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0107 (Rev3) - WIN: Temporary suspension of WorkSource System Policy 1101 (Suspending CASAS as a Basic Skills Testing Requirement for Youth). 0108 (Rev3) - WIN: Temporary suspension of the 30 percent limit on transfers of formula grant funds 0109 (Rev3) - WIN: WIOA Title I-B verbal self-attestation and remote eligibility ETPL State Policy Approval Approval to Release for Public Comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Policy 5415 - Performance Sanctions Draft Policy 1024 - Infrastructure Funding Agreements and the Statewide Funding Mechanism 	
1:10 p.m.	Executive Director's Report	2
1:15 p.m.	Look, Listen & Learn Session with the Governor's Office of Equity	3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dr. Karen Johnson, Executive Director 	
2:40 p.m.	Break	
2:55 p.m.	Parameters for the Board's 2022 Legislative Agenda	4
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nova Gattman, Workforce Board Joe Wilcox, Workforce Board Lew McMurrin, Workforce Board 	
5:00 p.m.	Meeting Wrap-Up and Adjourn	

Tab 1



MINUTES OF MEETING NO. 247
March 10, 2021

Board Members Present:

Perry England, Chair
Chris Alejano, Representing Underserved Populations
Gary Chandler, Representing Business
Larry Brown, Representing Labor
Lee Anne Caylor, Representing Business
Jane Hopkins, Representing Labor
Creigh H. Agnew, Representing Business
Mark Martinez, Representing Labor
Cami Feek, Employment Security Department (ESD)
Rebecca Wallace for Chris Reykdal, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Lisa Brown, Department of Commerce
Marie Bruin for Jan Yoshiwara, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC)
Mark Mattke, Representing Local Government
David Stillman for Cheryl Strange, Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS)

Call to Order

Mr. Perry England called the meeting to order at 10 a.m. on a virtual meeting using Zoom.

Consent Agenda

Motion 2021-246-01: Ms. Creigh Agnew moved to approve the items on the consent agenda as presented. Ms. Lee Anne Caylor seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Economic Security for All Briefing and Panel

The Board was provided presentations by Ms. Miriam Halliday with Workforce Southwest, Ms. Jamilet Nerell, Benton-Franklin WDC, and Ms. Shannon Brundle of Spokane Workforce Council. They provided a program model overview which included items such as outreach, partnerships, and response to COVID-19.

Inclusive, Equitable, Economic Recovery

Mr. Eric Wolf provided the Board with an overview of the National Governors Association (NGA) grant features, overarching goals/expectations and their alignment with the collective impact initiative. He also gave “deep dive” results from other states like Florida and Alabama and how they are measuring progress.

The Board discussed whether partners should be tracking and dashboarding to be confident of equitable recovery.

Additional key discussion questions included:

- Self-sufficiency or other measurables that demonstrate equitable recovery?
- Financial, workload, and programmatic implications for partners?
- Do the goals of the collective impact initiative align with partners goals?
- Will the partner agency provide data to track a new measure?
- Is the measure/dashboard useful for aligning work across system partners?
- How can we best engage the Board during the NGA grant?

Ms. Jan Yoshiwara expressed that Washington’s Self-Sufficiency Calculator is a tool but not the ultimate metric. Additional options to consider: employment rates, wage progression over time, and career pathways.

Ms. Cami Feek would like the Board to look at the collective work and consider measurements currently being used.

Ms. Lisa Brown expressed that people entering pathways in all communities (geographically and historically disadvantaged communities) are important. Self-sufficiency calculator can be useful; however, she has an issue with the label for a metric.

Sufficient feedback was given for the team to move forward with their efforts.

Legislative Update

The Board was given a Legislative update by Ms. Nova Gattman. Bill themes for this session included pandemic relief, customized training, manufacturing workforce corrections, education in support for foster students in postsecondary education, and behavioral health. Ms. Gattman expressed that the Board has led the way in many conversations around behavioral health through the Behavioral Health Workforce Assessment. Unemployment support reform, education system changes, and poverty reduction were also common themes.

The meeting adjourned at 11:51 a.m.

Consent Agenda Item: Extending COVID-19 Policy Flexibility to January 2022

PRESENTERS: Eric Wolf

BOARD MEETING DATE: 06/02/2021

DISCUSSION TIME NEEDED: n/a

<p>ISSUE/SITUATION: Be concise - 1 or 2 sentences that get to the heart of the situation, problem or opportunity being addressed</p>	<p>In April 2020, the Workforce Board acted at the request of the Washington Workforce Association to provide policy flexibility that enhanced local WDCs' ability to respond to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and service delivery changes that have resulted. At the time, the Board anticipated reviewing the policies after six months to determine whether they are still needed due to pandemic or pandemic-recovery conditions. These waivers were extended in November 2020 through the end of May 2021. Due to the ongoing public health outlook, the recommendation is to extend the authorized flexibility an additional six months, to January 2022. Staff further recommends that the Board continue to receive briefings at subsequent meetings in 2021 to determine whether certain WINs should sunset due to one-stop reopenings.</p>
<p>TAP STRATEGIC PRIORITY: Which TAP strategic priority or priorities does this recommendation support? Can you tie to specific goals and objectives in TAP? Briefly describe these connections. If the connection is unclear, describe why this is of consequence to the Workforce Board and/or workforce system.</p>	<p>In the TAP Plan the Workforce Board sets broad policy that affords maximal service delivery by streamlining customer service so people can reach their career goals, no matter their barriers or background. The era of COVID-19 necessitates greater flexibility and reliance upon the established programs, existing judgment and demonstrated competency of local boards to execute programs and funding in ways that serve the highest and greatest good.</p>
<p>BACKGROUND: Short history of how this recommendation came to be. What has been tried, to what result? What evidence exists to support this recommendation?</p>	<p>These policies were initially approved by the Workforce Board in April 2020 in response to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, with the expectation that the Board would consider after six months whether or not additional flexibility was warranted due to public health conditions. In the intervening six months, we have experienced a continuing public health situation that has necessitated that the workforce system continue to offer services remotely when possible. Moreover, many potential system customers have delayed accessing workforce services due to the extension of UI benefits and the temporary suspension of work search activity requirements.</p>
<p>RECOMMENDATION AND NEXT STEPS: What specific result do you want from the Board? Is this recommendation for discussion or action? If for discussion, will action be required at a later date? What next</p>	<p>The recommendation is for the Board to support extending each of the below flexibilities (communicated in "Workforce Information Notices" or "WIN"s) for an additional six month time period (mid-May 2021), at which point the Board will reconsider whether to extend the policies for an additional period of time.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WIN 0107: Suspending the CASAS Testing Requirement for Youth 2. WIN 0108: Transferability between Adult and Dislocated Worker Funds 3. WIN 0109: Verbal Self-Attestation of Participants

steps are expected after this discussion?

