

SYSTEMS PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE MEETING
August 23, 2019
Camden County Workforce Development Board Office

ATTENDANCE:

Members		7-Jun-18	17-Aug-18	16-Nov-18	15-Feb-19	17-May-19	23-Aug-19
Abusi, Pat, CHAIR	RailRoad Construction of South Jersey	X	X	X	X	X	
Bryant, Janice	CCOS, Fiscal Manager	X		X	X	X	
Cirii, Frank	Local Area Operations Director, CCOSCC			X	X	X	X
Doran, Ryan	IBEW Local 351				X		
Maguire, Laurie	CCOS, Manager, Information Systems	X	X	X	X	X	X
Pape, Barbara	CCOS, Senior Accountant	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sinclair, Nidia	CCOS, Director, Career Center	X	X				
Weil, Robert	Conner Strong & Buckelew Companies Inc.						
Swartz, Jeffrey S., Exec. Director	WDB, Execitve Director	X	X	X	X	X	X
Primas, Theo	WDB, Program Evaluator	X	X	X	X	X	X
Varallo, Kathleen	WDB, Administrative Assistant	X	X	X	X	X	X
Williams, Leslie J	WDB, Comptroller	X	X	X	X	X	X

WELCOME:

Jeffrey S. Swartz, Executive Director, welcomed attendees.

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated May 17, 2019. Jeff made the first motion to approve the minutes dated May 17, 2019. Frank Cirii made the second motion. By unanimous vote to the affirmative the motion was carried and the minutes were approved.

FISCAL REPORTS REVIEW

Barbara Pape, One-Stop, Senior Accountant, presented the Master Budget for program year 2019-2020. She also presented the Fund Balance Report through June 30, 2019 and the Contract Analysis Summary through August 15, 2019.

Leslie Williams, Comptroller, WDB asked Barbara to review the carry over funds regarding the Summer Youth Employment Pilot Program. (SYEPP). She asked if the SYEPP funds should be moved to carry-over funding in the budget. They must be spent by September 30, 2019. Barbara said for our purposes, June 30th was the end of the fiscal year and the SYEPP funds were part of youth funds last year even though it is being spent in the current program year. The whole amount of the funds is considered to be carry over funds. Jeff expressed concerns and suggested keeping the SYEPP funds totally separate due to it being special funding tied to a grant proposal. It should be viewed as funding from WIOA, however the State set a specific criteria for the use of the funds and it is has not been made clear yet how the unused funds will be handled. Barbara said the funds were put into the master budget when they were received in the former program year. She carried them over into the new Master Budget for the coming year because all accounting of expenditures have not been fully processed because of employer reimbursements. Frank Cirii, Local Area Operations Director, said once all the accounting for the program is closed out, Barbara will generate a report and a letter that will be sent to the State asking for direct guidance as to either

sending the funds back or keeping them in reserve for an extension of the program in summer 2020. Leslie clarified the terminology used in the budget. The SYEPP funds can be considered a liability but it is currently active so it will not be considered a liability until the program ends and it is fully closed out. It should not be shown on the budget as a new form of income. Barbara clarified that it is being noted on the master budget as obligated funds to the WDB for reimbursement. The Committee discussed the procedures for closing out the SYEPP and adjustments that need to be made in the master budget.

Barbara reported that certain funds on the master budget are shown in the carry over categories and then shown again in the obligated areas of where the funds will be spent. She also referred to the adjusted funds received for the Smart Steps program. She has still not received a full reporting on the transportation funds. That may be due to the fact that SJTA moved back from a fiscal year to a calendar year.

Barbara reported that she prepared the Master Budget based on the current level of expenditures at the facility on Mt. Ephraim Ave. Other costs in the master budget may be the same as last year even with the move. She is still waiting for the costs levels in the new facilities. Most of the new cost basis has not been established. She said we are being told that the costs will be the same at the new location. Utilities are built into the rent. Frank said there will be adjustments once these costs are fully established. He said there may be a savings in phone costs. Barbara said she will modify the budget by November or January 2020. Jeff said that the new Infrastructure Funding Agreement (IFA) may be more challenging because there are more common areas. Barbara said she already ordered the specific square footage for each area in the new location. She said that once the move is made, starting in October, she will gage usage of the common areas as well as specific areas such as the classroom and meeting rooms to see who is using the areas and when they are being used. Then a cost basis can be established. Leslie asked if the utilities will be broken out even though they are included in the rent. Barbara said she will have to see how it can be monitored. The key is to know where all agencies are located in the new facility. The costs for security will a challenge to calculate. Barbara said that the State Department of Labor may rely on her fiscal department to allocate costs. The Committee reviewed these concerns.

