

**ACTION ITEM**  
**MODIFICATION TO THE JTPA PY94-95 GOVERNOR'S**  
**COORDINATION AND SPECIAL SERVICES PLAN**

## **PURPOSE**

To present the Council with the proposed modifications to the Governor's Coordination and Special Service Plan (GCSSP) for PY95. The approved modification will be transmitted to the Department of Labor (DOL) upon Governor's approval.

## **BACKGROUND**

The Job Training Partnership Act requires the Council to submit to the Governor a two-year GCSSP which outlines the proposed use of all resources granted to the state under the Act and which reviews the use of funds during the previous two years. The GCSSP was submitted to DOL last May 1994 for the two year planning cycle (PY94-95) in accordance with the legislative requirements for approval. The GCSSP was revised according to recommendations by DOL and resubmitted in February 1995.

During the mid-year of the two year cycle (i.e. Program Year 1995), the GCSSP would be modified to reflect changes in policy for the upcoming year and to update other information as requested by guidelines provided to the state by the U.S. Department of Labor. This year however, DOL has indicated that they will not be sending out guidelines for the GCSSP Modification, leaving the modification process to the discretion of the State in terms of format and submission date.

## **DISCUSSION**

### Issues

A number of JTPA policies approved by the Governor for PY95 are different from PY94. To maintain the integrity of Texas GCSSP, these modified policies and other changed information need to be formally transmitted to the USDOL as a formal modification of that plan.

### Implications

Staff have incorporated the following policies changes in the GCSSP modification:

- Attachment A Goals and Objectives for Women in Non-Traditional Employment
- Attachment B JTPA Program Performance Summary for PY92 and PY93
- Attachment C Definition of the 50% Out-of-School Youth Service Level Requirement;
- Attachment D Performance Standards and Incentive Policy;
- Attachment E PY95 Allocations to Service Delivery Areas; and
- Attachment F SDA Determined Hard-To-Serve Eligibility Categories for PY95;

Relation to Strategic Goals and Objective

The recommendation supports the purpose of the Governor's Coordination and Special Service Plan by keeping it pertinent to the issues of the State. Since the goals and objectives adopted in the Workforce Development System Strategic Plan have not been changed, these will continue to be cornerstone on the GCSSP.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Commerce and TCWEC staff recommend that the modification to the Governor's Coordination and Special Service Plan be approved, and that the Nontraditional Employment for Women Program Annual Report developed by TCWEC be submitted to DOL with the GCSSP.

## Attachment A

<b>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR WOMEN IN NONTRADITIONAL EMPLOYMENT</b>
--

**GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR WOMEN IN NON-TRADITIONAL EMPLOYMENT**

The Governor has approved recommendations presented to the Council on the Non-Traditional Employment (NEW) Program. These recommendations include that participant information reported will be in a standardized format, by both adult and youth, to allow the comparison of NEW activities across SDAs.

To be effective in the training and placement of women in non-traditional occupational areas, SDAs should have in their job training plans specific goals and strategies; a process to identify and address barriers to participation; intensive staff development; orientation to nontraditional career options; individualized assessment of needs; establishment of linkages with other agencies and organizations; survival skills training; aggressive recruitment; expansion of training options; high numerical goals for training and placement; development of retention strategies and plans for continuous program improvement.

The following information is requested for PY94

- Discussion of goals for the program, strategies used to accomplish these goals, progress made and problems encountered.
- Numerical goals for training and placement
- Number of female participants enrolled in nontraditional training
- Average Age
- Ethnicity - % (Black, Hispanic, White, Other)
- Number and % that completed training
- Number and % still in training
- Number and % that did not complete training
- Of those that completed training in nontraditional occupational areas:
  - Number and % returned to school (youth)
  - Number and % of completers placed in nontraditional employment
  - Number and % of completers placed in traditional employment
  - Number and % of completers not placed
- Average wage of nontraditional placements
- Average wage of traditional placements
- 13-week follow-up - Percent retention
- 13-week average follow-up wage

## Attachment B

JTPA PROGRAM PERFORMANCE SUMMARY FOR PY92 AND PY93
--

The following is a summary of JTPA program performance for the fourth quarter of program year 1993. The data used in this report, which covers the period from July 1, 1993 through June 30, 1994, is based on State Management Information System data. Data is compared to data through the fourth quarter of PY92.

<u>Overall JTPA Performance</u>	PY92	PY93
Number of programs	172	164
Number of participants	139,458	119,656
Number of terminations	111,796	93,541
Number of terminees entered employment	27,412	21,044
Number of overall positive outcomes	92,245	82,161
Percent of overall positive outcomes	82.5%	87.8%

Through the fourth quarter of program year 1993, JTPA programs overall served 119,656 participants. Of those participants, 93,541 completed their program participation with 87.8 percent (82,161) receiving positive outcomes. Of the 119,656, 33.3 percent were enrolled in Title IIA adult and IIC youth programs; 36.3 percent were Title IIB Summer Youth program participants; 19.1 percent were Dislocated Workers program participants; 9.2 percent were Education Coordination program participants; and Older Individual and Veteran program participants constituted 2 percent of overall JTPA participants.

A comparison of the fourth quarter program performance data for PY92 and PY93 shows that the positive termination rate increased from 82.5 percent to 87.8 percent; however, the overall number of participants and terminees in PY93 decreased. This overall decrease can be attributed to several factors including: 1) the impact of the JTPA reform amendments which requires more front end services including objective assessment, addition documentation and referrals, 2) reduced funding in the Title II programs, and 3) increased costs associated with providing longer term training. A comparison of the average weeks of participation in the Title IIA programs increased from 26 weeks in PY92 to 35 weeks in PY93 and the average weeks of participation in the Title IIC programs increased from 27 weeks to 30 weeks. For Title IIA welfare participants, the average weeks of participation increased from 29 weeks to 40 weeks.

There was a decline in the number of Title IIA and IIC participants and terminees compared to the fourth quarter of PY92. In comparison to program performance in the fourth quarter of PY92, there was significant improvement on the adult follow-up weekly earnings (from \$246.95 to \$276.06), the adult welfare follow-up weekly earnings (from \$214.87 to \$232.37), and the youth employability enhancement rate (from 57.2% to 64.7%).

With respect to the Older Individual Programs, a comparison of the fourth quarter program performance data for PY92 and PY93 shows that the overall number of participants and terminees in PY93 decreased. Although DOL did not establish performance standards for older individual programs for PY93, the 4th quarter performance on both the entered employment and average wage at placement exceeds the standards established by DOL for PY94, i.e., 52 percent for the entered employment rate and \$5.45 for the average wage at placement.

There was an increase in the number of participants in the Dislocated Worker programs from 21,167 in PY92 to 22,843. The average wage at placement for these programs increased from \$9.78 to \$10.73.

For Title IIB Summer Youth Program, there was a 12 percent decrease in the number of participants in the summer 1993 program; however, the overall positive termination rate did increase slightly, from 95.1% to 96.9%.

#### Title II-A and II-C Adult and Youth Programs

Title II-A and II-C are the JTPA "core" programs for providing training and support services to economically disadvantaged adults and youths. Funds are provided to Private Industry Councils who oversee programs in the Service Delivery Areas.

	PY92	PY93
Number of programs	35	35
Number of participants	53,822	39,887
Number of terminations	38,059	27,645
Number of terminees entered employment	16,230	10,849
Youth positive terminations	17,484	13,287

Adult Measures:	PY92	PY93
* Follow-up Employment Rate	63.4%	63.6%
* Follow-up Weekly Earnings	\$246.95	\$276.06
* Follow-up Welfare Employment Rate	52.1%	50.9%
* Follow-up Welfare Weekly Earnings	\$214.87	\$232.37
Average Weeks Worked During the Follow-up Period	8.2	8.1
Entered Employment Rate	64.0%	62.2%
Welfare Entered Employment Rate	51.8%	52.2%
Average Wage at Placement	\$5.99	\$6.57

Youth Measures:	PY92	PY93
* Entered Employment Rate	38.8%	36.6%
* Employability Enhancement Rate	57.2%	64.7%
Positive Termination Rate	78.0%	79.9%

\* DOL performance standard.

#### Title IIA Older Individual Programs

Five percent of JTPA Title II-A funds are set-aside, by regulation, for providing training to economically disadvantaged individuals age 55 years and older. Funds are provided to contractors through a statewide Request for Proposal (RFP) process.

	PY92	PY93
Number of programs	16	17
Number of participants	2,579	2,042
Number of terminations	2,275	1,692
Number of terminees entered employment	1,339	1,046
Entered Employment Rate	58.9%	61.8%
Average Wage at Placement	\$5.62	\$5.70

Title III Dislocated Workers Programs-EDWAA

The goal of the Dislocated Workers program is to adequately prepare workers, who have lost their jobs due to lay offs or plant closings, for reemployment and to ensure their continued employability through a broad range of quality retraining, services and participant support.

The data presented here includes the outcomes of formula funded and discretionary programs including Defense Conversion Adjustment (DCA) Grants.

	PY92	PY93
Number of programs	33	33
Number of participants	21,167	22,843
Number of terminations	12,644	12,429
Number of terminees entered unsubsidized employment:		
from retraining	5,364	3,886
from basic readjustment services only	3,354	4,561
Total number of terminees entered employment	8,718	8,447
Entered Employment Rate	68.9%	68.0%
Average Wage at Placement	\$9.78	\$10.73

Title IV-C Veterans Programs

Texas contracts with the U.S. Department of Labor to operate Title IV-C programs which provide training opportunities specifically targeted to veterans. Funds are provided to contractors through a competitive RFP process. Although the entered employment rate was greater than in PY92, the average wage at placement is considerable less.

	PY92	PY93
Number of programs	2	3
Number of participants	452	413
Number of terminations	437	326
Number of terminees entered employment	314	260
Entered Employment Rate	74.6%	79.8%
Average Wage at Placement	\$8.47	\$7.47

Title II-A 8% Education Coordination Programs

The 8 percent Education Coordination Programs are administered by the Texas Education Agency. For PY94-95, the Governor's coordination of JTPA and education will focus on school-to-work transition, literacy and lifelong learning opportunities, and statewide coordinated approaches to train, place and retain women in non-traditional employment.

	PY92	PY93
Number of programs	51	41
Number of participants	12,181	11,060
Number of terminations	9,127	8,052
Number of terminees entered employment	591	442
Number attained employability enhancements	1,232	1,431
Number attained local program objectives	4,979	4,365
Total number of positive outcomes	6,802	6,238
Positive termination rate	74.5%	77.5%

Title II-B Summer Youth Programs

JTPA funds are contracted to the 35 SDA administrative entities to provide summer youth employment and training programs for disadvantaged young people.

	CY92	CY93
Number of programs	35	35
Number of participants	49,257	43,411
Number of terminations	49,254	43,397
Total number of positive outcomes	46,821	42,034
Positive Termination Rate	95.1%	96.9%

## Attachment C

**DEFINITION OF THE 50% OUT-OF-SCHOOL  
YOUTH SERVICE LEVEL REQUIREMENT**

The JTPA Final Rule Section 628.803(h)(1) gives the Governor the responsibility for determining the period for which the 50% out-of-school service level requirement will be calculated. The Governor has determined that the 50% out-of-school youth service level requirement will be calculated based on active participants during the two-year planning cycle. The job training plans in Texas are written on a two year basis and the 50% out-of-school youth service level requirement will be monitored annually so that SDAs can make adjustments in the program mix if necessary without disrupting the training of active participants and/or service providers at the end of the first year of the planning period.