WIN 0107: Suspending CASAS Testing Requirements for Youth

The Board acted in 2010 to require a single basic skills test be administered across the workforce system's programs, CASAS. The test is most often administered in person and proctored, neither of which is practical as long as social distancing directives continue. See WorkSource System Policy 1011 at http://media.wpc.wa.gov/media/WPC/adm/policy/1011_rev_6.pdf for more information.

The Board was asked to temporarily suspend the policy and allow LWDBs to use alternative means (other basic skills assessments or school record data) to determine skill level. At the present time, CASAS test administration is still hampered by the social distancing requirements and proctoring requirements. Partners have indicated additional time for the waiver is warranted.

WIN 0108: Transferability Between Adult and Dislocated Worker Fund

WIOA allows LWDBs to transfer up to 100 percent of funds between the Adult and Dislocated Worker program funds within WIOA Title I, with the approval of the Governor. At a May 2015 meeting of the state Workforce Board, the Board voted to table action on a state policy allowing full transferability between these funds and instead voted to cap transferability between the funds at 30% and impose the same criteria for transferring funds as was previously imposed under WIA Title I-B.

Under the usual structure, as part of requesting up to 30 percent transfers between funds, LWDBs are required to submit a formal request to ESD with signatures from the full local board, along with a variety of planning forms. Specific documentation requirements and the transfer procedure may be found in WIOA Title I Policy 5401 at <http://media.wpc.wa.gov/media/WPC/adm/policy/5401.pdf>.

In April 2020, the Board voted first to allow 100 percent flexibility on transfers between the Adult and Dislocated Worker funds; and second, that the process for requesting such transfer be expedited, streamlined, or eliminated.

The COVID-19 crisis has necessitated this flexibility in several ways: Each of the 12 WDAs are experiencing varying levels of immediate impact with regard to jobs lost, people sick and the need to quickly retool service delivery. Some areas will see a greater need to immediately serve a higher number of dislocated workers while others may see those laid off workers staying home, waiting it out and collecting benefits, while low skilled adults out of the workforce find themselves desperate for work and skill building during this downtime. Areas need maximum flexibility to serve whoever needs it. One hundred percent transferability gives local areas the ability to do just that.

WIN 0109: Verbal Self-Attestation

Pursuant to Board action to support finding an alternate or streamlined guidance for when self-attestation can be used to enroll a WIOA Title I-B participant, ESD issued WIN 0109 after consulting with the U.S. Department of Labor. WIN 0109 establishes

	<p>the temporary, minimum requirements for eligibility documentation and registration into WIOA Title I-B programs due to COVID-19 impacts. Individuals enrolled by these means can receive all WIOA Title I-B services. Eligibility determination is a critical and non-waivable element of DOL-funded programs. WIN 0109 specifies what documents and under what limited conditions self-attested documentation can be used to determine eligibility, particularly if the enrollee cannot physically provide documents due to social distancing.</p>
--	--

Updating WA Eligible Training Provider List Policy

PRESENTERS: Dave Wallace

BOARD MEETING DATE: 6/2/21

DISCUSSION TIME NEEDED: N/A – Pre-meeting report on impact of proposed thresholds

<p>ISSUE/SITUATION: Be concise - 1 or 2 sentences that get to the heart of the situation, problem or opportunity being addressed</p>	<p>Updating the state's Eligible Training Provider (ETP) List policy has been an urgent need due to changes and adjustments necessary to be compliant with the federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA).</p> <p>The Eligible Training Provider List, located on the Workforce Board's public-facing CareerBridge.wa.gov site, includes programs that meet certain earnings, completion, and employment outcomes and are potentially eligible for federal (and some state) training dollars.</p> <p>Read the proposed policy here. We will also provide information about which programs remain eligible under the newly proposed higher performance thresholds. The analysis looks at changes due to higher employment, earnings and completion outcomes.</p>
<p>BACKGROUND: Short history of how this recommendation came to be. What has been tried, to what result? What evidence exists to support this recommendation?</p>	<p>A staff work group has been busy working on policy updates for more than two years. The updated policy has been put out for public notice, and has received a fair amount of feedback.</p> <p>The updates include needed clarifications, fixes where loopholes existed, new policies to be WIOA compliant, as well as new target thresholds for programs to be eligible to be on the list.</p> <p>These thresholds include participant earnings, completion rate, and employment rate, to reflect the current environment.</p>
<p>RECOMMENDATION AND NEXT STEPS: What specific result do you want from the Board? Is this recommendation for discussion or action? If for discussion, will action be required at a later date? What next steps are expected after this discussion?</p>	<p>It's hoped that Board members will take action on the proposed policy and updated thresholds at this meeting. Staff will be available for questions.</p>

WIOA Policy Updates

PRESENTERS: Eric Wolf and Dave Wallace

BOARD MEETING DATE: 6/02/21

DISCUSSION TIME NEEDED: Consent Agenda Item – Discussion as Necessary

<p>ISSUE/SITUATION: Be concise - 1 or 2 sentences that get to the heart of the situation, problem or opportunity being addressed</p>	<p>DOL Monitoring in early 2021 required the state to develop new policies for performance sanctions and outlining the state funding mechanism in the event local areas do not reach agreement on infrastructure funding agreements.</p> <p>Draft Policy 5415 establishes and implements a state performance sanctions policy for all entities that receives Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) Title I-B funding. Draft Policy 1024 outlines expectation for local workforce boards to periodically execute infrastructure funding agreements among partners and the state's procedure for supporting local areas to complete them, including when local areas should communicate the possibility of no agreement so that state support can be leveraged to assist negotiations. The request of the Board on June 2 is to release these two draft policies, developed in consultation with the LWDA's and ESD in a policy workgroup, for 30 days of public comment.</p>
<p>BACKGROUND: Short history of how this recommendation came to be. What has been tried, to what result? What evidence exists to support this recommendation?</p>	<p><u>Draft Policy 5415: Performance Sanctions</u></p> <p>The purpose of the performance sanctions policy is to ensure accountability of entities that receive WIOA Title I-B funds from state administrative agencies in meeting the needs of the local workforce development system and ensure compliance with applicable federal and state laws, regulations, policies, guidance, and terms and conditions of applicable awards and contracts.</p> <p>To accomplish these responsibilities, as well as to satisfy its oversight role, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (WTB), as the State Workforce Development Board (SWIB) will impose penalties or conditions in the form of sanctions for any issues of noncompliance that have not been promptly resolved based on state-imposed corrective actions identified in monitoring or other oversight reports.</p> <p>Section 116(b)(3)(A)(iv) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) requires the state workforce development board to negotiate performance targets for each WIOA metric at the local level. States may leverage sanctions on local grant recipients sanctioned for performance failure or for failure to report (section 116(f) of WIOA).</p> <p>The draft performance sanctions policy sets up a corrective action plan strategy to address performance issues. LWDA's that do not perform (as defined in the policy) to negotiated levels will be placed on a corrective action plan. If performance is not corrected after two years of corrective action, a third year of non-performance may generate a recommendation to the state workforce development board that the Governor not recertify the LWDA in future years.</p>

Draft Policy 1024: State Funding Mechanism Process

The purpose of Draft Policy 1024 is to communicate requirements of infrastructure funding agreement (IFA) negotiations locally and on Local Workforce Development Boards (LWDBs), the Governor and the WTB when LWDBs are unable to achieve consensus among local one-stop delivery system partners regarding local IFAs.

