Continuous Improvement And Accountability Committee

Date: April 16, 2025

Time: 1:00-2:15 PM

Chairperson: Marlon McClinton

Vice Chairperson: Kevin Irvine

Location: Zoom

**Members Present:** Kevin Irvine, Lisa Jones, Erik Grebner, Peter Creticos, Cleve Dixon, Jay Brooks, Kimberly Pinckney, Mark Burgess (proxy for Julio Rodriguez), Ami Chambers, Lisa Bly-Jones, Andy Blanke, Carrie Thomas

**Members Absent:** Victor Dixon, Larry Fitzpatrick, Jennifer Foster, Karin Garcia, Erik Grebner, Marcus Jordan, Marlon McClinton, Biswa Phuyla, Becky Raymond, Lizabeth Stuck, Nina Tangman, Andrew Warrington, Jane Vellinga, Jess Wright

# **Staff Attendees:** Sarah Blalock and Antonio Gomez

|  |
| --- |
| Item |
| **Welcome: Agenda, Roll Call, and Community Agreements**  Vice Chairperson Kevin Irvine served as Committee Chair in Chairperson McClinton’s absence.  Sarah Blalock performed roll call and determined that a quorum was not present.  Vice Chair Irvine reviewed the Community Agreements for the group to ensure that all members feel respected and heard during the meeting. Additionally, Vice Chair Irvine noted that person-first language is great, but identity-first language is also appropriate during meetings if that is how the individual chooses to identify. |
| **Approval of March 18, 2025, Daft Minutes, *Final Action***  A quorum was determined not to be present. The Approval of the March 18, 2025, and April 16, 2025, Continuous Improvement and Accountability Committee Meeting Minutes will be addressed at the next Committee Meeting in May. |
| **Foundational Level-Set: Charges and Priorities Review**  Vice Chair Kevin Irvine provided a review of the Continuous Improvement and Accountability Committee’s Charges and Priorities for the group. |
| **March Meeting Review**  Sarah Blalock provided a review of the March Meeting for the committee, noting that performance has been a focus point for the last few meetings. |
| **Proposed Additional Questions – CIC Performance Workgroup Feedback**  Sarah stated that after using Google Doc for committee input and after deciding on activities for the CIA to pursue, the next step was to review questions to ask the four core partners during their annual performance updates. Four additional questions were proposed during the March CIA meeting. Sarah stated that she reached out to Jay Brooks and the CIC Performance Workgroup members on behalf of the committee to ask for their input.  Jay Brooks stated that after he received the proposed questions, he coordinated with individuals from each title to discuss whether the proposed questions touch on points beyond what titles have shared in the past, if adjustments need to be made to current presentations, and whether this would be the ideal time to modify the questions. Jay addressed each of these questions individually for the CIA Committee. Below are the additional questions and Jay’s responses.   1. **What is the likelihood that the job a person is training for today will be available in two years?** 2. **Are there leading indicators that have predictive qualities for measures we are interested in influencing in the future?**    * Response: Jay noted that tere is a process for programs to be approved by both Title I and Title II that take into account local demand and need. Jay noted that in order for a program to be approved by a Local Workfoce Innovation Board (LWIB), demand must be noted in that area. Jay noted than an LWIB would not use it’s Individual Training Account (ITA) funds to fund that specific type of training if there was not a need or potential for growth. Additionally, Jay stated the community college system has similar processes for adding programs. 3. **Are there practices that one title is employing that another (or multiple other) title(s) should adopt?**    * Response: The partner presentations have focused on performance, but there is a question for each title to report a succuss story. 4. **Is there a current collaboration/service integration between titles?**    * Response: Regarding both questions 2 and 3, Jay stated that there is collaboration and communication between titles and noted that oftentimes, they track people who are con-enrolled. However, it is largely self-reported by clients and students. |
| **Discussion of Final Partner Performance Questions**  ***Discussion Theme: General Thoughts***  Carrie Thomas asked if there was a way to use existing data to answer the proposed title performance questions. Mark Burgess noted a question asked at a previous meeting (Could you compare projections from the last 10-15 years and see what patterns emerge?) and stated that we cannot see the future with data.  ***Discussion Theme: Strategic Planning***  Lisa Bly-Jones noted the distinction between the compliance piece and the strategic piece when training for future jobs comes into the conversation and asked if there is a tool that could collect more data when students are being sent to training programs, particularly in community colleges.   * Mark Burgess cited collaborative efforts including systemwide Technical Assistance Workgroup with representatives of each core partner, Equal Opportunity monitoring to reduce overlap and redundancy, and policy development. * Additionally, Mark stated that Titles I and III are provided a Quarterly Report Analysis through the Department of Labor that touches on other data and program process metrics that go beyond the five primary indicators of performance but are not subject to formal assessment. * Jay spoke specifically to Lisa’s question regarding community colleges, noting that in those program offerings part of the process to propose a new program is that they need to do the labor market research to be approved as a new program. Jay stated that adding the question regarding “likelihood” should fall to the LWIB because they look specifically at the labor market research and would be better equipped to answer that specific question.   ***Discussion Theme: Occuapational Outcomes***  Cleve Dixon stated that he would like to know how many people are getting jobs in the field where they are training.   * Mark noted that employment records do not have specific occupations attached to them, making it difficult to pinpoint what job someone ultimately attains following training completion. * Erik Grebner stated that the contact tracers trained during COVID served the same purpose and asked what they are doing now. * Sarah stated that it is difficult coming into the WIOA space and noted that there is a discrepancy because customers are not followed beyond two years. * Erik Grebner stated that individual programs follow participants far longer than WIOA mandates and noted that he has seen one-year follow-up as a minimum standard to achieve with WIOA. * Erik Grebner stated that he sometimes looks at success in terms of employment as a generalized idea and asked if all employment and wage-growth was positive even if the information is not used to see what training is being done. * Mark Burgess agreed and asked if it would warrant looking at what other programs could have led the individual to eventual employment and different short-term or less expensive programs. * Erik Grebner asked if what is needed might be a more generalized program versus a specific OST.   ***Discussion Theme: Current Demand vs. Future Need***  Peter Creticos stated that current demand is not an indication of future demand and stated that the related question is looking into the ability to provide an educated guess.   * Mark Burgess stated that Demand-Occupation Training Criteria looks at projected 10-year, wage factor, and education level needed for new programs and noted that if a program is added it has to have some level of predictability. Additionally, regarding exit information, Mark stated that even with a twelve-month follow-up period after customer exit, individuals are free to ignore calls and can choose not to provide information (only 30% of participant information is currently known). * Jay stated that he is working closely with IDES and noted that employment records are run often. |
| **CIA Performance Workgroup Establishment Proposal, Final Action**  **Annual Presentations:**   * Provide an overview of the definition of each measure under WIOA. * Provide specific information on each target by fiscal year and measure as set by each title in negotiation with their respective federal agency and the timeline for those negotiations. * Provide an overview of the Statistical Adjustment Model, including which partners it affects and how.   **Bi-Annually:**   * Coordinate Core Partner Program Presentations that include information on each title’s actual performance on each measure as outlined in item #1 and in the context of the targets outlined in item #2. * Provide CIA members with context for data outcomes and trends. * Share specific strategies and interventions being implemented by the title to build on successes and address areas for improvement.   **Ongoing:**   * Update the WIOA Performance and Transparency website on a scheduled time frame as data is submitted and finalized with federal officials. * Review Disaggregated WIOA and Non-WIOA Performance and Program Data Annually, Including Occupations and Outcomes. * Determine how the CIA/IWIB can support Economic Development Regions to Analyze Disaggregated Data for Core WIOA Programs to Identify Inequities and Inform Solutions. * Review the current methods of aggregating and presenting data and work towards standardizing both the presentation of data across all partners (to allow direct comparisons, i.e., all data presented at county-level and/or community-area level and reaggregated to LWIA, DHS Region, etc.) as well as the public dissemination of data. * Determine how to support effective evaluation of WIOA programs at the state and local levels.   Vice Chair Kevin Irvine stated that the CIA determined that a Performance Workgroup is needed and noted that the items in red have been added to the Performance Workgroup’s charges and priorities.  Sarah Blalock stated that due to the lack of quorum at this meeting, final action could not be taken. Sarah noted that she would share all necessary information regarding this vote with the full committee for review and will revisit final action at the next meeting.  Jay Brooks stated that he had quite a few concerns about some of the language, noting that even with wage data it is unknown if an individual was employed full-time or part-time.  Additionally, Mark Burgess stated that Title I would have a challenge providing disaggregated data in the short term as States have received waivers for years and are only now preparing to request non-WIOA performance.  Sarah noted that the first two were added by the IWIB, not the committee.   * Carrie Thomas suggested that the committee should be clearer about what a WIOA vs. Non-WIOA Program is. |
| **Policy Process Update and Activity Discussion**  Sarah Blalock provided a Policy Process Update for the committee, specifically noting that regarding the current proposed process policy the committee needs to revise the equity language to ensure its alignment with the governor’s vision and federal guidelines. Sarah stated that this step needs to be completed before the Policy Process is published.  Sarah stated that the next activity would be to publish this on workNet’s e-Policy webpage.   * The location was approved by the CIC.   The final step is to follow that policy to ensure that the intended outcomes are received.  Erik Grebner asked whether the second revised process was final.   * Sarah stated that the CIC voted to approve, noting that the portions that need to be evaluated after the government and federal guidance are the equity language at the bottom of the graphic. |
| **New Business/Old Business**   * Finalizing Workplan * Incorporate research questions for performance and email the proposed performance scope to the CIA to the CIA for final conversation at the next meeting. |
| **Public Comment**  Vice Chair Kevin Irvine called for public comment. There was none. |
| **Adjournment**  Vice Chair Irvine called for a motion to adjourn the April 16, 2025, Continuous Improvement and Accountability Meeting. Peter Creticos made a motion to adjourn. Lisa Bly-Jones seconded the motion. All present members voted in the affirmative. The motion carries. The April 16, 2025, Continuous Improvement and Accountability Meeting adjourned at 2:03 PM.   * **Next Meeting: May 21, 2025 1:00-2:15 PM** |

## **Continuous Improvement and Accountability Committee**

## **Charges**

* Support continuous improvement of the IL workforce system.
* Provide local workforce areas with technical assistance, information, promising practices, and tools to advance equity.
* Support economic development regions to analyze disaggregated data for core WIOA programs to identify inequities and inform solutions.
* Support local workforce areas and industry partnerships in a broad range of sectors to disrupt occupational segregation of people of color, women, and individuals with disabilities in lower-wage jobs and support training and career advancement opportunities.

## **Priorities**

* Review disaggregated WIOA and non-WIOA performance and program data annually, including occupations and outcomes.
* Support effective evaluation of WIOA programs at the state and local level, including dissemination of the evaluation toolkit to local workforce partners.
* Incorporate an equity lens into the IWIB policy process and support continuous improvement of equity efforts in IWIB work.
* Collaborate with the WIOA Professional Development team and the WIOA Technical Assistance (TA) team to ensure that topics related to equity and inclusion in workforce development are covered in the training and TA provided by the state.
* Work with local workforce partners, case managers, and one-stop operators to understand and address the root causes of occupational segregation in WIOA-funded training.