## Attachment D

## PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND INCENTIVES POLICY

A. **PERFORMANCE MEASURES:** The following performance criteria apply to Title IIA and IIC programs for PY95:

- Department of Labor performance measures:
  - Adult follow-up employment rate;
  - Adult follow-up weekly earnings;
  - Adult welfare follow-up employment rate;
  - Adult welfare follow-up weekly earnings;
  - Youth employability enhancement rate; and
  - Youth entered employment rate.
- Additional measures required by the JTPA amendments:
  - Model out-of-school youth programs having a demonstrated record of success and serving more than the minimum required percentage of out-of-school youth.
  - Placing adults in employment of at least 20 hours per week which included employer-assisted benefits. Employer-assisted benefits is defined as fringe benefits consisting of, at a minimum, health insurance benefits and coverage under Social Security or an equivalent pension plan.
- State performance measures:
  - Adult high wage placements.
  - Serving Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) participants.

1. **DEPARTURE POINTS:**

- Department of Labor performance measures: as established by DOL;
- Model out-of-school youth programs having a demonstrated record of success and serving more than the minimum required percentage of out-of-school youth: 1) Serving at least 51 percentage out-of-school youth (In-school individuals served as a part of a school-wide project are not counted as a part of the ratio of in-school individuals to out-of-school individuals. Out-of-school youth includes youth enrolled in an alternative school), and 2) at least 70 percent demonstrated success in terms of these outcomes:
  1. Entered Employment
  2. Returned to School
  3. Remained in School
  4. Completed Major Level of Education
  5. Entered Non-Title II Training - "Certificate" or Apprenticeship Program.
- Placing adult participants in employment which includes employer-assisted benefits: 57.0 percent;
- Adult high wage placements: the Family Hourly Wage as defined in the Texas Smart Jobs Act, i.e. \$11.79; and
- Serving Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) participants: the incidence of JOBS participants in the eligible poverty population in the SDA.

2. **ADJUSTMENT METHODOLOGY:**

- Department of Labor performance measures: as established by DOL worksheets;
- Model out-of-school youth programs having a demonstrated record of success and serving more than the minimum required percentage of out-of-school youth: none;

- Placing adult participants in employment which includes employer-assisted benefits: adjusted to account for availability of health benefits in the area based on variations in area industry composition using worksheet provided by DOL.
- Adult high wage placements: adjusted for regional variations as prescribed in the Texas Smart Jobs Act.
- Serving Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) participants: none.

### 3. MINIMUM QUALIFYING PERFORMANCE LEVELS:

Department of Labor Performance Standards: For PY95, the minimum qualifying performance levels for exceeding a standard is defined as the adjusted 50th percentile of national performance, i.e., the 50th percentile of national performance adjusted for SDA local factors by the DOL adjustment model from the DOL established departure point. The adjusted standard is the actual predicted, or mid-point, values established for each SDA during the annual planning process and recalculated at the end of the Program Year based upon actual events (e.g., local economic conditions, service levels, etc.) during the year. For all standards, SDAs with actual performance within the zone between the adjusted 50th percentile of national performance and the lower confidence interval inclusive shall be considered to have met but not exceeded the standard. The lower confidence interval is the adjusted standard minus the greater of the tolerance range; or expanded tolerance range, for those standards for which the SDA has extreme values on two or more local factors.

Model out-of-school youth programs having a demonstrated record of success and serving more than the minimum required percentage of out-of-school youth: The SDA must meet at least four of the requirements below, and the requirement to serve at least 51% out-of-school youth, and the 70% successful outcome requirement.

1. Each youth must participate in a work based activity such as, but not limited to, work experience, limited internship, job shadowing, and/or mentoring with adult supervision in the work place. The intent is that programs should demonstrate that a youth work strategy has been developed and administered using real productive work.
2. Basic skills instruction must include some SCANS based curriculum.
3. Programs must allow for attainment of a high school diploma or GED if a participant has not received either credential.
4. Occupational skills training must be provided.
5. Supportive services must be provided if need is verified by the Individual Service Strategy (ISS). Support services may be provided through an agreement with another agency.
6. Programs must attempt to instill a sense of community responsibility in youth. Examples of how a program might instill a sense of community responsibility include:
  - Tutoring or mentoring other participants/students (reading to kindergarten students, peer-tutoring, etc.),
  - Volunteering and participating in a community service project (Habitat for Humanity, weatherization projects, etc.),
  - Designing a community project (ex. murals in neighborhoods with gangs, AIDS awareness, etc.), and
  - Performing a service that assists others (working at a school day care center).

For placing participants in employment which includes employer-assisted benefits the minimum qualifying performance level is defined as the adjusted standard.

For serving JOBS participants, the minimum qualifying performance level is twice the incident of JOBS participants in the poverty population and serving AFDC recipients at rates at least as high as their incidence in the eligible poverty population. For the purposes of this standard: 1) the percent of JOBS participants served shall be calculated as the number of terminees (adult and youth) who were JOBS participants expressed as a percentage of all terminees (adult and youth), and 2) the percent of AFDC recipients served shall be calculated as the number of terminees (adult and youth) who were AFDC recipients expressed as a percentage of all terminees (adult and youth)

## B. INCENTIVE AWARDS POLICY.

### ELIGIBILITY FOR INCENTIVE AWARDS:

- If less than 65 percent of the SDAs Title IIA participants are hard-to-serve, the SDA will be precluded from eligibility for incentive grants based on performance during PY95.
- If less than 65 percent of the SDAs Title IIC participants are hard-to-serve, the SDA will be precluded from eligibility for incentive grants based on performance during PY95.
- If an SDA fails three or more of the six DOL performance Standards or fails both of the DOL youth standards, it will be precluded from eligibility for incentive grants based on performance during that year.

**ALLOCATION OF FIVE PERCENT INCENTIVE FUNDS BY SDA.** Ten percent of the available incentive funds will be set aside for the Adult High Wage Placement incentive. Maximum potential SDA shares of the remaining incentive funds will be calculated. Shares will be proportionate to the SDA share, for the current Program Year, i.e., PY94, of the State's Title IIA and Title IIC allocation. Any funds not needed for performance against the Serving JOBS Participants Standard will be divided evenly between the Model Out-of-school Youth Standard and the Adult Employer-assisted Benefits Standard.

**ALLOCATION OF FIVE PERCENT INCENTIVE FUNDS BY PERFORMANCE MEASURE.** For PY95, the following ten performance criteria are weighted/ranked equally at 10.0 percent each:

- Adult follow-up employment rate,
- Adult follow-up weekly earnings,
- Adult welfare follow-up employment rate,
- Adult welfare follow-up weekly earnings,
- Youth entered employment rate,
- Youth employability enhancement rate,
  - Model out-of-school youth programs having a demonstrated record of success,
  - Adult Employer-assisted Benefits rate,
  - Adult High Wage Placements, and
  - Serving JOBS participants.

**ALLOCATION OF FIVE PERCENT INCENTIVE FUNDS BY DEGREE TO WHICH STANDARDS ARE EXCEEDED.**

- Funding tiers. For the DOL performance standards, serving JOBS participants standard, and model out-of-school youth standard, two funding tiers will be included in the PY94 policy, thus allowing SDAs opportunity to increase their incentive award for higher performance levels.
- Allocation of funds. For the DOL performance standards, serving JOBS participants standard, and model out-of-school youth standard, eighty-five and 15 percent of the five percent incentive funds will be allocated to Tiers I and II, respectively.

- Required performance levels.  
The degree by which the DOL performance standards must be exceeded to qualify for funds in a given tier are as follows:
  - Tier I: above the adjusted 50th percentile of national performance
  - Tier II: above the adjusted 65th percentile of national performance

The degree by which the serving JOBS participants standard must be exceeded to qualify for funds in a given tier are as follows:

- Tier I: serving JOBS participants at rates greater than twice their incidence in the eligible poverty population.
- Tier II: serving JOBS participants at rates greater than three times their incidence in the eligible poverty population.

For the model out-of-school youth standard:

- Tier I: the SDA must meet at least four of the six requirements, serve at least 51% out-of-school youth, and meet the 70% successful outcome requirement.
- Tier II: the SDA must meet five or more of the six requirements, serve at least 51% out-of-school youth, and meet the 70% successful outcome requirement.
- SDAs which exceed their adjusted Adult Employer-assisted Benefits rate will receive the full amount available to the SDA for this standard.
- The funds set aside for performance on the State Adult High Wage Placement Standard will be divided among SDAs based on their proportionate share of all adult high wage placements.

**DISTRIBUTION OF ANY REMAINING FIVE PERCENT INCENTIVE FUNDS:** If total incentive is less than the total amount allocated for incentives, the balance will be prorated by award share to those SDAs eligible for an incentive award, and provided to SDAs as additional incentive grant funds. Total incentive awards will not exceed the total amount allocated for incentives (not less than 67% of the Title IIA and IIC 5% allocation). Not more than 25 percent of the total incentive funds distributed will be for State performance standards.

#### **C/D. RESOLVING FAILURE TO MEET PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

At the end of the first year in which an SDA fails to meet one or more performance standards, a program review will be conducted by state staff in conjunction with self-assessment efforts by the SDA. The purpose of this program review is to identify the program factors and/or conditions which contributed to the failure of the performance standard. The review would cover all aspects of program delivery, to include sub-contracted activities. The product of this review is a Technical Assistance Plan.

Once problem areas have been identified, state staff will assist the SDA in developing the Technical Assistance Plan by which program performance can be improved during the course of the program year following the failure of the performance standard. The Technical Assistance Plan is meant to be an agreement between the SDA Administrative Entity, the PIC, the Chief Elected Official(s) and the state which outlines efforts at both the state and local level to improve the SDA's performance.

An SDA that fails three or more of the six core standards or fails both youth standards for a second consecutive program year is subject to SDA reorganization. Such reorganization activities would be

determined upon completion of a comprehensive review of the SDA's programs, to include an assessment of the effectiveness of technical assistance activities which were undertaken during the previous program year, a review of the SDA's administrative capabilities, a review of the SDA's procurement activities and subcontracts, if applicable, and a review of the effectiveness of the PIC's oversight of the SDA Administrative Entity. The product of this comprehensive review is the SDA Reorganization Plan.

The SDA Reorganization Plan will detail the specific actions to be taken by the SDA to strengthen SDA administration and improve program performance. The plan will include those elements of the technical assistance plan as well as an assessment of why the Technical Assistance Plan implemented the previous year failed to improve performance. The Reorganization Plan will be developed by state staff in conjunction with SDA staff.