IFAs, which are part of local one-stop Memoranda of Understanding (MOU), are expected to be negotiated by LWDBs through local processes that achieve consensus amongst required and optional partners in local one-stop delivery systems and quantified through Local Funding Mechanisms (LFMs). Draft Policy 1024 requires IFAs for the next program year to be completed before March 31 annually. Draft Policy 1024 sets forth an annual timeline for local boards to provide the state board with executed IFAs, or advance notice that their negotiations are stalled so that state partners can offer TA and support the negotiations.

The draft process places the following calendar dates and expectations around annually communicating IFA status to the WTB:

- By March 1 of each year, LWDBs must provide to WTB an assessment of the status of their IFA negotiations for the subsequent program year to begin July 1. If LWDBs execute an IFA prior to March 1, they must send a letter signed and dated by partners to the WTB.
- If an LWDB reports by March 1 that they anticipate they will not achieve agreement around an IFA, the LWDB has to indicate whether they feel consensus will be achieved by April 1, or whether specific technical assistance from state partners is needed.
- If no IFA is agreed to by April 1, the LWDB must send the Governor (via the WTB, the Governor's representative) a notification of impasse. Upon receipt of notification, the Governor (or designee) will charge Board staff to support re-negotiation of IFAs with specific technical assistance for up to one month, as specified in Step 2 of the draft policy.
- If by May 1 no agreement is reached, the WTB will begin determining a draft infrastructure budget using the procedures specified in Steps 3-8 of the draft policy.
- This infrastructure funding budget will only trigger if the LWDB does not reach a negotiated agreement prior to the beginning of the program year on July 1.

If local partners cannot reach agreement on an IFA, a State Funding Mechanism (SFM) is triggered in that local area. To that end, the Governor must issue guidance, and the LWDB must assist with the issuance of that guidance and with developing the formula used by the Governor under the SFM to determine one-stop center budgets in the event local consensus cannot be reached.

	<p>For the purpose of this policy, the Washington Technical and Educational Coordinating Board (WTB) has been designated as the Governor's representative in the SFM process. TEGl 17-16, Infrastructure Funding of the One-Stop Mechanism, provides additional guidance on this subject.</p>
<p>RECOMMENDATION AND NEXT STEPS: What specific result do you want from the Board? Is this recommendation for discussion or action? If for discussion, will action be required at a later date? What next steps are expected after this discussion?</p>	<p>Vote on allowing Board staff to release the policy for public comment (discussion as needed). The Board would then vote on whether to approve the policy during the July meeting.</p>



Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Title I Policy Employment System Administration and Policy

Washington envisions a nationally recognized fully integrated One-Stop system with enhanced customer access to program services, improved long-term employment outcomes for job seekers and consistent, high quality services to business customers. In order to achieve this vision, Employment System Administration and Policy sets a common direction and standards for Washington's WorkSource system through the development of WorkSource system policies, information memoranda, and technical assistance.

Policy Number: 5415

To: Washington WorkSource System

Effective Date: TBD

Subject: WIOA Title I-B Performance Sanctions

1. Purpose:

To establish and implement a state performance sanctions policy for all entities that receive Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) Title I-B funding.

The purpose of the performance sanctions policy is to ensure accountability of entities that receive WIOA Title I-B funds from state administrative agencies in meeting the needs of the local workforce development system and ensure compliance with applicable federal and state laws, regulations, policies, guidance, and terms and conditions of applicable awards and contracts.

To accomplish these responsibilities, as well as to satisfy its oversight role, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (WTECB), as the State Workforce Development Board (SWDB) will impose penalties or conditions in the form of sanctions for any issues of noncompliance that have not been promptly resolved based on state-imposed corrective actions identified in monitoring or other oversight reports.

2. Background:

Section 116(b)(3)(A)(iv) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) requires the state workforce development board (SWDB) to negotiate performance targets for each WIOA metric at the local level. States may leverage sanctions on local grant recipients sanctioned for performance failure or for failure to report (section 116(f) of WIOA).

3. **Policy:**

There are currently five metrics (employment 2 quarters after exit, employment 4 quarters after exit, median earnings, credential attainment rate, and measurable skill gain rate) for the three Title I programs (Adult, Dislocated Workers, Youth).

Targets for these are negotiated between the state and the WDC. Local areas are then held accountable to possible sanctions after adjusting targets (using the state-developed regression model) to account for most recent local conditions

The state performance sanctions policy mirrors the federal sanctions policy (TEGL 11-19) to the extent possible. "Failure" to perform on any WIOA metric would be defined as any of the following:

- Failure to meet 50% of targets for any metric, or
- Failure to average 90% of targets for all measures across programs (i.e. Adult), or
- Failure to average 90% of targets for all programs across a given measure (i.e., earnings).

Failure in the first year would trigger technical assistance state partners coordinated by the WTECB, and a corrective action plan to achieve negotiated performance levels. If an area does not improve performance in their corrective action period for two consecutive program years, they may be subject to sanctions.

Sanctions assessed after two years of performance failure under correction action may include a recommendation to the state workforce board that a non-performing local workforce development area not be recertified by the Governor in future program years.

Appeals Process

Upon an area being notified of the possibility of being sanctioned, local boards have the right to appeal the decision to the Department of Labor. They must do this within 30 days of intent to sanction for performance failure. The appeal would be to the Region 6 DOL representative.

4. **Definitions:**

Sanction is a penalty imposed/assessed or a remedial action required for noncompliance with applicable federal, state and local laws, regulations, contract provisions/grant agreements or conditions, or policies.

Targets are the negotiated level of performance agreed upon for any of the five metrics across the Title I programs

Technical Assistance is the efforts by either the Department of Labor or the state to identify and correct causes of performance failure.

5. **References:**

- WIOA Section 116(g) – Performance Accountability
- WIOA Final Rule, 20 CFR 677.220 – Under what circumstances may a corrective action or sanction be applied to local areas for poor performance?

- WIOA Final Rule, 20 CFR 677.225 – Under what circumstances may local areas appeal a reorganization plan?
- Training and Employment Guidance Letter (TEGL) 11-19 – Negotiations and Sanctions Guidelines for the WIOA Core Programs

6. Supersedes:

None.

7. Website:

<https://wpc.wa.gov/policy/state/WIOA>

8. Action:

Local Workforce Development Boards and their contractors must distribute this policy broadly throughout the system to ensure that WorkSource System staff are familiar with its content and requirements.

9. Attachments:

None.