Jeff asked if the staff development costs are included in the conference line item. Barbara said staff development is usually budgeted by Resource Center funding. The GSETA funding is usually budgeted by the conference meetings line item. Laurie Maguire, Manager, Information Management Systems, said in the past, counselors had to complete 15 hours of credit hour training to maintain their state certification. This may be something worth budgeting for. The Committee discussed the requirement and agreed to look further into whether achieving those hours would be at the counselor or agency's responsibility. Laurie said she would send an email to the counseling supervisor at the State or to Joseph Dombrowski, Assistant Director, Employment Services LWD, to get a definitive answer. Jeff suggested doing an internal audit to see which counselors have met the requirement and query the need before further action is taken. He said it is important for all counselors to be certified.

Barbara reported that Individual Training Account (ITA) funding is at the same level as last year. There has been an increase in ITA's for TANF customers. She reviewed other funding sources and allocations such as SNAP and GA. She is confident that funds will be spent in these areas. Leslie

asked about the highlighted areas on the Master Budget. Barbara said the highlights are a reminder about areas of further research. She will send a clear copy.

Laurie brought up some areas in the master budget where co-enrollment helped to break down the cost per person. The Committee discussed outcomes and the cost allocations in the areas to Title I, Adult Basic Training. Laurie explained how MIS breaks down the enrollment process to take full advantage of allowable costs. Frank said this is where setting up a follow up unit would be beneficial. Laurie asked for a recommendation by the System Performance Committee in order to give the Management Information System office a clear directive about co-enrollment on a case by case basis. The Committee discussed ways that co-enrollment would benefit the customer based on their Individual Employment Plan (IEP). They recommended that Laurie use ASOS to apply the proper coding system as needed to appropriate the allowable costs per person to the correct funding sources. This may include co-enrollment in some cases into non-WIOA or Workfirst funded programs. The Committee also discussed the intake process and how case management and counselors would need further training to catch co-enrollment opportunities at the intake process. Theo Primas, Program Evaluator, WDB, added that referral back to the One-Stop for funding was added to the ITA contracts some years ago. He read the clause in the contract to the committee. Theo said that One-Stop Partners and Vendors could be advised of these opportunities and educated on how to handle these types of referrals. Frank suggested a business card or referral card that could be given out by case managers with information about the opportunity of the training grant. He also said eligible Workfirst and other program customers would be better served if referral to the One-Stop, for an orientation of services, was made mandatory. All agreed the goal is to assign coding wisely, serve eligible customers who may have been overlooked for one reason or another, and not to send back unused grant funding.

The Committee finished reviewing the Master Budget for the 2019-2020 program year and recommended it be presented to the full Board of Trustees for approval at the quarterly meeting scheduled on September 25, 2019 at Camden County College. This action is pending minor high lighting and changes discussed by the committee. Barbara said she would make the changes and forward the finalized budget to the WDB Office for distribution to the full board.

Barbara reviewed the Fund Balance Report and noted the funds that will be sent back if not spend by the end of the program year. She said we are already two months into the program year and without more referrals unused funds will be sent back. She suggested contacting the Board of Social Services and letting them know there are available funds to serve TANF customers. She also said the One-Stop did spend its WIOA funds. Youth and Adult funds are on target to be spent by the end of the program year. More adult funds have been allocated this year and less dislocated worker funds so we have to place an emphasis on Adult Occupational Training. Jeff said he discussed an idea with Assistant Commissioner Hugh Bailey about moving funds regionally as needed between counties. There is no reason to send funding back if we can share it with other southern counties looking for more funds. Barbara asked about the rules regarding a customer moving between counties for services. Laurie said dislocated workers can be obtain services by different counties but it may not be beneficial to send funds to other areas.