PY 95 – IIA	ALLOCATION PY94 IIA	ORIGINAL ALLOCATION PY95 IIA	DIFFERENCE	PCT. CHANGE
1 Alamo (San Antonio)	4,408,236	4,514,366	106,131	2.41%
2 Rural Capital Area	485,374	497,060	11,686	2.41%
3 Rural Coastal Bend	829,050	969,411	140,361	16.93%
4 Dallas County	1,367,479	1,400,402	32,923	2.41%
5 Gulf Coast	2,991,218	3,569,079	577,861	19.32%
6 Harris County	1,966,349	2,429,314	462,965	23.54%
7 North Central Texas	1,648,086	1,890,883	242,797	14.73%
8 South Plains	365,422	410,351	44,929	12.30%
9 Tarrant County	1,016,172	1,040,637	24,465	2.41%
10 Brazos Valley	390,167	399,560	9,393	2.41%
11 Cameron County	1,610,332	1,908,012	297,679	18.49%
12 Central Texas	816,248	835,899	19,652	2.41%
13 Austin/Travis County	1,032,797	1,057,663	24,865	2.41%
14 Corpus Christi/Nueces CO.	1,095,150	1,403,692	308,542	28.17%
15 Dallas City	3,813,597	4,170,365	356,768	9.36%
16 Houston City	6,591,505	8,344,617	1,753,112	26.60%
17 Lubbock/Garza Counties	537,216	550,150	12,934	2.41%
18 Concho Valley	280,909	342,472	61,563	21.92%
19 Deep East Texas	964,902	1,190,070	225,168	23.34%
20 East Texas	2,077,060	2,486,383	409,323	19.71%
21 Fort Worth	2,041,901	2,091,060	49,159	2.41%
22 Golden Crescent	370,596	524,107	153,511	41.42%
23 Heart of Texas	693,950	736,388	42,438	6.12%
24 Hidalgo/Willacy Counties	3,814,273	3,919,108	104,835	2.75%
25 Middle Rio Grande	1,113,069	1,141,657	28,588	2.57%
26 North East Texas	858,053	1,150,570	292,517	34.09%
27 North Texas	499,127	511,673	12,546	2.51%
28 Panhandle	667,974	808,643	140,669	21.06%
29 Permian Basin	1,225,686	1,392,189	166,503	13.58%
30 South East Texas	1,519,693	2,043,196	523,503	34.45%
31 South Texas	1,577,176	1,615,147	37,971	2.41%
32 Texoma	388,998	464,404	75,406	19.38%
33 Upper Rio Grande	3,150,900	3,605,761	454,861	14.44%
34 West Central Texas	738,398	873,709	135,311	18.32%
35 Collin County	365,263	374,057	8,794	2.41%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>53,312,326</b>	<b>60,662,055</b>	<b>7,349,729</b>	<b>13.79%</b>

PY 95 – IIC	REVISED ALLOCATION PY94 IIC	ORIGINAL PY95 IIC	DIFFERENCE	% CHANGE
1 Alamo (San Antonio)	3,025,202	2,851,600	(173,602)	-5.74%
2 Rural Capital Area	333,094	313,979	(19,115)	-5.74%
3 Rural Coastal Bend	571,202	604,344	33,143	5.80%
4 Dallas County	957,044	902,124	(54,920)	-5.74%
5 Gulf Coast	1,967,236	2,125,567	158,331	8.05%
6 Harris County	1,378,189	1,540,695	162,505	11.79%
7 North Central Texas	1,119,561	1,161,424	41,863	3.74%
8 South Plains	263,828	268,548	4,721	1.79%
9 Tarrant County	720,346	679,009	(41,337)	-5.74%
10 Brazos Valley	267,756	252,391	(15,365)	-5.74%
11 Cameron County	1,125,035	1,325,740	200,705	17.84%
12 Central Texas	560,160	528,015	(32,145)	-5.74%
13 Austin/Travis County	708,768	668,096	(40,673)	-5.74%
14 Corpus Christi/Nueces Co	773,008	895,964	122,956	15.91%
15 Dallas City	2,642,473	2,613,172	(29,301)	-1.11%
16 Houston City	4,572,899	5,241,699	668,800	14.63%
17 Lubbock/Garza Counties	372,461	351,088	(21,374)	-5.74%
18 Concho Valley	193,055	213,111	20,056	10.39%
19 Deep East Texas	627,903	703,042	75,139	11.97%
20 East Texas	1,377,745	1,493,596	115,852	8.41%
21 Fort Worth	1,415,752	1,334,509	(81,243)	-5.74%
22 Golden Crescent	254,326	315,431	61,106	24.03%
23 Heart of Texas	465,964	445,383	(20,580)	-4.42%
24 Hidalgo/Willacy Counties	2,617,588	2,610,686	(6,902)	-0.26%
25 Middle Rio Grande	763,856	766,502	2,646	0.35%
26 North East Texas	578,282	691,655	113,372	19.61%
27 North Texas	337,790	318,406	(19,384)	-5.74%
28 Panhandle	461,275	505,499	44,224	9.59%
29 Permian Basin	847,500	870,759	23,258	2.74%
30 South East Texas	1,018,556	1,245,785	227,229	22.31%
31 South Texas	1,082,355	1,020,244	(62,111)	-5.74%
32 Texoma	257,437	278,301	20,864	8.10%
33 Upper Rio Grande	2,162,340	2,395,361	233,021	10.78%
34 West Central Texas	503,609	539,290	35,680	7.08%
35 Collin County	262,595	247,526	(15,069)	-5.74%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>36,586,190</b>	<b>38,318,540</b>	<b>1,732,350</b>	<b>4.73%</b>

## CY 95 IIB

S D A	CY 94	CY 95	DIF.	% INCR
1 Alamo (San Antonio)	5,209,031	4,938,996	(270,035)	-5.18%
2 Rural Capital Area	579,009	548,993	(30,016)	-5.18%
3 Rural Coastal Bend	992,600	1,049,443	56,843	5.73%
4 Dallas County	1,662,796	1,576,597	(86,199)	-5.18%
5 Gulf Coast	3,418,214	3,691,044	272,830	7.98%
6 Harris County	2,394,515	2,675,414	280,899	11.73%
7 North Central Texas	1,945,255	2,016,812	71,557	3.68%
8 South Plains	458,454	466,334	7,880	1.72%
9 Tarrant County	613,741	1,144,547	530,806	86.49%
10 Brazos Valley	506,535	480,277	(26,259)	-5.18%
11 Cameron County	1,931,547	2,302,147	370,600	19.19%
12 Central Texas	964,527	914,526	(50,001)	-5.18%
13 Austin/Travis County	1,244,104	1,179,609	(64,494)	-5.18%
14 Corpus Christi/Nueces Co.	1,343,253	1,555,840	212,587	15.83%
15 Dallas City	4,591,655	4,537,770	(53,885)	-1.17%
16 Houston City	7,946,194	9,102,203	1,156,009	14.55%
17 Lubbock/Garza Counties	647,192	613,642	(33,550)	-5.18%
18 Concho Valley	335,474	370,066	34,592	10.31%
19 Deep East Texas	1,091,084	1,220,832	129,748	11.89%
20 East Texas	2,394,022	2,593,628	199,606	8.34%
21 Fort Worth	2,850,912	2,344,763	(506,149)	-17.75%
22 Golden Crescent	443,913	547,746	103,833	23.39%
23 Heart of Texas	824,513	781,771	(42,743)	-5.18%
24 Hidalgo/Willacy Co.	4,507,165	4,533,453	26,288	0.58%
25 Middle Rio Grande	1,315,265	1,331,030	15,764	1.20%
26 North East Texas	1,018,352	1,201,057	182,705	17.94%
27 North Texas	586,950	556,523	(30,427)	-5.18%
28 Panhandle	801,580	877,799	76,219	9.51%
29 Permian Basin	1,472,688	1,512,071	39,383	2.67%
30 South East Texas	1,769,899	2,163,304	393,405	22.23%
31 South Texas	1,863,689	1,767,076	(96,613)	-5.18%
32 Texoma	447,317	483,269	35,952	8.04%
33 Upper Rio Grande	3,723,319	4,159,542	436,223	11.72%
34 West Central Texas	875,098	936,476	61,378	7.01%
35 Collin County	435,103	412,548	(22,555)	-5.18%
TOTAL	63,204,966	66,587,146	3,382,180	5.35%



## TITLE III ALLOCATIONS

## Attachment 4

SSA #	SSA NAME	PY94 ALLOCATION	MINIMUM PY95 ALLOCATION 66.48%	DIF-FERENCE	PERCENT CHANGE	MAXIMUM PY95 ALLOCATION 80%	RANGE
1	ALAMO	2,561,346	2,340,583	(220,763)	-8.62%	2,816,472	475,889
2	RURAL CAPITAL	902,125	922,610	20,485	2.27%	1,110,196	187,586
3	RURAL COASTAL	568,620	874,516	305,896	53.80%	1,052,323	177,807
4	DALLAS CO.	1,520,728	2,110,783	590,055	38.80%	2,539,948	429,165
5	G.C./HARRIS	3,650,179	4,841,957	1,191,778	32.65%	5,826,426	984,469
7	NORTH CENTRAL	1,542,775	2,383,878	841,103	54.52%	2,868,569	484,691
8	SOUTH PLAINS	486,884	747,421	260,536	53.51%	899,386	151,966
9	TARRANT CO.	1,667,343	1,076,742	(590,602)	-35.42%	1,295,665	218,924
10	BRAZOS VALL.	606,034	892,906	286,873	47.34%	1,074,453	181,546
11	CAMERON CO.	506,021	702,743	196,722	38.88%	845,625	142,882
12	CENTRAL TEX.	775,295	884,549	109,254	14.09%	1,064,396	179,847
13	AUST./TRAVIS	714,907	1,401,572	686,665	96.05%	1,686,540	284,968
14	C.C./NUECES	494,104	861,398	367,294	74.34%	1,036,538	175,140
15	DALLAS - CITY	3,625,399	2,911,277	(714,121)	-19.70%	3,503,200	591,922
16	HOUSTON	3,172,611	4,263,284	1,090,673	34.38%	5,130,097	866,813
17	LUBB./GARZA	463,374	599,070	135,696	29.28%	720,873	121,803
18	CONCHO VALL.	493,449	613,910	120,462	24.41%	738,731	124,821
19	DEEP EAST	755,348	963,953	208,605	27.62%	1,159,944	195,991
20	EAST TEXAS	1,398,312	1,935,596	537,284	38.42%	2,329,142	393,546
21	FT. WORTH	1,675,693	1,940,807	265,114	15.82%	2,335,413	394,606
22	GOLDEN CRES.	593,332	966,680	373,347	62.92%	1,163,226	196,546
23	HOTCOG	672,023	1,161,508	489,485	72.84%	1,397,666	236,158
24	HIDALGO/WILL.	913,609	1,383,063	469,454	51.38%	1,664,269	281,205
25	MIDDLE RIO	477,071	655,947	178,876	37.49%	789,314	133,367
26	NORTH EAST	840,605	1,353,703	513,099	61.04%	1,628,939	275,236
27	NORTH TEXAS	609,136	839,364	230,228	37.80%	1,010,024	170,660
28	PANHANDLE	796,439	1,115,654	319,215	40.08%	1,342,490	226,835
29	PERMIAN	950,666	1,142,411	191,745	20.17%	1,374,686	232,275
30	SOUTH EAST	802,341	1,854,943	1,052,602	131.19%	2,232,091	377,148
31	SOUTH TEXAS	503,391	596,352	92,961	18.47%	717,603	121,251
32	TEXOMA	591,276	783,452	192,176	32.50%	942,744	159,292
33	UPPER RIO	1,100,066	1,710,231	610,165	55.47%	2,057,956	347,725
34	WEST CENTRAL	929,386	1,408,048	478,662	51.50%	1,694,333	286,285
35	COLLIN CO.	443,425	600,303	156,878	35.38%	722,356	122,054
TOTAL		37,803,313	48,841,215	11,037,902	29.20%	58,771,634	9,930,419

Minimum allocations are stated at the same ratio of Governor's Reserve to Formula Funds as last year, PY 94. Maximum PY 95 formula allocation (80% to Formula Funds) will be recommended.

TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	Statement on the Adult Education and Literacy Resources To Meet Identified Needs
<b>Committee</b>	Intervention Committee
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Barbara S. Crosby, TCWEC
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>This presentation will describe the state's need for adult education and literacy resources sufficient to enable large portions of the adult population to attain the literacy skills necessary to secure and retain employment. The Committee will consider a statement of those needs for the Governor with recommendations on actions the Governor might take to increase the resources for adult education and literacy programs.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	Letter to The Honorable George Bush, Jr., Governor of Texas

**ACTION ITEM**  
**STATEMENT ON THE ADULT EDUCATION AND LITERACY RESOURCES**  
**TO MEET IDENTIFIED NEEDS**

## **PURPOSE**

To provide the Governor with information on the need for adult education and literacy instruction within the state and to enlist his leadership in finding resources to meet the need.

## **BACKGROUND**

In 1992, the U. S. Department of Education engaged the Educational Testing Service to evaluate the social and economic implications of adult literacy in the nation. Twelve states, including Texas via the Texas Education Agency, conducted a concurrent state survey. The National Adult Literacy Survey provided a new framework for evaluating literacy. Literacy is now defined as the performance level on an increasingly difficult scale of reading and using prose, document and quantitative text. For ease of use, the scales are divided into five levels. The Texas Adult Literacy Survey, (TALS) describes the current state of literacy in Texas.

At the April 20, 1995 Intervention Committee meeting, the Committee reviewed the workforce development implications of the survey results. In response to the TALS data, the Committee requested that staff explore ways the Governor could direct sufficient federal and state funds toward basic adult education and literacy services to enable large portions of the adult population to benefit from occupational training and educational opportunities and to secure and retain employment.

### Workforce Development Implications of Survey Results

Fifty-two percent of adult Texans perform at the lowest TALS levels, Levels 1 and 2. Almost 7 million (6.8 ) adult Texans use printed material in so limited a way that they cannot write a brief letter explaining an error on a credit card bill or calculate the difference between regular and sale price from an advertisement.

Of the people in Levels 1 and 2, 4.3 million are of workforce age, (ages 19-54.) 1.1 million work full-time, another 1.6 million work part-time. These people are part of the Texas workforce now; they will be of working age for 11 to 44 years. The current workforce contains nearly 3 million people who will certainly be left behind when the requirements for their current job increase. The 500,000 in Levels I and 2, who are currently unemployed and who are still seeking work, do not have the basic reading proficiency to profit from job training.

The Texas Adult Literacy Survey included questions about family literacy practices. Family behavior clearly impacts each individual 's reading proficiency.

Most people who scored in Levels 4 and 5 reported having the following experiences :

- Parents read to them.
- Parents helped them with homework.
- Parents provided a variety of reading material.
- As parents of children six years and under, they read to their children.
- The family occasionally goes to the library.

The majority of people who scored in the lower levels reported very few such experiences.

A small, but steady flow of young adults annually increases the number of Texans with low literacy skills. Of the people with proficiencies in Levels 1 and 2, nearly half a million were 16-18 years old. A quarter of a million were still in high school.

### Current Resources

In FY94, the Texas Education Agency had the following funds specifically for teaching adults basic skills and literacy:

Federal Adult Education	State Adult Education	Total
\$13,938,492	\$6,250,000	\$20,188,492

These programs served 209,651 participants at an average expenditure of \$96.00 per person.

In addition to the \$20 million, The Texas Education Agency receives \$2 million for adult education from state appropriations to serve AFDC-JOBS eligible clients (15,035 participants.) The Texas Department of Human Services provides federal matching funds in the amount of \$3.5 million.

The Legislature sets aside \$1.2 million in JTPA 8% Education Coordination funds and \$250,000 in General Revenue funds for literacy.

All of the above total \$27,138,492 for FY94. This represents 2% of the \$1.1 billion federal and state funds available annually for workforce development programs. Texas depends upon federal funding to meet most of the state's literacy needs. The FY94 total state support of nearly 9 million dollars represents one eighth of one percent of the 7.4 billion state dollars available annually for K-12 public education in Texas.

## **DISCUSSION**

The survey results dramatically reveal the literacy situation in Texas. More than six million adult Texans use printed material at a level which precludes their participation in a high wage, high tech economy, unless they learn basic literacy skills.

For workforce development the future is now. More than four million people in TALS Levels 1 and 2 are of workforce age; they will be workers during the next critical quarter of a century when Texas expects to surge into world class competitiveness.

The literacy skills of the workforce already impacts the state's competitiveness. The national survey reports that "the percentages of Texas adults who demonstrated the most limited proficiencies were higher than the percentages of adults nationwide who did so." The percentages of Texas workers in Levels 1 and 2 were higher than the percentages of such workers in the nation. Business leaders consider workforce quality when they plan expansion and new locations.

In addition, there are adults among the six million in Levels 1 and 2 who are raising children in homes where there are few or no activities that model or develop literacy skills. Those children will come of working age with no greater literacy skills than their parents.

### Relation to Strategic Goals and Objectives

The Strategic Plan describes a vision of Texas where all people have the education, training, skills and employment opportunities to enjoy a quality standard of living as members of a changing and internationally competitive workforce. Goal Three addresses education: "All Texans will have the literacy, basic education and basic workplace skills necessary for education and career advancement."

Current resources are not sufficient to meet the state's needs: they are not enough to support a state effort to create an internationally competitive workforce, and they are not enough to allow the Council to achieve its Strategic Plan Goal Three.

### **OPTIONS AND RECOMMENDATION**

In the existing workforce funding structure, the Governor's discretionary funds are the only source of additional federal resources. Most federal programs allow the Governor to use a portion of the state's allotment to fill a need which is particular to the state. In the future federal funding structure, the Governor will likely have authority to direct the use of large portions of block grant funds toward solving particular problems within the state. The TALS identifies needs and reveals specific problems facing workforce development in Texas

The Governor's chief legislative focus is education. Under his education leadership, the state could identify state funds which could be redirected toward adult education and literacy.

Attached is a letter to the Honorable George Bush, Governor of Texas.

The staff recommends that the Intervention Committee approve the letter, seek approval of the full Council, and forward the letter with the briefing information to the Governor.

## Attachment

LETTER TO THE HONORABLE GEORGE BUSH, JR., GOVERNOR OF TEXAS
--

June 1, 1995

**DRAFT**

The Honorable George Bush, Jr.  
 Governor of Texas  
 State Capitol  
 Austin, Texas 78711

Dear Governor Bush:

The Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness is seeking your assistance in addressing the problem of lack of resources to meet the literacy and basic education needs of adult Texans. We are aware that literacy is an issue of great concern to you and to your family. We recognize that family literacy is a factor in your reform of public education. The Council, with responsibility for workforce development, is particularly concerned about the many Texans who need literacy training before they can benefit from job training.

The Texas Adult Literacy Survey, recently conducted by the Educational Testing Service, dramatically reveals the literacy situation in Texas. More than six million adult Texans use printed material at a level that precludes their participation in a high wage, high tech economy, unless they learn basic literacy skills. Four million of that six million are of workforce age; they will be workers during the next critical quarter of a century when Texas expects to surge into world class competitiveness.

More employed Texans scored in the lowest survey levels than did employed workers in the nation as a whole. A workforce without basic literacy skills is now, and will continue to be, a hindrance to high-tech, high-income business development.

In addition, there are adults among the six million with the lowest literacy skills who are raising children in homes where there are few or no activities that develop literacy skills. Those children will come of working age with no greater literacy skills than their parents.

Council members examined the Texas Adult Literacy Survey as part of planning for the Council Strategic Plan Goal 3: "All Texans will have the literacy, basic education and basic workplace skills necessary for education and career advancement." Council members recognized that the need overwhelms the available resources. Current resources are not enough to support a state effort to create an internationally competitive workforce.

In FY94, Texas budgeted \$27,138,492 for adult education and literacy services. This represents 2% of the \$1.1 billion federal and state funds available annually for workforce development programs. Texas depends heavily upon federal funding to meet the state's literacy needs; the state provided only \$9 million of the FY94 total. This represents one-eighth of one percent of the \$7.4 billion available for public school education in Texas.

The Council asks for your leadership and support in finding the resources to solve the problems revealed by the Texas Adult Literacy Survey.

Under the current workforce development structure, the Council recommends that you emphasize basic literacy skills development in Wagner Peyser 7(b) projects.

Under the future federal funding structure, the Council recommends that you use the flexible portions of block grants to direct as much funding as possible to providing focused, cohesive adult education and literacy training.

In your role as Governor, the Council asks you to lead the state in identifying and redirecting state funds to adult education and literacy programs.

I would welcome your contacting me for further information. You can reach me at (210) 220-4411 or the Council's Acting Executive Director, Cynthia Mugerauer, at 912-7155. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Tom Frost  
Presiding Officer

**DRAFT**

TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	Report on the State Board of Education Adult Education and Literacy Policy
<b>Committee</b>	Intervention Committee
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Dr. Alma A. Allen, Houston District 4, State Board of Education Member Chair, Task Force on Adult Education and Literacy Task Force
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>In July 1994, the State Board of Education approved the establishment of a Task Force on Adult Education and Literacy to develop a policy statement and report for use by state and local educators to design appropriate programs to accelerate learning of adults in need of literacy services. Task Force members were confirmed by the Board in September 1994.</p> <p>The Task Force has met eight times, conducted 18 hearings in ten cities across the state, visited programs and received testimony from more than 300 individuals. In developing the policy statement and report, the Task Force analyzed adult literacy needs, including the Texas Adult Literacy Survey, and the current research on adult learning and effective practice available in the literature. It also examined the testimony presented at the hearings and considered the resources available for adult education and literacy services in Texas.</p> <p>This policy was accepted by unanimous vote at the State Board of Education Meeting, May 12, 1995. This presentation will outline the policy and its implications.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	Policy Statement on Adult Education and Literacy



## **POLICY STATEMENT ON ADULT EDUCATION AND LITERACY**

### **PHILOSOPHY**

**EVERY TEXAN, REGARDLESS OF AGE, IS ENTITLED TO A BASIC EDUCATION.**

### **MISSION**

**THE MISSION OF ADULT EDUCATION AND LITERACY IS TO ENSURE THAT ALL ADULTS WHO LIVE IN TEXAS HAVE THE SKILLS NECESSARY TO FUNCTION EFFECTIVELY IN THEIR PERSONAL AND FAMILY LIVES, IN THE WORKPLACE, AND IN THE COMMUNITY.**

In September 1994 the State Board of Education appointed a Task Force on Adult Education and Literacy with the charge to establish a framework for state and local educators to use in designing programs for accelerating the learning of all adults in need of basic education. This policy statement and the accompanying report, *Adult Literacy: A Texas Priority*, constitute that framework.