Direct Inquiries To:

*Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board
P.O. Box 43105
Olympia, WA 98504-3105
(360) 709-4600
workforce@wtb.wa.gov*

Direct Other Inquiries To:

*Employment System Administration and Policy
Policy, Data, Performance and Integrity Division
Employment Security Department
P.O. Box 9046
Olympia, WA 98507-9046
SystemPolicy@esd.wa.gov*



WorkSource System Policy
Employment System Administration and Policy

DRAFT

Washington envisions a nationally recognized fully integrated One-Stop system with enhanced customer access to program services, improved long-term employment outcomes for job seekers and consistent, high quality services to business customers. In order to achieve this vision, Employment System Administration and Policy sets a common direction and standards for Washington's WorkSource system through the development of WorkSource system policies, information memoranda, and technical assistance.

Policy Number: 1024
To: Washington WorkSource System
Effective Date: May XX, 2021
Subject: Infrastructure Funding Agreements and State Funding Mechanism

1. Purpose:

This policy was jointly developed by Employment Security Department (ESD) and the Workforce Training Education and Coordinating Board (WTECB) to communicate requirements of and guidance to Local Workforce Development Boards (LWDBs) and Partners regarding the requirement to enter into an Infrastructure Funding Agreement (IFA) for the operating costs of the one-stop prior to the start of each program year. Additionally, this policy communicates requirements on LWDBs, the Governor and the State Workforce Development Board (SWDB) when LWDBs are unable to achieve consensus among local one-stop delivery system partners regarding local IFAs, thus, triggering the State Funding Mechanism (SFM).

2. Background:

Developed jointly by the U.S. Departments of Labor (DOL), Education (ED), and Health and Human Services (HHS), the Joint WIOA Final Rule for Unified and Combined State Plans, Performance Accountability, and the One-Stop System Joint Provisions, the Joint WIOA Final Rule communicates the expectations of the sharing and allocation of infrastructure costs among one-stop partner programs as governed by WIOA sec. 121(h), its implementing regulations, and the Federal Cost Principles contained in the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards at 2 CFR part 200 (Uniform Guidance).

IFAs, which are part of local one-stop Memoranda of Understanding (MOU), are expected to be negotiated by LWDBs through local processes that achieve consensus amongst required and optional partners in local one-stop delivery systems and quantified through Local Funding Mechanisms (LFMs) through IFAs. TEGL 17-16, Section 10, Infrastructure Funding of the One-Stop Mechanism, provides additional guidance on this subject. See Attachment I to this policy for list of required partners in the one-stop system.

All required one-stop partner programs must contribute to the infrastructure costs and certain additional costs of the one-stop delivery system based on their proportionate use and relative benefit. A partner's contribution must be an allowable, reasonable, necessary, and allocable cost to the program, consistent with the Federal Cost Principles set forth in the Uniform Guidance. Locally, additional partners may be invited by the LWDB to participate in the one-stop system and be party to the MOU. While these additional partners are encouraged to contribute to the infrastructure costs of the one-stop system, their failure to sign the IFA will not trigger the SFM.

WIOA, Sec. 121(h) mandates that the State, through the designated authority of the Governor (WTECB), provide guidance to assist LWDB's, Chief Elected Officials (CEO's) and one-stop partners to determine equitable and stable methods to fund one-stop center infrastructure costs. WIOA regulations also require the State's guidance include a timeline for LWDB's to notify if local IFA negotiations reach an impasse.

Advantages of LWDB's negotiating their own IFA's include:

- Local autonomy -decisions stay at the local level and can be tailored to local needs and priorities
- Stronger partnerships maintained with each partner program having direct say in local negotiations
- No caps on local contributions but under SFM specific caps are set on the amount/percent of each partner programs' funds that may be contributed
- Flexibility on funds used-local Title I partners can use program funds to pay their proportionate share of infrastructure costs, but if SFM is triggered, Title I programs may be required to pay their proportionate share out of administrative funds only.

If local partners cannot reach agreement on an IFA, a State Funding Mechanism (SFM) is triggered in that local area. To that end, the Governor must issue guidance, and the SWDB must assist with the issuance of that guidance and with developing the formula used by the Governor under the SFM to determine one-stop center budgets in the event local consensus cannot be reached.

For the purpose of this policy, the Washington Technical and Educational Coordinating Board (WTECB) has been designated as the Governor's representative in the SFM process. TEGL 17-16, Infrastructure Funding of the One-Stop Mechanism, provides additional guidance on this subject.

3. Policy:

a. Memorandum of Understanding regarding Infrastructure costs and Additional Costs

Per WIOA Sec. 121 (c)(1) and WA Policy 1013, Rev.2 One-Stop partners must enter into MOU, which must contain provisions describing how the costs of services will be provided by the one-stop system and how operating costs will be funded (including infrastructure costs and additional costs). See Attachment I of this policy for full list of required partner programs. The one-stop operating budget under the MOU may be considered the master budget and must be periodically reconciled against actual costs and adjusted accordingly.

b. Infrastructure Funding Agreement Negotiation and Consensus

One-stop partners are to act in good faith and negotiate an Infrastructure Funding Agreement (IFA), which must be effect no later than **March 31** of each year, outlining how each will contribute to infrastructure costs of the one-stop system described in the Local Funding Mechanism (LFM).

IFA's must include:

- Time period IFA is effective
- Identification of infrastructure cost budget (component of one-stop operating budget)
- Identification of all one-stop partners, LWDB and CEO participating in the IFA
- The Cost-Allocation Methodology used to determine and allocate costs among the one-stop partners sufficient to fund the costs of infrastructure of one-stop(s) for the program year
- Description of periodic review and modification process ensuring equitable benefit of one-stop partner programs
- Information on the steps used to reach consensus and how local partners followed the local funding methodology process
- Full description of the local process used among partners to resolve issues related to IFA during the MOU duration when consensus cannot be reached
- Signatures of all authorized representatives of the LWDB, CEO's and all workforce partner programs who signed the MOU*

NOTE: Cost Allocation Methodology- The specific methodologies used to allocate costs among the one-stop partners are not prescribed in WIOA. Because of the need to provide maximum flexibility to accommodate various organization structures, costs, and budgets in local areas, there is no single method prescribed for allocating costs, but in general should include allocation bases, inputs and outputs.

*NOTE: While WIOA is silent on the use of electronic signatures specific to MOU, per [5 CFR 850.106](#), [31 CFR 370.38](#), [15 USC 96 Sec. 7001](#) and [RCW 1.80.060](#), the use and validity of electronic signatures is allowed with mutual agreement of all parties. However, parties cannot be made to use an electronic form of signature if they prefer instead to use physical signatures (see [RCW 1.80.040](#)).

c. IFA Process Steps

1. Identify one-stop operating costs, including infrastructure costs and additional costs.
2. Develop the one-stop operating budget that includes an infrastructure costs budget and additional costs budget.
3. Develop the cost allocation methodology, including the identification of cost pools and allocation bases.
4. Determine estimated partner program contributions.
5. Prepare, agree to and sign the IFA(s).
6. Allocate actual costs by each partner program's proportionate use and relative benefit received.
7. Conduct a periodic reconciliation **(Not less than biannually)**.
8. Modify infrastructure costs budget and/or cost allocation methodology, as appropriate.

