

**STATE WORKFORCE INNOVATION COUNCIL
EDUCATIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
JANUARY 12, 2010, 9:30 AM
INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
JAMES WHITCOMB RILEY ROOM
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA**

Present: Carol D’Amico, Jim Dunn, Leroy Jackson, Derek Redelman, and Debra Seman.

Absent: Harold Force

Also Present: From the Indiana Department of Workforce Development (DWD): Jackie Dowd, Marie Mackintosh, Jennifer O’Shea, Monica Go, and Brenda Johnson.

The meeting was called to order by Carol D’Amico at 9:32 AM

Introductions were made and the agenda was reviewed.

Jackie Dowd distributed the minutes and Derek Redelman made a motion to approve them. The motion was seconded by Debra Seman and the minutes were approved without objection.

Mr. Redelman pointed out that public comment on the eligible training provider policy was required pursuant to the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) regulations, and made a motion as a result not to proceed with the action to “communicate to current providers to provide mandatory information” that was authorized during the committee meeting on November 18, 2009. Motion was seconded and approved without objection.

Ms. Dowd distributed a draft of the policy and stated that it was aligned with WIA Section 122. Marie Mackintosh gave an overview of the draft policy, highlighting the following key points:

- Existing providers (including out of state providers) must reapply and may be granted a six-month waiver for performance data if it is not readily available;
- New providers may apply continuously;
- Providers will be required to submit information on each program;
- Program performance data is required;
- Minimum performance levels will be determined by the Educational Review Committee based on initial performance data submitted by the providers;
- Reasons for denial;
- Subsequent eligibility: training providers must reapply each year and submit new data performance data. Approval or denial will be based on program performance levels;
- Whether Marion County Workforce Investment Board should be used instead of IPIC; and

- The appeals process.

Ms. Dowd emphasized that the policy can change with public comment down the road.

Discussion points on the draft policy are highlighted below:

- Mr. Redelman raised an issue with the proposed appeals process stating that if the plaintiff does not accept the decision of the DWD legal team, it should be taken to the SWIC for a final decision with both sides presenting their cases. DWD staff will meet with both the DWD legal and policy teams to clarify the appeals process;
- Ms. Mackintosh confirmed that all training providers would be notified of new policy;
- Ms. D'Amico stated that "if a training provider cannot produce performance measures, it should not be on the list" (after initial eligibility grace period);
- A year was defined as a 12-month period within the last 18 months. It was pointed out that it would be good for consumers to see and evaluate data covering the same time period. However, because of rolling admission, this is not practical.
- Define unsubsidized employment; and
- Leroy Jackson wanted to see the changes made to the policy and application prior to voting.

Discussion points on Individual Training Accounts are highlighted below:

- Does the Educational Review Committee decide the available training for the Individual Training Accounts (ITAs)? Does the committee decide the demand occupations for the ITAs? Ms. Dowd explained the Balance of State-Workforce Investment Board (BOS-WIB) and the State Workforce Innovation Council (SWIC) approving role;
- Inability to know which training providers are being used via the ITA;
- No concrete financial data;
- Regional operators earmark funding for the ITAs not necessarily track each person;
- Incomplete information on who went to training, completed, or got a job;
- Ms. Dowd again offered to bring the Budget and Accounting Director to the meeting to explain ITAs in more depth to the committee.

Discussion points on attachment one (application) of the draft policy:

- "Financially sound" in Section 2, question 5, is too subjective;

- Does an eligible training provider have to be registered with COPE? Ms. Mackintosh stated that “we would have to determine criteria”;
- Online training capacity should be added;
- Remove “relevant” from section 3 question 11;
- Costs should be “detailed.” Section 3, question 21 – include chart with components (unit, semester, 3rd quarter) and choose one. Total number at the bottom of chart should be linked to the program length in question 14;
- Add number of enrollees to the performance data.

Ms. Dowd informed the committee that 49 defunct training providers were removed from the current eligible training provider list.

Next steps: DWD staff to finalize appeals process; adjust policy and application as appropriate
Educational Review Committee to approve policy
Policy posted for public comment

Next Educational Review Committee meeting will be held Tuesday, January 26 at 11:00 AM. Conference calling will be available.

Meeting adjourned 3:48 PM

EDUCATIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

Carol D’Amico, Chairman

Date

ATTEST:

Jaclyn P. Dowd, Director of Educational and Training Programs
Indiana Department of Workforce Development