### **LEARNER OUTCOMES**

**ADULT LEARNER OUTCOMES ARE THOSE LITERACY, PERSONAL AND THINKING SKILLS FUNDAMENTAL TO ACADEMIC, ECONOMIC, AND PERSONAL SUCCESS.**

Texas adults must be able to read; solve quantitative problems; use English proficiently; access and succeed in complex and rigorous educational and/or training opportunities; compete for and succeed in employment opportunities; and respond to personal demands and goals, so that all can participate responsibly and productively as family and community members, consumers, workers, and learners.

Texas adults must be able to understand and use text in all media. The ability to understand and use simple as well as complex text in the home, in the workplace, and in the community implies the ability to gain meaning from text that is used in the newspaper, in operations manuals, on the television, on the computer screen, on a ballot, in children's books, and in a myriad of other places.

Adults must also be mathematical problem-solvers. The ability to communicate and reason mathematically means adults are able to accomplish functional tasks (e.g., computing their take-home pay, developing a realistic budget, comparison shopping, or figuring miles per gallon of gas).

Adults must be able to use English to communicate orally and in writing. Adults must listen effectively in order to understand information or instructions given at school about their children, at work, in the doctor's office, or in other situations. To communicate their feelings, needs, wants and desires, adults must be able to speak and write effectively.

Texas adults must be prepared to compete for and succeed in educational and training opportunities. As the world becomes more complex, more technologically oriented, and more information-rich, adults must be able to update and expand their literacy skills so that they may access and participate in workplace training programs, college-level programs, and/or independent learning projects.

Texas adults must be prepared to compete for and succeed in employment opportunities. Texas adults need proficiency in those skills identified by employers as essential to perform in the workplace.

Texas adults must possess the skills that will enable them to respond, successfully and productively, to personal demands and goals that challenge them daily. They need the skills to interact effectively with people of diverse cultures, function as ethical citizens, and act as responsible parents. These same skills empower adults to participate as lifelong learners.

## **PROGRAM PLANNING**

### **EFFECTIVE PLANNING PROVIDES THE FRAMEWORK FOR QUALITY ADULT EDUCATION AND LITERACY PROGRAMS THAT BENEFIT TEXANS.**

Effective planning is the foundation for the success of adult education and literacy programs. Both planning and implementation work best if local providers create a structure which encourages collaboration. Working together, agencies such as local educational agencies, community-based organizations, public or private nonprofit agencies, postsecondary educational institutions, libraries, and others collaboratively fulfill adult learners' varied needs.

The most effective planning occurs when the adult education and literacy group plans collaboratively with other stakeholders who either serve the same clients or are impacted by their literacy levels. This group includes students, social service providers, government agencies, industry, school districts, and other direct and indirect stakeholders.

The entire collaborative planning group conducts learner and community needs assessments, surveys and maximizes resources; designs and implements programs; and updates and improves programs through ongoing evaluation. The planning group also develops strategies to help remove multiple barriers to learner participation, to provide support so that learners successfully complete their studies; and to provide successful transitional options for learners upon program completion.

## CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

**WELL-DESIGNED ADULT EDUCATION AND LITERACY INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS PROVIDE FOR ACTIVE PARTICIPATION OF LEARNERS AND BUILD ON THEIR PRIOR KNOWLEDGE, DRAWING ON A LIFETIME OF EXPERIENCES AS NATURAL RESOURCES FOR LEARNING. ADULTS CONSTRUCT MEANING BY INTEGRATING NEW EXPERIENCES AND INFORMATION INTO WHAT THEY HAVE ALREADY LEARNED.**

Adult education uses a participatory approach to literacy education as an effective way of drawing on the prior knowledge of adult learners and accelerating their progress. In such a model, teachers and learners are involved in dynamic, on-going curriculum development. Additionally, the teacher ceases to be the sole source of knowledge and becomes a guide and facilitator. The learner ceases to be a passive recipient of information and becomes an active participant.

The ability to process language is fundamental to adult learners' attainment of their educational goals. Understanding and producing spoken and written language is critical to adults' full participation in society. Reading and writing instruction, critical components of an effective curriculum, integrates adults' past experiences. Effective reading programs integrate explicit knowledge of the sounds and structures of words and understanding of the sound-symbol relationships of the alphabet within language- and literature-rich learning environments.

Active learning also includes instructional strategies to assist adults with numeracy using manipulatives and incorporating real-life mathematical problem-solving. Acquired proficiencies in numeracy, as well as in language, are applied in a wide variety of contexts from family, to the workplace, to the community.

Curricula taught in adult education classes have a functional content so that learners are able to use the knowledge they gain to improve their personal, family, community and workplace status. To accelerate learning, curricula also reflect learner needs and interests. Curricula include metacognitive strategies (understanding how we learn), interdisciplinary and multisensory approaches, and problem-solving techniques. Integrated curricula relate to the whole person and attend to affective, cognitive, and socio-cultural domains.

Appropriate assessment in the participatory adult education and literacy context relates directly to the curriculum. It involves the learners by developing goals based on their needs, and is qualitative as well as quantitative. Assessment necessitates the use of multiple measures of learner growth. Rather than focusing on deficits, assessment demonstrates the learner's progress over time using a variety of strategies and real, purposeful activities that reflect the complexity of literacy in our society.

Educators are keenly aware of the literacy needs of children and their families. Family literacy is a perfect example of curriculum that incorporates functional content, is learner-centered, and promotes a participatory approach to adult education. Family literacy has the potential to assist adult learners with strengthening the family unit and promoting self-sufficiency and responsibility.

**RECRUITMENT,  
RETENTION &  
SUPPORT SERVICES**

**RECRUITMENT, RETENTION AND SUPPORT SERVICES ARE INEXTRICABLY LINKED WITH EACH OTHER AND ARE AN INTEGRAL PART OF ANY SUCCESSFUL ADULT EDUCATION AND LITERACY PROGRAM.**

Recruitment of adults who need literacy services is a collaborative effort involving agencies and organizations that serve the same client, as well as other community entities. Recruitment reflects the community's needs and is continuously evaluated.

Recruitment is directed toward Texas' adult populations most in need of literacy services. Educationally disadvantaged adults recruited into adult education and literacy programs are supported with comprehensive adult education on a priority basis. Parents with school-age children who are in need of literacy services are recruited through cooperative efforts with local public schools and provided family literacy programs where parents and children learn together.

Adults who could benefit from adult education and literacy services face multiple barriers to participation and have needs which go beyond the scope of a traditional educational environment. These needs may include transportation, child care, counseling, housing and many other social and financial concerns. In order to promote learner participation and success, learner needs are addressed as part of a comprehensive adult education program using input provided by all members of a collaborative planning group.

Support services needs are addressed through collaborative activities with other agencies and organizations in the community which serve the same client to reduce the barriers to educational success. If these necessary support services to overcome barriers that discourage and limit adults' participation in literacy programs are not available, many will not be able to take advantage of literacy education, and others will not be able to stay in the program for very long.

Because the responsibilities faced by adults on a daily basis are numerous, deliberate strategies to keep these adults in attendance and to accelerate their progress are critical to learner and program success. Learners must be retained long enough so that they achieve their goals and/or make a successful transition to jobs or further education. Strategies for doing so are integrated into the adult education and literacy program from intake through program completion. Retention strategies are continuously evaluated.

## **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

**ALL ADULT EDUCATION AND LITERACY PRACTITIONERS HAVE THE PROFESSIONAL FOUNDATION TO ENSURE THAT TEXAS ADULTS WHO NEED LITERACY SERVICES CAN ACHIEVE THE SKILLS NECESSARY TO FUNCTION EFFECTIVELY IN SOCIETY.**

Professional development for adult education and literacy practitioners is based on the following: educational qualifications, experience levels and program roles; adult learners' needs and desired program outcomes; and promising practices in curriculum, instruction and program development.

Professionalization is critical to the improvement of practice. An infrastructure to support adult educators' professional development must be created so that teachers and administrators have significant professional development resources directed to them.

Adult educators are supported by increased opportunities for professional growth and recognition; creation of more full-time positions to keep highly talented educators from leaving the field because they find that they cannot "afford" to work in adult education; opportunities for advancement; and opportunities to reduce isolation. A flexible credentialing process that allows for the attainment of adult education proficiencies in conjunction with professional development would add to the recognition and respect of adult educators as professionals.

Adult education and literacy practitioners bring extensive prior knowledge to the teaching of adults, and professional development programs capitalize on this opportunity. To enhance and support literacy within the family unit and maximize the capabilities of adult educators, professional development occurs in a variety of milieu. Professional development is flexible in regard to the pressures of time, job fragmentation, and even isolation in teaching assignments.

TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	Food Stamp Employment and Training Program State Plan
<b>Committee</b>	Intervention Committee
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	DHS Representative
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>The Department of Human Services is required to submit a State Plan for the Food Stamp Employment and Training (E&amp;T) Program to the U.S. Department of Agriculture for federal Fiscal Year 1996, which begins October 1, 1995. The Plan is due August 15, 1995. This Plan is described in the following Action Item along with recommendations for Council staff to review the Food Stamp Employment and Training State Plan in accordance with review criteria used for other state plans.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	

**ACTION ITEM**  
**FOOD STAMP EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM STATE PLAN**

**PURPOSE**

To brief the Council on the requirements for obtaining federal approval for state administration of the Food Stamp Employment and Training (E&T) Program as described in the state plan of operations.

**BACKGROUND**

The Food Stamp Employment and Training (E&T) Program was implemented in April 1987 under the authority of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). Requirements for state agencies responsible for administering the E&T Program are described in 7 CFR 273.7(c) and include the following:

- The state agency shall design an employment and training program which consists of one or more of the authorized employment and training components.
- The state agency shall submit a state plan for the upcoming federal fiscal year no later than August 15 in the current fiscal year.

There are no federal statutory or regulatory requirements to coordinate approval of the E&T state plan prior to submission for federal approval.

**DISCUSSION**

The federally prescribed format for the Food Stamp E&T state plan includes detailed descriptions of employment and training components to be provided, projected numbers of individuals to be served by each component, projected numbers of individuals to be exempted and the reason for exemption, cost data, and a description of inter-and intra-agency coordination. Cost data must be detailed throughout the plan and requires that the cost of services be estimated by component and category of expenses within each component as well as specific contractor costs.

Client eligibility is determined by DHS eligibility staff and arrangements for child care are done through the department's Child Care Management Services (CCMS) system; however, all employment-related services are provided under contract or through non-financial interagency agreements. Job readiness and job search services are provided through an interagency agreement with the Texas Employment Commission (TEC).

Actual statistical and cost data are compared to estimates contained in the state plan and are monitored by the USDA during the fiscal year. A state plan amendment is required if costs are expected to exceed federal funds approved in the plan or if actual client data vary significantly from previous estimates. As a result, the accuracy of data in the state plan is very critical. Although preliminary planning regarding services to be provided in the coming fiscal year can be initiated without knowing the amount of federal funding which will be available, actual development of the state plan cannot begin until this information and instructions regarding the state plan format are received from USDA. The state is usually notified of the funding amount and format requirements in late May of each year.

The format for the Food Stamp E&T state plan is very prescriptive and does not include an opportunity to speak to the State's goals and objectives for workforce programs. In developing the state plan for



Fiscal Year 1995 the TDHS prepared an addendum to the Plan to address TCWEC strategic goals and objectives and will include a similar addendum in the Fiscal Year 1996 Plan as well as a description of coordination activities with TCWEC and other agencies.