9. Evaluate the existing process and prepare for the following program year.

Should difficulties arise during the negotiation process, parties involved will seek resolution through their local dispute resolution process. If however, local agreement cannot be reached, a State Funding Mechanism (SFM) is triggered. To that end, the Governor must issue guidance, and the WCETB (as the designated Governor's representative) must assist with the issuance of that guidance and with developing the formula used by the Governor under the SFM to determine one-stop center budgets in the event local consensus cannot be reached. In this situation, section 4, the State Funding Mechanism will be implemented.

4. State Funding Mechanism

a. State Funding Mechanism Requirement

If LWDBs fail to reach consensus with all of the required partners on the amount that each partner will contribute to the one-stop delivery system's infrastructure costs, the SFM process in Section 4.b of this policy is triggered as a "fail-safe" mechanism, though the application of capped levels of funding under the SFM may restrict the amount available for infrastructure funding in a given local area. The local area shall be subject to the SFM for the program year for which consensus was not met and for any subsequent program year that all partners do not reach such agreement. Due to the complex calculations and the timeframes required to complete the SFM process, LWDBs must provide the WTECB an assessment of their status of negotiations by **March 31** of each year.

b. State Funding Mechanism Process

If it is apparent to an LWDB by **March 1** of each year that it will not achieve an IFA agreement, that LWDB must evaluate its progress toward consensus and notify the SWDB of its status using the following decision points:

- i. Whether partners feel consensus can be achieved by April 1;
- ii. An assessment the barriers that are causing the impasse locally;
- iii. Whether agreement can or cannot be achieved with technical assistance from appropriate entities or through additional negotiation.

Step 1: Notice to Governor of Failure to Reach Consensus

If a local IFA has not been successfully negotiated by **April 1** prior to the beginning of each program year for which it is negotiated, notification of impasse, in writing, must be sent to the WTECB. Notification of failure to negotiate the IFA may be communicated by LWDBs, Chief Elected Officials or required partners, and all parties involved must receive copies of signed and dated notifications (electronic copies are acceptable).

Step 2: Provision of Local Negotiation Materials

Upon receipt of notification(s), WTECB- which is the the State Workforce Development Board- (SWDB), as the Governor's designated representative, will identify staff to support renegotiation by assisting with mediation or technical assistance for up to one month.

Documents accompanying the notification to the Governor must include, at a minimum:

- i. the local WIOA plan;
- ii. the cost allocation methodology or methodologies proposed by the partners to be used in determining the proportionate share;
- iii. the proposed amounts or budget to fund infrastructure costs and the amount of partner funds included;
- iv. The amount of and the type of funds (cash, non-cash, and third-party in-kind contributions available);
- v. any proposed or agreed-upon one-stop center or system budget; and
- vi. any partially agreed-upon, proposed, or draft IFAs;
- vii. Summary of meetings which were discussed regarding the IFA;
- viii. Identification of partners that are causing the impasse;
- ix. A summary of technical assistance requested and received from the state to date.

The SWDB may request additional information and documentation from the parties. LWDBs may give the SWDB additional materials that they finds to be appropriate

Step 3: Determination of One-Stop Center Infrastructure Budgets

If, by **May 1** of each year, the local IFA has not been completed and signed by all parties, the SWDB will initiate determination of the infrastructure budget(s).

Depending on the local delivery system structure, there may be more than one infrastructure budget, each of which is contained in a one-stop operating budget. While the SWDB should take into account the one-stop center's operating budget, it only has the power to determine the infrastructure budget under the SFM.

The SWDB must determine the infrastructure budget in one of two ways. If, as a result of an agreed upon infrastructure budget, only the individual programmatic contributions to infrastructure funding based upon proportionate use of the one-stop centers and relative benefit received are at issue, the SWDB may accept the infrastructure budget, from which each partner's contribution, consistent with the cost allocation methodologies contained in the federal Uniform Guidance, must be calculated. The U.S. Department of Labor and State recommend this approach.

If, however, an infrastructure budget or budgets were not agreed upon in the local negotiations, or the SWDB determines that the agreed upon budget does not adequately meet the needs of the local area or does not reasonably work within the confines of the resources available to that local area (in accordance with the Governor's guidance on one-stop infrastructure funding), then the SWDB must use a formula that it developed on behalf of the Governor (see Steps 4-8 below).

Step 4: Establishment of cost allocation methodology

After an infrastructure budget has been determined, the SWDB must establish a cost allocation methodology that determines the distribution of infrastructure funding costs among the local one-stop partners in accordance with the principles of proportionate use of the one-stop center and relative benefit received. This allocation methodology must be consistent with the Federal Cost Principles of the Uniform Guidance in 2 CFR part 200, all relevant Federal regulations and statutes, further regulatory guidance, and the partner programs' authorizing laws and regulations.

Beyond these requirements, the determining factor may be a wide range of variables, such as number of customers served, square footage used, or a different basis that is agreed upon for determining each partner's contribution level for infrastructure costs.

Step 5: Determination of Partners' proportionate shares

Once a methodology is established, the SWDB must use this methodology to determine each required one-stop partner's proportionate share of infrastructure funding costs. The SWDB must consider a number of factors in reaching a proportionate share determination, including:

- i. the costs of administration of the one-stop delivery system for purposes not specifically related to a one-stop center for each partner (such as costs associated with maintaining the LWDB or information technology systems);
- ii. statutory requirements for each partner program;
- iii. each one-stop partner's ability to fulfill such requirements; and
- iv. all other applicable legal requirements.

The Governor may draw upon any proportionate share determinations made during the local negotiations, including any agreements reached at the local level by one or more partners, as well as any other materials or documents from the negotiating process.

Note: For other required partner programs in which grant awards are made to entities that are independent of the authority of the Governor, such as Job Corps contractors or grant recipients of DOL-administered national programs, the determination of the amount each of the applicable partners must contribute to assist in paying the infrastructure costs of one-stop centers continues to be made by the Governor, through the authority granted to the Governor by WIOA and its implementing regulations.

Step 6: Calculation of Statewide Caps

The SWDB must use the established cost allocation methodology to calculate the statewide caps to determine the maximum amounts that required partner programs could be *required* to contribute toward infrastructure funding in that local area. There are no statewide caps for additional partners because the SFM does not apply to them.

The statewide caps are a statutory requirement for purposes of the SFM, even when only one local area is unable to reach consensus on an IFA through the LFM. However, the caps only restrict those infrastructure cost contributions required by one-stop partners within the local area(s) that has (or have) not reached consensus. The caps used in the application of the SFM are referred to as the applicable program caps, which must be calculated by the SWDB using sub-steps, percentages, and formulas detailed on pages 24-25 of TEGL 17-16.

In the event that more than one local area does not reach consensus, then the aggregate of the infrastructure funding costs that must be contributed by each required one-stop partner, in all of the local areas, that did not reach consensus is restricted by the applicable program cap.

For example, if three of seven local areas do not reach consensus, the required infrastructure funding contributions of each required one-stop partner under a particular program in these three areas would be added together, the sum of which could not exceed the calculated applicable program cap.