Barbara reviewed the Contract Analysis. She said both vendors met enrollment. OEO achieved 5% job placement and the Workgroup achieved 27% job placement. They both still have more time to get more youth placed in jobs. Jeff asked what type of jobs the youth were placed in. He said the

WDB may want to see how the outcomes are creating real career paths for youth. Barbara said a report could be generated that would include that information. Further education can be included as a positive outcome. Leslie asked why OEO is reporting lower outcomes. Barbara said that youth may still be in the process of completion. Jeff suggested that the WDB contact the Workgroup about doing an orientation for the ACE program since they are experiencing a good completion rate. Jeff also said the WDB would still like to attract more youth providers. It was great that we picked up JEVS this year but other counties seem to have more than three providers. Laurie said that JEVS did postpone their MIS training session. They are going to re-schedule. Jeff said that JEVS is doing well in Atlantic County. He has been encouraging them for years to offer services in Camden County. Theo said that one reason may be that our local youth providers provide training in all 14 common measures, whereas, in some counties, there may be different providers only providing one piece of the required programming. Barbara suggested that Jeff request a copy of Atlantic County's youth provider contract for comparison and ideas that could be incorporated into the Camden County contract. Jeff said that Camden County has been very strict about the terms of their contracts and assurances. The Committee discussed ways to attract more youth providers. Laurie brought up a point that the Youth One-Stop is the design framework for the programs that the youth providers offer, however, they are operating separate and apart from the One-Stop. All youth referred to these programs would be first registered at the Youth One-Stop and go through the regular eligibility process. Laurie also said another concern is that according to TANF regulations, youth can enter a program at the age of 18, but as soon as they turn 19 years of age they must be transferred to a BREM/CWEP program. The question being how can we make our youth programs a countable activity so that youth ages 19-26 can participate while receiving benefits. When a youth, age 19, comes to the YOS for services, they are currently referred back to case management. The requirements of a BREM/CWEP are only 10 hours and they may need more hours to achieve a GED. Some of the youth providers are only accepting youth, age 18, as long as they complete their programs before they turn age 19. The Committee discussed the concern and the gap between Labor and the DFD. Frank said the lack of cross communication between computer systems is the biggest problem. All agreed that resolving some of these concerns could help to attract more youth provider and provide better services to youth in the County.

PROGRAM EVALUATOR REPORT

Theo Primas, WDB Program Evaluator, reported there are currently 38 Individual Training Account (ITA) Vendors eligible to receive program year (PY) 2019-2020 Career Center Referrals. He sent out 61 contract packages for additional vendors and they are still being processed.

WORKFIRST & WIOA

Theo reported that program year 2019-20 services have begun. He also reported that there are new regulations regarding the Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL). Under new requirements, the WDB must send copies of the scoring rubrics and fully executed contracts to the Center for Occupational Employment Information (COEI) for review. The Department of Education exerts their influence over training vendor applications because they have to approve the curriculum. Labor or COEI approves the value of the training by its ability to result in the career. It was required that these training providers be a private career or post-secondary school but some of the vendors were in limbo because they were also providing GED attainment. Reading the requirements in that way, the youth providers, while meeting the WIOA 14 common skills development measures, did not meet the requirements of a career school. The WDB regular

requirements do not require a provider to provide all 14 elements, they do have to provide access to them. Accordingly, youth vendors might have had to apply with 14 separate applications. Theo said he and Jeff helped write a letter to the State. New rules have given providers more clarity and consideration for being contracted by the standard procurement process. Camden OEO was the first provider in the local area to complete the process this program year. Theo said his new process is to scan all the scoring rubrics, wait for the signed contract to come back from the County and then send the package to the State. Theo showed the committee email correspondences regarding the process.

SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PILOT PROGRAM (SYEPP)

Theo reported that all active employer worksites have been visited. The reporting is complete, pending receipt of the final participant evaluations being submitted by the employers.

The next quarterly meeting of the System Performance Committee meeting is scheduled Friday, November 15th, 2019 @9:00am

Submitted by,

Kathleen Varallo

WDB Administrative Assistant