The Food Stamp Employment and Training State Plan must be submitted to USDA before August 15, 1995. Since instructions for preparation of the Plan have not yet been received by TDHS, it is not possible to have a draft for Council review at the June meeting, and the September meeting will be too late for formal Council review. Since TDHS plans no major changes in the program and has incorporated TCWEC strategic goals and objectives and a description of coordination activities into the plan, the following process is recommended.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that TCWEC staff review the Food Stamp Employment and Training State Plan in accordance with review criteria used for other state plans and work with TDHS staff to make any appropriate changes prior to submission to the U.S. Department of Agriculture on August 15, 1995.

TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	Title II JTPA Third Quarter Performance/Fiscal Report
<b>Committee</b>	Intervention Committee
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Jim Gaston, TDOC
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>Summarizes 3rd quarter PY94 statewide performance by JTPA program including SDA/SSA performance against standards for Titles IIA, IIC, and Title III.</p> <p><i>Note: This item can be found in the Evaluation and Performance Committee section.</i></p>
<b>Attachments</b>	

TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	JTPA Title IVC Veterans' Employment and Training Program Second Year Funding
<b>Committee</b>	Intervention Committee
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Sarah Bailey, Texas Department of Commerce
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>Briefing item to provide information to the Council on the status of Texas' JTPA Veterans and Training Program Grant awarded under Title IV, Part C of the Act. Title IVC funds are used to meet employment and training needs of service-connected disabled veterans, veterans of the Vietnam era and veterans who are recently separated from military service.</p> <p>The funds for these services are awarded by the USDOL through a competitive application process. Commerce, with their subgrantees-American G. I. Forum, Texas Association of Developing Colleges and Workforce Development Corporation (Corpus Christi/Nueces County PIC) - prepared a successful grant application and were awarded \$718,250 for first year program operations. Performance under the grant is exceeding the goals established under the contract, so second year funding will be made available to continue the program for PY95.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	

**TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS**

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	Update on JTPA/Literacy Partnership Grants (8% Education Coordination Funds)
<b>Committee</b>	Intervention Committee
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Sheila Rosenberg, Texas Department of Commerce
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>Fourteen (14) JTPA/Literacy Partnership grants were funded for PY 94-95 from JTPA 8% Education Coordination funds through a competitive bid process. These grants fund the development of community partnerships to serve JTPA eligible persons who are most educationally disadvantaged. The partnerships must provide the basic literacy skills required for participants to enter employment training. These projects currently include a total of 90 local community partnerships. This briefing item provides an overview of these 14 projects, their current status and progress to date.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	

TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS
--

Agenda Item Information
-------------------------

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	JTPA Older Individual Program Performance
<b>Committee</b>	Intervention Committee
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Sarah Bailey, Texas Department of Commerce
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>This briefing item provides information to the Council on the Older Individual Program (OIP) for PY95. Five percent of the JTPA Title IIA funds are to be used for services to economically disadvantaged older individuals aged 55 and over. Fourteen contractors were awarded two year contracts for PY94-PY95 with the second year funding contingent upon satisfactory performance in the first year. A handout will be provided at the Committee meeting showing first year performance of the contractors and the second year funding awards.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	

WORKER TRANSITION / LOCAL SYSTEMS  
COMMITTEE

## Agenda

**Worker Transition/Local Systems Committee  
June 1, 1995  
Doubletree Hotel - De Zavala Room  
Austin, Texas**

- 1:00 p.m. Call to Order  
Announcements  
Public Comment
- 1:15 p.m. Action Item: JTPA Title III Local Plan Modification Approval
- 1:30 p.m. Action Item: JTPA Title III State Plan for Dislocated Workers
- 1:45 p.m. Action Item: Designation of the Gulf Coast Workforce Development Area
- 2:15 p.m. Action Item: Recommendations on Part One of the Plan for a Common Application and Eligibility Determination System
- 2:45 p.m. Action Item: Employment Service State Plan
- 3:15 p.m. Break
- 3:45 p.m. Action Item: Quality Work Force Planning Responsibilities and Funds in Regions with Multiple Workforce Development Boards
- 4:15 p.m. Policy Briefing Item: Impact Statement on a Rule Change for Direct Service Provision
- 4:30 p.m. Action Item: Cameron County Waiver Request on Direct Service Provision
- 5:00 p.m. Briefing Item: JTPA Title III Third Quarter Fiscal and Performance Reports
- 5:15 p.m. Briefing Item: Contractor Awards on PY94 Title III Statewide, Regional and Industrywide Projects
- 5:30 p.m. Adjourn

NOTICE: Persons with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and who may need auxiliary aids or services, or persons who need assistance in having English translated into Spanish, should contact Mita Gosdin, 512/912-7158 (or Relay Texas 800/735-2988), at least two days before this meeting so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	PY95 Title III Dislocated Worker Substate Plan Modification Approval
<b>Committee</b>	Worker Transition/Local Systems Committee
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Sarah Bailey, Texas Department of Commerce
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>The Program year 1995 Title III Plan Modifications for Dislocated Workers will be presented to the Council for recommendation for approval by the Governor. Program Year 1994-1995 local plans are prepared and submitted in April 1994 in accordance with Section 313 of the JTPA. Each plan summarizes the program design and activities to be made available to eligible dislocated workers. The Plan Modifications are submitted for the second of the two year planning cycle in accordance with the PY95 Plan Modification Guidelines which were issued early this year. The review is conducted by the Title III Planner in conjunction with the appropriate EDWAA Specialists.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	Dislocated Worker Substate Plan Modification Status and Projected Local Performance Report. An update to this report providing the most recent plan modification status will be provided at the meeting.



**ACTION ITEM**  
**PROGRAM YEAR 1995 TITLE III DISLOCATED WORKER SUBSTATE**  
**PLAN MODIFICATION APPROVAL**

## **PURPOSE**

To approve the Program Year 1995 Title III plan modifications for each Substate Area (SSA) pursuant to Section 313 of the Act and 631.5 of the Federal Regulations governing the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) program.

## **BACKGROUND**

The purpose of the Dislocated Worker program, as implemented in the State of Texas, is to provide effective and productive quality job training and employment services to persons experiencing employment dislocation because of downturns in local labor market conditions and/or structural shifts in the general economy.

In order to receive funding under the Title III program for PY95, each Substate Grantee must submit a plan modification to the PY94-95 Substate Area plans. The Program Year 1995 plan modifications were prepared in accordance with the Plan Modification Guidelines distributed by the Texas Department of Commerce (Commerce) earlier in the year. In accordance with the Act, "the Substate Area plan must contain a statement of:

- the means for delivering program services and activities;
- the means to be used to identify, select and verify the eligibility of the program participants.
- the means for implementing coordination with the unemployment compensation system;
- the means for involving labor organizations in the development and implementation of services; and
- the performance goals to be achieved as prescribed by the State.

The PY95 Plan Modification Guidelines required that only those portions of the plans which have been modified need be submitted for approval for the ensuing program year.

## **DISCUSSION**

### Issues

Substate Plans require the approval of the Council and the Governor prior to the execution of a contract and the expenditure of funds by the SSAs. Should reduction in the current allocation occur, the SSAs will be required to formally amend their plans to account for that difference.

The most recent information available at the time of the plan modification approval process was that even should rescissions occur, the total allocation to the State will continue to be a significant net increase over the PY94 allocation.

Implications

Approval of the Substate plans is necessary before funding of SSA operations can begin. Timely approval of the plans allows the local areas to carry on operations without disruption.

The plan modifications were submitted on April 7, 1995 and the funding represented in the modifications is based upon the total allocation to the Substate Areas as announced during the State's Planning Forum in January, 1995. Any changes to the allocations which might occur will result in the necessity for the SSAs to formally amend their plans in accordance with the requirements of the Act and State Policy.

Relation to Strategic Goals and Objectives

In general, the local plans reflect the intention to achieve Goals One through Four. Goal One is addressed through the SSAs efforts to build the capacity to serve greater numbers of participants with quality programs, increased efforts to coordinate services with other agencies and programs, establishment of Worker Adjustment Career Centers, the continued refining of labor market information and the improvement of the comprehensive assessment and IRP development. The Second Goal is addressed through the continued enhancement of communication and coordination with Commerce and other programs through enhanced agreements; cross communications with other programs; and the ongoing upgrading of CMS systems. Goals Three and Four are addressed through the comprehensive assessment of all participants. Assignment of activities are achieved through analysis of the assessment process and utilization of Labor Market Information.

Each SSA has satisfactorily addressed each of the Strategic Goals and Objectives as evidenced by the approval of their PY94-95 Plans. Approval of the PY95 Plan Modifications will result in furthering these Goals and Objectives.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Commerce and TCWEC staffs recommend the following to the Council for the Governor's approval:

- 1) approval of all satisfactory Title III plan modifications.
- 2) approval of Title III plan modifications which are currently satisfactory conditional, contingent upon attainment of satisfactory status prior to submission to the Governor for approval. It is understood that no authority to contract is granted until an SSAs Title III Plan Modification is given satisfactory status and approved by the Governor.

## Attachment

## Substate Plan Modification Status and Projected Local Performance

An update to the Plan Modification Status will be provided as a handout at the meeting.

## Attachment

## SUBSTATE PLAN MODIFICATION STATUS AND PROJECTED LOCAL PERFORMANCE

SSA	ALLOCATION	PARTICIPANTS	TERMINATIONS	EER	STATUS
ALAMO	4,514,366	1041	791	84 %	SC
AUS/TRAVIS	922,610	550	500	80.5	S
BRAZOS	892,906	250	225	90	SC
CAMERON	702,743	276	248	70	S
CENTRAL	884,549	325	175	80	S
COLLIN	600,000	206	137	84	SC
CONCHO	513,910	225	160	75	S
CORPUS	861,398	350	265	65.2	S
DALLAS CIT	2,911,127	511	133	75	S
DALLAS CO	2,110,783	040	780	75	SC
D.EAST	936,953	426	375	69.4	SC
EAST	1,935,596	774	597	62	S
FT.WORTH	1,940,807	893	402	66.7	S
G.CRES'NT	966,680	170	66	62.8	S
G.COAST	4,841,957	150	112	69	SC
HOTCOG	1,161,508	430	164	73.2	S
HIDALGO	1,383,063	710	491	68	SC
HOUSTON	4,263,384	522	075	65	S
LUBBOCK	599,070	190	124	84	S
MID RIO	789,314	165	75	85	SC
N.C.TEX	2,383,878	035	681	76.2	S
N.E.TEX	1,628,939	424	892	74	S
N.TEXAS	839,364	296	128	70.4	SC
PANHANDLE	1,115,654	420	150	80	S
PERMIAN	1,142,411	550	193	86	S
RUR.CAP	922,610	350	174	80.5	S
RUR.COAST	874,516	222	155	66.3	SC
S.E.TEX	1,854,943	395	257	67.5	S
S.PLAINS	747,598	103	47	72.3	SC
S.TEXAS	596,352	208	148	61	SC
TARRANT	1,076,742	880	525	70.7	S
TXOMA	793,452	300	150	72.5	S
UP RIO	1,710,231	850	510	75	S
W.CENT.TX	1,408,048	400	200	80	S

S SATISFACTORY      SC SATISFACTORY CONDITIONAL      U UNSATISFACTORY

TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	JTPA Title III State Plan for Employment and Training Assistance for Dislocated Workers
<b>Committee</b>	Worker Transition/Local Systems Committee
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Sarah Bailey, Texas Department of Commerce
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>Section 311(a) of JTPA requires the Governor to submit a biennial State Plan to the Secretary of Labor in order to receive funds for operation of the Dislocated Worker Programs in Texas. This modification of the PY94-95 State Plan is not required, but shall be submitted to incorporate changes to Title III policy for the upcoming year. This action item proposes to modify the State Plan for the second year of the two year PY94-95 planning cycle through the incorporation of policy changes approved by the Worker Transition Committee at the April meeting.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	A draft of the State Plan Modification will be included as an insert in the Council briefing materials.