Step 7: Assessment of the Aggregate Total of Infrastructure Contributions as it relates to the Statewide Cap

Once the SWDB has determined the applicable program cap for each program as well as the proportionate share of the infrastructure costs (as determined under Step 5) that are required of each local required one-stop partner in a non-consensus area without regard to the cap, the SWDB must ensure that the funds required to be contributed by each partner program in the non-consensus local area(s), in aggregate, do not exceed the applicable program cap.

If the aggregate total contributions are below the applicable program cap, then the SWDB must direct the one-stop partners to contribute what was determined to be their proportionate shares. If the aggregate total contributions exceed the cap, the SWDB may either:

- i. Inquire as to whether those local partner programs that have pushed the aggregate total contributions above the applicable program cap (i.e., those whose contributions would have otherwise exceeded the statewide cap on contributions) are willing to contribute beyond the applicable program cap in accordance with their proportionate share; or
- ii. Allow the LWDB, one-stop partners, and CEO(s) to:
 1. Re-enter negotiations to reassess each one-stop partner's proportionate share and make adjustments and identify alternate sources of funding to make up the difference between the capped amount and the proportionate share of infrastructure funding of the one-stop partner; and
 2. Reduce infrastructure costs to reflect the amount of funds available without exceeding the applicable program cap level.

Note: For additional guidance and examples, refer to TEGL 17-16

Step 8: Proportionate Share Adjustment

If LWDBs, CEOs, and the required one-stop partners have failed to reach agreement on how to address a situation in which the proportionate share exceeds the cap (using the approaches described in Step 7), the SWDB must make adjustments to specific local partners' proportionate share in accordance with the amounts available under the applicable program cap for the associated program. The aggregate total contribution of a program's local one-stop partners under the SFM may not exceed the applicable program cap.

The specific allocations derived through the state funding mechanism will be provided to the LWDB, the CEO, and the required partners for the LWDB prior to July 1 of each year.

c. Appeals Process

LWDB chairs, CEOs, or required partners may appeal for cause, in writing, within 21 calendar days of receipt of the specific terms of the state funding mechanism determination.

The appeal must be clearly labeled as such and must be addressed to the Governor. It must identify the appellant and the basis for the appeal. The petitioner must demonstrate that the State's funding determination is inconsistent with:

- (1) the proportionate cost-share requirements, or
- (2) the cost-contributions limitations, or
- (3) the cost-contribution caps.

The appeal letter may originate with LWDB Chairs, Chief Elected Officials, or required partner(s), and must be signed (electronic signature is acceptable) and dated. All parties involved must receive copies of the notification.

The Governor will acknowledge the appeal and return a determination under the authority of the Governor as quickly as feasible.

Until the appeal process is completed, the appellant remains responsible for its contribution as originally determined in the state funding mechanism. If a partner's appeal to the state is successful and there is a change to the partner's infrastructure cost contributions, then the MOU must be updated to reflect those changes.

5. Definitions:

Infrastructure Costs – Non-personnel costs that are necessary for the general operation of the one-stop center, including, but not limited to:

- Rental of the facilities;
- Utilities and maintenance;
- Equipment (including assessment-related and assistive technology for individuals with disabilities); and

- Technology to facilitate access to the one-stop center, including technology used for the center's planning and outreach activities This may include costs associated with the development and use of the common identifier (i.e., AJC signage) and supplies.

Non-Personnel Costs - Are all costs that are not compensation for personal services

Personnel Costs - Include salaries, wages, and fringe benefits of the employees of partner programs or their subrecipients as described in 2 CFR 200.431.

-One-stop partner programs must share in additional costs, which must include applicable career service, and may include shared operating costs and shared services that are necessary for the general operation of the one-stop center(s). Refer to TEGE 16-16 for more detail.

Infrastructure Cost Funding – May be in the form of (1) cash, non-cash, and third-party in-kind contributions; (2) funding from philanthropic organizations or other private entities; or (3) other alternative financing options, as described in WIOA Sec. 121(c)(2)(A)(ii). Cash funds may be provided to the local board or its designee by one-stop partners, either directly or by an interagency transfer, or by a third party. Non-cash funds are expenditures incurred by one-stop partner programs on behalf of the one-stop center; and non-cash contributions or goods or services contributed by a partner program and used by the one-stop center. Third-party In-kind contributions may consist of space, equipment, technology, non-personnel services, or other like items to support the infrastructure costs associated with one-stop operations, by a non-one-stop partner to: support the one-stop center in general; or support the proportionate share of one-stop infrastructure costs of a specific partner. Non-cash and third-party in-kind contributions must be valued consistent with 2 CFR 200.306 to ensure they are fairly evaluated and meet the partners' proportionate share and relative benefit. Partners must fairly value contributions on a periodic and annual basis.

Proportionate Use - For the purpose of this joint policy guidance, "proportionate use" refers to a partner program contributing its fair share of the costs proportionate to: (1) the use of the one-stop center by customers that may include reportable individuals and participants in its program at that one-stop center; (2) the amount of square footage occupied by the partner program in the one-stop center; or (3) another allocation base consistent with the Uniform Guidance.

Relative Benefit - In determining the proportionate share, the "relative benefit" received from participating in the one-stop delivery system is another step in the cost allocation process and does not require partners to conduct an exact or absolute measurement of benefit, but instead to measure a partner's benefit using reasonable methods.

State Funding Mechanism - Although the local one-stop operating budget contains different cost components, failure by only one of the required partner programs to reach consensus in a local area with respect to the infrastructure costs in the IFA will trigger implementation of the SFM. A failure by required partners to reach consensus on additional costs does not trigger the SFM. If the Local WDB and required one-stop partners fail to reach consensus on funding infrastructure

costs under the LFM, as outlined above, this will trigger the SFM. Even if all required partners *except one* agree on the terms of the IFA, consensus is not reached, and the SFM is triggered.

6. References:

- [Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2014](#), Section 121(a)(1); 121(c)(2)(A); 121(h)
- [WIOA Joint Rule-Federal Register](#) WIOA Joint Rule on Unified and Combined State Plans, Performance Accountability and One-Stop System Joint Provisions, 20 CFR 678.500(b), 34 CFR 361.500(b) and 34 CFR 463.500(b); 20 CFR 678.700 and 678.760, 34 CFR 361.700 and 361.760, and 34 CFR 463.700 and 463.760.
- [2 CFR 200.306](#) and DOL CFR Ch II, Pt. 2900
- [20 CFR 678.725-750 and 678.730](#)
- [TEGL 16-16 WIOA-General Guidance for One-Stop Operations](#)
- [TEGL 17-16, Infrastructure Funding of the One-Stop Delivery System](#)
- Resource Sharing for Workforce Investment Act One-Stop Centers: Methodologies for Paying or Funding Each Partner Program's Fair Share of Allocable One-Stop Costs; Notice. Published at 66 FR 29638 (May 31, 2001)
- WorkSource System Policy 1013, Rev. 2

7. Supersedes:

None.

8. Website:

<https://wpc.wa.gov/adm/policy/state>

9. Action:

Local Workforce Development Boards and their contractors, as well as ESD Regional Directors, must distribute this policy broadly across the one-stop system to ensure that WorkSource System staff are familiar with its content and requirements.

10. Attachments:

Attachment I: Examples of Cost Pools and Possible Allocation Bases, TEGL 17-16. Att. I

Attachment II: [Paying for the One-stop Delivery System](#), TEGL 17-16, Att. II

Attachment III: Required Partners in One-Stop System and Infrastructure Costs: Funding Sources
May be good to include a timeline/calendar of deadlines and next-steps

Direct Inquiries To:

Employment System Administration and Policy Unit

Policy, Data, Performance and Integrity Division
Employment Security Department
P.O. Box 9046
Olympia, WA 98507-9046
[*SystemPolicy@esd.wa.gov*](mailto:SystemPolicy@esd.wa.gov)

or

Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board
P.O. Box 43105
Olympia, WA 98504-3105
360-709-4600
[*workforce@wtb.wa.gov*](mailto:workforce@wtb.wa.gov)

Tab 2

**Executive Director's Report
Workforce Board Meeting, June 2, 2021 Meeting No. 248**

1. **Student Data Portal opens July 6**—The Workforce Board's secure, encrypted Student Data Portal is set to open soon, with schools from across the state able to submit student-level records for evaluation by agency research staff. Schools will also be able to get tips on how to submit their data as part of a live webinar, to be scheduled soon. This webinar is also recorded for later viewing. Student-level records submitted through the portal help research staff evaluate completion rates, employment rates, wages, and more, for recent graduates of thousands of Washington postsecondary education programs. This evaluation is used to determine which programs meet performance thresholds to be on the state's Eligible Training Provider List, and potentially qualify for federal workforce training dollars. The portal is scheduled to be open through August 27. More details: <https://www.wtb.wa.gov/private-career-schools/student-data-reporting/>
2. **Performance Accountability:** The Workforce Board's Net Impact and Cost-Benefit Evaluation of the state's workforce development programs is conducted every 4-5 years as required by statute. This latest evaluation, published in May 2021, details the economic impact and public return on investments for workforce programs. These programs generate an estimated \$3 billion per year in economic impact. The full report is available here: <https://www.wtb.wa.gov/research-resources/workforce-training-results/>
3. **Performance Targets:** The Board approved the WIOA state targets in May 2020, which included the breakout by WDC of locally negotiated targets for all measures except for rates of Credential Attainment and Measurable Skill Gains. Only state targets were submitted for these measures due to a lack of clarity on the information required to be collected at the local level. DOL has since provided training on these metrics, and staff have been working with local areas to determine the best approach for local area rate targets. The state target level was not changed.
4. **National Governors Association's Workforce Innovation Network (WIN):** Washington has been engaged over the last month in the National Governors Association's Workforce Innovation Network (WIN) project, which brings together a cohort of 10 states to collaborate on service integration projects designed to move dislocated workers more quickly to a career pathway. Washington's project is designed to advance the Board's collective impact initiative, and to coalesce the many economic recovery efforts underway in our state. The Workforce Board submitted the application on behalf of, and in coordination with, the Governor's office, DSHS, ESD, SBCTC, and Commerce. AWB and WSLC have since been invited to participate. We also have active agency engagement from the OFM Washington Recovery group, DSB, and WSAC, with new members joining at every bi-weekly meeting.

Washington's five-month project has four key components: Developing a comprehensive map of jobseeker and business services offered by our workforce system partners; creating a common set of counseling and service planning tools that can be used across the system to aid service navigation; identifying one or more systemic measures of collective impact; and establishing inter-agency MOUs that codify new service integration protocols and expectations. Additionally, to aid the Board's collective impact work, we are using the expertise and wide field of vision of our NGA partners to look at how states are using systemic measures to determine their impact

during recovery, particularly among vulnerable populations. We're interested in learning how other states have systemically measured poverty reduction and/or the increase in economic self-sufficiency among participants.

5. **Congressional Recommendations for WIOA and Workforce Issues:** There is a great deal of interest among Congressional members in supporting effective workforce development in the post-pandemic economy. Current discussions on a federal infrastructure package, new financial aid tools, a focus on critical industry sectors such as healthcare and IT, the "future of work," expanding access to registered apprenticeships, and modifications to better support rural regions, have all emerged as areas of interest. Your executive director has been the primary contact with Gov. Inslee's D.C. office staff, and WA's Congressional delegation as inquiries and draft bills are posed. I've provided referrals to other agency and stakeholder partner staff depending on the topic. One bill that a number of our partners have helped develop and support is Rep. Adam Smith's H.R.8747 - Emergency Economic and Workforce System Resiliency Act. He will be discussing the bill at an AWB event on July 21. Here is a link to the bill: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/8747/text?q=%7B%22search%22%3A%5B%22adam+smith%22%5D%7D&r=12&s=1>

In late April, Senator Patty Murray's office asked Workforce Board staff for assistance in working with stakeholders to develop a list of ideas for a potential WIOA reform bill. We committed to surveying system stakeholders to develop our response. Nova Gattman is leading this effort and has engaged set of stakeholders from across state and local agencies, and representing all components of the workforce development system. Nova is also coordinating with the governor's office to ensure alignment with the governor's priorities.

With subject matter support from Eric Wolf and myself, and input from stakeholders, Nova is providing recommendations on a variety of topics, including, but not limited to the Eligible Training Provider List, career pathways, future of work, performance accountability, career-connected learning and youth provisions under WIOA. One topic area is developed and sent each week to Sen. Murray's lead staff, Jennifer Stiddard. This work will be complete in mid-June, but the Board's role will continue – as the draft ideas and concepts brought up by the small group will be items for potential consideration of the Board for our more formal workforce system legislative and policy agenda.

6. **Legislative Session – Health Workforce Board Items:** This session saw many robust investments in behavioral health, including workforce! We're excited to report that multiple items recommended in the Board's 2020 Behavioral Health Workforce Assessment were included in both the Governor's proposed budget, as well as the final budget passed by the Legislature! Funded recommendations include:
 - a. Development of a teaching clinic enhancement rate, intended to more accurately compensate community behavioral health agencies for their vital role in supervising graduate-level students and practitioners pursuing their clinical licensure. This was the report's highest priority recommendation and is also linked to recommendations found in the 2017 Behavioral Health Workforce Assessment.
 - b. Inclusion of a mental health professional among the team of personnel responding to emergencies involving mental health challenges.