**ACTION ITEM**  
**REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE MODIFICATION TO THE JTPA**  
**STATE PLAN FOR DISLOCATED WORKERS**

**PURPOSE**

To present for Council consideration and action, the modifications to the JTPA State Plan for Employment and Training Assistance for Dislocated Workers for PY95.

**BACKGROUND**

Section 311(a) of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) requires the Governor to submit a biennial state plan to the Secretary of Labor in order to receive funds for operation of Dislocated Worker Programs in Texas and, Section 311(d) states that the plan **may** be modified to incorporate changes in or additions to the programs and activities set forth in the plan. Section 317 requires that the Council review, and submit written comments on the State Plan (and any modification thereof) before its submission to the Governor and the Secretary of Labor under Section 311.

The Council approved the PY94-95 State Plan during the April, 1994 meeting. This modification to the State Plan for Dislocated Workers shall be submitted to the DOL with comments of the Council in accordance to Section 317 of the Act.

**DISCUSSION**Issues

The State Plan must be modified to incorporate the changes in policy approved by the Council and Governor for PY 95 and the PY95 allocation.

Implications

This modification incorporates the policy changes to Title III which were approved by the Council during the April, 1995 meeting. The purpose of the modification serves to codify the new policy into an official document presented to the Department of Labor. The policy changes will effect the SSAs and their operations upon issuance of the JTPA Official Guidance Letters.

Relation to Strategic Goals and Objectives

The State Plan which is approved by the Council, satisfactorily addresses the Strategic Goals and Objectives. The modification to the Plan does not alter the State's approach to the accomplishment of the Goals and Objectives. Goal one is addressed through such initiatives as funding for capacity building projects (i.e. Worker Adjustment Career Centers [WACC]) and funding of projects through the Statewide, Regional and Industry-wide category. Goal two is addressed through increased coordination of programs through expanded agreements with other agencies, an enhanced Client Management System (CMS) and development of internet communications. The State continues to address goals three and four through continued technical assistance and training, proactive monitoring for program quality as well as the development of a comprehensive, locally sensitive customer satisfaction survey. Commerce and the SSAs continue to explore and develop new initiatives which address the Goals and Objectives.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council review, comment and make recommendations to the Governor for approval of the Modification to the PY 94-95 State Plan for Employment and Training Assistance for Dislocated Workers.

TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	Designation of the Gulf Coast Workforce Development Area
<b>Committee</b>	Worker Transition/Local Systems Committee
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	John H. Fuller, TCWEC
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>On the basis of the Council's recommendations, the Governor has designated 28 areas of the state as local workforce development areas for the purpose of establishing workforce development boards and one-stop centers. One area of the state, the Gulf Coast Region remains undesignated. Council staff reported to the Worker Transition Committee, at the April meeting, that written input was received from twelve (12) County Judges in the Gulf Coast Region regarding their position on the area designation. Letters have once again been sent to the remaining Chief Elected Officials requesting their input. Mayor Lanier did respond (see attachment). However, the Harris County Judge and Pasadena Mayor had not responded as of May 20. We will update you regarding their responses at the Council meeting. This action item and recommendations will be sent to the members in advance of the meeting.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	Letter from Mayor Lanier.



# CITY OF HOUSTON

Post Office Box 1562 Houston, Texas 77251 713/247-2200

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

anier, Mayor

May 16, 1995

Mr. Tom C. Frost, Chairman  
Cullen/Frost Bankers, Inc.  
P.O. Box 1600  
San Antonio, Texas 78296

Dear Mr. Frost:

The City of Houston requests that it be designated a Workforce Development Area under Senate Bill 642.

If current law does not permit such a designation, we would support and request a modification in the law.

It is our desire to form a Workforce Development Board for the City to administer Block Grant Funds.

No designation should be made for the Gulf Coast Area until this issue is resolved.

Sincerely,

Bob Lanier  
Mayor



TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	Plan for a Common Application and Eligibility Determination System
<b>Committee</b>	Worker Transition/Local Systems Committee
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Gayla Gibler, TCWEC
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>This action item will outline the initial plan for development of a common application and eligibility determination system. Since the role and responsibilities of the Council in this area may change pending passage of the consolidation bill, this action item will be provided to the Committee as an insert to the Council briefing book.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	

TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	Employment Service State Plan
<b>Committee</b>	Worker Transition/Local Systems Committee
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	George Davis, Texas Employment Commission
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>One of the responsibilities of the Council listed in Section 122(b) of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) is to review and comment on the state plan developed for the State Employment Service agency [Texas Employment Commission (TEC)]. As a human resource investment council in accordance with Section 701 of the JTPA, this responsibility is assumed by the Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness. The State Employment Service Plan is submitted by the Governor to the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) for approval. This plan is due to the DOL by June 1, 1995. However, a waiver of this deadline has been granted by the DOL to allow Council action.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	The State Employment Service Plan will be mailed with the Council briefing book.

<p><b>ACTION ITEM</b>  <b>EMPLOYMENT SERVICE STATE PLAN</b></p>
---

## **PURPOSE**

To propose comments on the Wagner-Peyser State Employment Service Plan for Program Year 1995 for Council action.

## **BACKGROUND**

One of the responsibilities of the State Job Training Coordination Council listed in Section 122(b) of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) is to review and comment on the state plan developed for the state Employment Service (ES) agency (Texas Employment Commission). As a human resources investment council in accordance with Section 701 of JTPA, this responsibility is assumed by the Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness. The plan is submitted by the Governor to the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) for approval.

The plan covers the time period July 1, 1995-June 30, 1996. The funding level for Program Year 1995 is \$54,896,894. The plan is due to DOL by June 1, 1995. A waiver of the due date has been requested because of the scheduling of the Council meeting date.

At the April meeting, the Council was briefed on the planning schedule and time frames for the plan. Planning guidelines and preliminary funding estimates were provided by DOL. This plan is developed according to the guidelines provided by DOL.

## **DISCUSSION**

As a plan for a statewide program, the ES Plan includes goals and objectives. The Texas Employment Commission (TEC) has incorporated the goals and objectives which the Council has set forth in the State Strategic Plan. The objective of the employment service is to bring together employers and job seekers to help reduce unemployment and maintain a stable, healthy economy. The ES Plan describes the programs and activities of TEC in delivering basic employment services according to the Council's goals and objectives and the programs and initiatives of DOL.

TEC is continuing to expand a network of automated public access, self-service systems for job seekers. These systems make information about jobs more accessible to job seekers. Job information is available for state government jobs, out-of-state jobs, and local jobs. Job seekers may access information from many sources such as: INFO/TEXAS kiosks located in retail centers; public access terminals in TEC local offices; the hi-TEC Bulletin Board; the America's Job Bank (AJB) Internet connection; and the Governor's Job Bank.

TEC is participating in the ES Revitalization initiative of DOL. Under a grant from DOL, TEC is facilitating a leadership development program which will identify "best practices" of local managers, recommend core curriculum for training management staff, and implement a managers exchange program. TEC will benefit from the results of revitalization grants to several other states.

TEC continues to work with the Council and other agencies' representatives on work groups to develop a uniform statewide job seeker application and eligibility system and to develop performance measurement and evaluation systems. As administrator of the federal grant for the One-Stop Career

Center System, TEC is involved at the state level in planning and implementing the grant. At the local level, TEC is participating in the five initial pilot sites and is included in proposals for an additional seven sites to be funded beginning July 1, 1995.

A major component of the ES Plan is the State Plan for Agricultural Services. This plan describes the services provided to the agricultural industry and to Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers (MSFWs). The plan anticipates a continued decline in agricultural job openings for Program Year 1995. A slight decline is also predicted in registration of MSFWs with TEC. An outreach program will utilize 9.5 staff positions to contact and provide services to MSFWS.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The TCWEC staff have reviewed the Employment Service State Plan for consistency with the Council's State Strategic Plan. The Employment Service has begun implementation of the Council's State Strategic Plan through many of the agency's initiatives. The TCWEC staff fully support and recommend the endorsement of the State Employment Service Plan.

TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	Quality Work Force Planning Responsibilities and Funds in Regions with Multiple Workforce Development Boards
<b>Committee</b>	Worker Transition/Local Systems Committee
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Cindy Geisman, TCWEC
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>S.B.642 provides that when a local workforce development board is formed, the responsibilities of the Quality Workforce Planning Committee (QWFP) are assumed by the new board. Quality Workforce Planning Committees are based on the 24 substate planning regions whereas workforce development boards may be formed currently in 28 areas of the state. In the areas of the state where more than one board may be formed in a substate planning region, responsibility for the QWFP function and funds is less clear. This action item presents the staff recommendations for assigning QWFP responsibilities in regions with multiple boards.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	

**ACTION ITEM**  
**QUALITY WORK FORCE PLANNING RESPONSIBILITIES AND FUNDS  
 IN REGIONS WITH MULTIPLE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARDS**

## **PURPOSE**

To present the Council with recommendations for the development of a rule regarding how the functions of the Quality Work Force Planning (QWFP) Committee and the distribution of QWFP funds should be carried out when there is more than one local workforce development board in a planning region.

## **BACKGROUND**

At the April 20, 1995 Council meeting, staff briefed the Worker Transition/Local Systems Committee on an unanticipated barrier to the implementation of Section 4.04 of Senate Bill 642. This section of the Act states that when a local workforce development board is formed, the responsibilities of the regional Quality Work Force Planning Committee is assumed by the new board.

In 19 regions of the state the consolidation of the QWFP function can proceed without difficulty when a local workforce development board is formed, since the local workforce development area is contiguous with the substate planning region or QWFP region. In the other five regions however, there are multiple workforce development areas within the region and thus the possibility for the formation of multiple boards. This situation makes a direct interpretation of Section 4.04 problematic in these five areas. Where there are multiple workforce development areas in a region, and the possibility for the formation of more than one local workforce development board exists, there is a question concerning how the QWFP responsibilities should be handled and how the \$75,000 allocated to each of the 24 QWFP regions by state law, should be distributed. Since the law does not provide a solution to this situation, SDAs and the QWFP committees requested that the Council develop a policy or rule to determine how Quality Workforce Planning functions would be carried out in regions with multiple boards.

Attachment A provides the options for addressing this issue which were presented to the Committee at the April meeting. Public comment received from the QWFP groups in the April Committee meeting unanimously supported Option Four which was to leave QWFP Committees intact until all areas in the region have formed a board.

## **DISCUSSION**

SB 642 does not address how QWFP responsibilities or funds should be distributed in the event that the substate planning region is divided into more than one workforce development area. The legislation did not anticipate the designation and further subdivision of five of the planning regions along PIC/SDA lines. What is clear however, is that the legislation intended that the QWFP functions continue to be carried out in a manner which would maintain this service to the entire region.