- c. A task force to examine impacts and changes proposed to the use of criminal background checks in behavioral health settings.
 - d. In addition, the Legislature funded our ongoing behavioral health workgroup efforts for another biennium and formalized the group as the Behavioral Health Workforce Advisory Committee (BHWAC). This group, led by our Health and Social Policy Advisor, Julia O'Connor, is charged with reviewing, monitoring, and reporting on the progress of recommendations from both of the aforementioned reports. In addition, the BHWAC will continue to develop policy and practice recommendations on pressing issues identified by stakeholders. This will allow the Board to continue to play a crucial role in addressing Washington's critical behavioral health workforce shortage, including identification of important progress and nagging gaps. A preliminary report is due to the Legislature by December 1, 2021, while the final report and recommendations are due December 1, 2022.
 - e. The Workforce Board was also charged with leading a significant research proviso to address gaps in behavioral health workforce data, which will help to inform the work of the BHWAC, with some of the work being done under contract with WA-STEM. The full body of work will include an analysis of behavioral health workforce shortages and challenges, data to inform systems change, and relevant policy recommendations and actions informed by the Board's employer demand projection and WA-STEM's talent development pipeline analyses.
7. **Long-term Care Workforce:** One other exciting item of note is that funding was appropriated for the development of a long-term care Nursing Assistant Certified (NAC) to licensed practical nurse (LPN) registered apprenticeship! This new pathway model was highlighted in the Board's Workforce Economic Recovery Plan, the state's Long-Term Care Workforce task Force, and the health Workforce Council. Funding is provided to the Washington Nursing Commission to work with a number of partners, including the Workforce Board, to develop all aspects of the program. The program will be developed in partnership with Apprenticeship Division staff from L&I to ensure that all criteria are met to be approved by the Apprenticeship Council for registration. The planning phase culminates with a design that can be to piloted in three regions of the state. Sponsoring employers, primarily skilled nursing facilities will be identified in each region. The legislative sponsor for this proviso, Sen. Steve Conway, is hopeful that funds can be appropriated in the 2022 state budget. The partnering agencies have also submitted a proposal to WA's Congressional delegation to be considered for "Congressionally-Directed Project" funding, also referred to as Community Project Funding. This is the first time in 10 years that this funding is being made available. We were very pleased that Rep. Dan Newhouse selected this proposal as one of his ten recommendations. We are hopeful that Sens. Murray and Cantwell will provide senate support.
8. **Update on One-Stop Operator Procurement at Workforce Central:** At the January Board Meeting, the Board was informed of an unsuccessful one-stop operator procurement in Workforce Central. After further guidance was received from Department of Labor, Workforce Central initiated a new procurement process and has successfully identified a new, third-party operator for their one-stops. As such, the local Board has no need to pursue waiver authority to provide operator services in-house through a "sole-source" agreement.

Tab 3



STATE OF WASHINGTON

WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD128 – 10th Avenue, S.W. • PO Box 43105 • Olympia, WA 98504-3105Phone: (360) 709-4600 • Fax: (360) 586-5862 • Web: www.wtb.wa.gov • Email: workforce@wtb.wa.gov

May 27, 2021

Dear Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board:

We are looking forward to the *Office of Equity Strategic Planning* listening session scheduled for Wednesday, June 2, 2021 from 1:15-2:40 during your scheduled board meeting.

Prior to the session, please complete the survey using the link below, whether you attend the listening session or not, to ensure that your voice is heard.

Survey: <https://forms.office.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=F-LQEU4mCkCLoFfcwSfXLX3oGaLIVgZNRlW8ST9dLBpURTQxRDJSSkoxTzJCSEdRSjlzUFc3M0k4Si4u>

Agenda for Executive Branch - Office of Equity Strategic Planning Listening Session

Reframing state government to work in a way that reduces disparities and improves equitable and just outcomes for everyone in Washington, for the next seven generations and beyond, is all of our work. *We need you.*

Meeting Purpose: To gather the collective wisdom for co-creating a five-year equity strategic plan that helps Washington to bridge opportunity gaps and reduce disparities so everyone in WA flourishes and achieves their full potential and there is equity and justice for all.

Introductions: Your name and, - in 25 words or less, - where you are on your anti-racist journey.

Listen: Imagine creating an organizational culture that centers equity and belonging to sustain workplace diversity.

- What observable evidence do you see?
- How do you feel working in this environment?
- What opportunity gaps need to be bridged in your agency?
- Which disparities need to be eliminated in your agency?
- What, in your opinion, must be measured to achieve this reality?

Learn

- What one thing do you want the Office of Equity (us) to know?
- What one thing do you want us to accomplish? How will you help?
- Who else do we need to meet?

Thank you for helping to create an equitable and just Washington for all, for the next seven generations and beyond!

Cindy Varley | she, her, hers

Executive Assistant to Dr. Karen A. Johnson, Director | Office of Equity | Office of Governor Jay Inslee

Voice/Text: 360-490-2972

www.governor.wa.gov |

Tab 4

Workforce System Legislative Agenda Planning

PRESENTER NAME: Nova Gattman

BOARD MEETING DATE: 6/2/21

DISCUSSION TIME ALLOTTED: 2 hours

<p>ISSUE/SITUATION: Be concise - 1 or 2 sentences that get to the heart of the situation, problem or opportunity being addressed.</p>	<p>THE ISSUE/OPPORTUNITY IS: Board staff will begin the conversation with the Board about potential parameters for the workforce system's 2022 legislative agenda. Board members will have the opportunity to debrief about the equity conversation earlier in the agenda, and hear a briefing about the Future of Work in the context of potential future direction for a system legislative agenda.</p>
<p>TAP STRATEGIC PRIORITY: Which TAP strategic priority or priorities does this recommendation support? Can you tie to specific goals and objectives in TAP? Briefly describe these connections. If the connection is unclear, describe why this is of consequence to the Workforce Board and/or workforce system.</p>	<p>THIS IS IMPORTANT TO THE WORKFORCE SYSTEM BECAUSE: The opportunity is for the Workforce Board to coalesce around key levers to advocate for strategies and tactics to improve economic outcomes for Washington's workers and businesses. Especially given the challenges for our business and workers in the last year, now is a prime opportunity to begin to set the parameters for our system's role in the 2022 legislative session and beyond – including in the federal policy arena.</p>
<p>BACKGROUND: Short history of how this recommendation came to be. What has been tried, to what result? What evidence exists to support this recommendation?</p>	<p>A Workforce Board legislative advocacy agenda will allow Business, Labor, and Government to be united in pursuing support from the Legislature and Congress to move key issues forward that will best positions the workforce system to play a key role in the state's economic recovery. A system agenda provides a more narrowed and stronger focus on a small set of issues critical to the workforce system, while not prohibiting advocacy for items that are not listed.</p> <p>Additionally, developing a small, targeted list of legislative priorities allows Board members and stakeholders to have a much deeper knowledge of key items on the list, allowing for increased participation and advocacy for the workforce system goals before policymakers.</p>
<p>RECOMMENDATION AND NEXT STEPS: What specific result do you want from the Board? Is this recommendation for discussion or action? If for discussion, will action be required at a later date? What next steps are expected after this discussion?</p>	<p>THE RECOMMENDATION AND/OR REQUESTED ACTION IS: Information and discussion only. Staff will provide key questions for the Board to consider to help set early parameters for action, and then will facilitate breakout sessions to provide more focused discussion on issues where needed.</p>