The fact that S.B. 642 did not address how QWFP responsibilities or funds should be distributed in substate planning regions with more than one workforce development area, was recognized and addressed in the consolidation legislation filed by Senator Ellis this session. The language in the consolidation bill states:

“In a state planning area in which there is more than one local workforce development area, the quality workforce planning committee of that state planning area shall continue in existence to provide labor market information for the entire area until local workforce development boards are certified in each workforce development area in the state planning region.” (Section 4.01(h))

The consolidation bill passed out of the conference committee and may be enacted by the time the Council meets in June. The staff will brief the Committee at the meeting on the status of this pending legislation.

In the event that the consolidation bill does not become law, the Council has been asked to establish a rule on the assignment of QWFP responsibilities and funds in planning regions with multiple workforce development areas.

Since S.B. 642 does not address how QWFP responsibilities and funds should be assigned in planning regions with multiple workforce development areas/boards, it is important for the Council to look at the intent of the law and the policy positions which it has adopted previously in the areas of program consolidation and integration.

- Section 1.01(5) of S.B. 642, which outlines the legislative findings, highlights the need to consolidate the planning and budgeting functions of the various federal and state workforce development programs at the state and local level to improve the quality and effectiveness of services.....
- Section 2.06(2) of S.B. 642 states that the Council shall “serve as an advocate for the development of an integrated workforce development system to provide quality services addressing the needs of business and workers in this state”
- In the Council’s consolidation report which was submitted to the 74th Texas Legislature, the Council made the recommendation that “Those regions that do not have local workforce development boards or which include more than one workforce development area within a region should be required to prepare a regional strategic plan for workforce development and submit it to the Council and the Governor. **In both of the above situations, regional planning for all workforce development programs at the local level should be convened by Quality Workforce Planning Committees, the 24 regional committees responsible for dissemination of regional labor market information.**”(emphasis added)
- When the Council voted to designate multiple workforce development areas in the five regions in May of 1994, the statement was made that the Council was entering into a compromise situation; allowing the regions to subdivide their areas when there was local consensus, even though the Council felt a regional designation was preferable. In addition, the Council noted that the designations would be reviewed in December of 1995 to assess the progress of the five areas in forming local workforce development boards. At this point, one year later, no boards have been formed.

## **Option One: Local Agreement**

### Issues

In the event that the Council decided that each area should come to an agreement on how the QWFP functions and funds should be distributed, the Council would have to set up criteria that such an agreement would have to meet e.g. the agreement would have to provide for the function to be covered regionwide at all times. Arrangements could vary across the state resulting in structural confusion for employers and other customers needing to access labor market information. In addition, there would have to be a provision for action by the Council if no agreement were reached.

### Implications

In the case of QWFP, the splitting of a region has financial consequences as well. State law currently provides \$75,000 to each QWFP region to carry out their planning functions. If the Council were to establish a rule that allowed local areas to decide how the QWFP functions and funds should be divided, the impact of the planning funds could be severely diminished. In addition, as stated above, there is the potential for inconsistency in the way the planning function is carried out across a region, which may cause confusion for customers of the system.

## **Option Two: First Board Formed Assumes Responsibility For Entire Region**

### Issues

S.B. 642 sets up a governance structure for local workforce development boards that provides the board with authority over their workforce development area. In planning regions with multiple workforce development areas, a board if formed, would not have a legal jurisdiction over the remaining workforce development areas, nor would it legally assume QWFP responsibilities for the rest of the region given the way in which S.B. 642 is currently written.

### Implications

If the Council chose to support Option Two and local areas were opposed to the formation of a rule based on this option, there may be room for a legal challenge of the rule by local entities. In addition, the first board formed may not be willing to assume planning functions for areas outside of their workforce development area.

## **Option Three: Each Local Workforce Development Board Assumes Responsibility For Its Own Planning**

### Issues

Under this option, the Council would be splitting the \$75,000 allotted to each region among the workforce development areas within the region when a board is formed. Areas that do not form a board would have to carry out the QWFP functions with another entity. The Council's rule would have to address the situation in which one board forms, technically dissolving the QWFP committee but leaving the remainder of the area without an entity to perform QWFP functions.

### Implications

This option fragments the regional planning approach and could result in various entities performing this function across workforce development areas. In addition, as indicated in option one, the impact on the planning funds could be severely diminished. There is also the potential for inconsistency in the way



the planning function is carried out across a region, which may cause confusion for customers of the system.

#### **Option Four: Leave QWFP Committee Intact Until All Areas In The Region Have Formed A Board**

##### Issues

Option four, if supported by the Council, would allow regional planning to continue, would not divide the resources for planning and would provide a consistent framework across the state for carrying out the QWFP functions. One of the issues with option four is whether or not a rule based on this option would be challenged as being inconsistent with section 4.04 of S.B. 642. Section 4.04 (c) (6) states that a local workforce development board when formed “assumes the functions and responsibilities of ..... quality workforce planning committees,.....”. As stated earlier, the consolidation legislation which is now pending does address this issue and maintains the QWFP committees until all workforce development boards in a region are established.

##### Implications

If a rule based on option four were to be challenged as being inconsistent with S.B. 642, the Council may be required to re-visit the rule again. Parties taking issue with a rule based on option four would have to explain how the rule violates the letter or spirit of the law. In addition, given that this option only delays the decision of how the QWFP functions and funds will be distributed in a region with multiple boards, the Council would need to approve criteria for local agreements which would assign QWFP functions and funds once all boards in an area are formed.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

In keeping with the intent of the law and the Council’s previous policy statements to consolidate the planning and budgeting functions, the TCWEC staff recommend:

- 1) that option four, to leave QWFP committees intact until all areas in the region have formed a local workforce development board, be the basis for the development of the rule; and
- 2) that once all of the workforce development boards in a region are established, that a local agreement be required between all of the workforce development boards that ensures that the QWFP functions are carried out regionwide.

## Attachment A

OPTIONS

## I. LOCAL AGREEMENT

One approach would be to let the parties involved at the local level design, recommend, and implement their own solution. The chief elected officials in the planning region could work together to determine how the responsibility would be handled in the region on the condition that any agreement must provide for QWFP services to the entire region. This agreement could be made a part of the application to form a board. In the absence of an agreement, another solution could be imposed by the Council.

## Advantages:

- Local officials should buy into decision, since they make it.
- Decision can be tailored to meet local needs.
- Solution should be able to address situations where one board was formed or all areas in region created boards.

## Disadvantages:

- Some solutions offered may not meet a strict reading of the statute.
- Locals may not be able to agree, requiring Council to impose solution.
- There would have to be a determination of what the appropriate Council solution would be if locals could not decide on a plan.
- Deliberations over how to address QWFP could result in delay in submission of application to form board.

## II. FIRST BOARD FORMED ASSUMES RESPONSIBILITY FOR ENTIRE REGION

Under this approach, the first local workforce development board formed in a region with more than one LWDA would assume the responsibility for QWFP. All funds and responsibilities would be transferred to the new board.

## Advantages:

- Clearly assigns the responsibility for QWFP upon the formation of a board.
- Carries out intent of the statute to consolidate QWFP into LWDB.
- Leaves funding intact.

## Disadvantages:

- Leaves the area not forming a board at a disadvantage.
- Could create a rivalry or dispute between local areas.

- Requires the area with a board to be responsible for regional planning outside its primary jurisdiction.

### III. EACH LOCAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD ASSUMES RESPONSIBILITY FOR ITS OWN PLANNING

Under this option, the QWFP responsibility would be divided in the same manner as the local workforce development areas. As boards were formed, each one would undertake the responsibility for planning in its area.

#### Advantages:

- Maintains the autonomy of the local workforce development board.
- Meets statutory requirement of consolidating QWFP into LWDB.

#### Disadvantages:

- Undercuts the goal of regional planning, providing less regional planning than current QWFP committees.
- The allocation of funds for QWFP has to be divided, providing an inadequate amount for each LWDB.
- Does not address the situation where one area in a region has formed a board but the other has not.

### IV. LEAVE QWFP COMMITTEE INTACT UNTIL ALL AREAS IN THE REGION HAVE A BOARD

Another alternative would be to leave the QWFP committee in place until local workforce development boards are in place to cover the entire region. It delays a difficult decision and allows a QWFP committee that may be functioning well to continue doing its job rather than abolishing it for a partial solution to the problem.

#### Advantages:

- Maintains regional planning with quality workforce planning in the lead role as recommended by the Council in its consolidation report.
- Each board or area has equal responsibility and allegiance to the committee.
- Does not divide the resources for planning.

#### Disadvantages:

- Raises some questions of compliance with statute since the QWFP committee would continue to exist until all areas form a board, but could be argued since the legislation does not address this situation.
- Separates Labor Market Information from strategic planning and evaluation functions of boards.

TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	Impact Statement on a Rule Change for Direct Service Provision
<b>Committee</b>	Worker Transition/Local Systems Committee
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Cynthia Mugerauer, TCWEC
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>At the April 20, 1995 meeting the Committee directed staff to conduct an impact study on the effects of changing the Rule on Direct Service Provision by local workforce development boards and/or allowing waivers on this provision. TCWEC staff conducted two separate surveys on this issue. The first survey was sent to approximately 500 people to get input on the pros and cons of direct service provision (see attachment A). The second survey (attachment B) was sent to the 35 JTPA service delivery areas to assess current practices. Survey results and staff recommendations are not printed in the Council book but will be mailed with the council briefing materials.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	<p>Attachment A-Survey on the Rule for Waivers of the Independent Staff and Direct Service Provision of S.B. 642            Attachment B-SDA Survey on Direct Service Provision</p>

Attachmen A  
**Survey on the Rule for Waivers of the Independent Staff and Direct Service Provision  
of S.B. 642**

**Background**

Senate Bill 642 at Section 5.01 lists the services that must be provided at a workforce development center. They are:

1. **Labor market information;**
2. **Common intake and eligibility determination** for all workforce development programs;
3. **Independent assessment** of individual needs and the development of an individual service strategy (i.e., assessment by an entity separate from the providers of workforce services in the area);
4. **Centralized and continuous case management and counseling;**
5. **Individual referral** for services including basic education, classroom skills training, on-the-job training, and customized training; and
6. **Supportive services**, including child care, loans, and other forms of financial assistance required to participate in and complete training.

The waiver rule adopted by the Council reflects this list of services that appears in SB 642 and thus defines activities such as intake and eligibility determination as "services."

This definition, however, has significant implications beyond the argument of whether these activities are technically services or operational functions. Indeed, the rule under consideration goes to the questions of what is the proper separation of functions among local workforce development boards, administrative agencies that operate the programs, and those entities that provide training and education directly to clients. The rule also has implications for assessing the extent to which competition is appropriate in determining which entity provides these activities and ultimately, who determines whether a client receives services and, how much choice the client has in determining what services he or she actually receives.

The question under consideration is whether an area should have to qualify for a waiver (and demonstrate that no other providers are qualified to provide these activities) in order for its local workforce development board to directly provide one or more of these "front end" activities. This would involve changing the rule to allow some of the services listed above to be considered "operational functions" or activities for the purpose of granting waivers for service provision.

The following questions are designed to elicit some thoughtful responses that will enable the state to resolve this issue in a way that will most benefit the clients and employers that are the customers of the workforce development system.

**Please submit the following survey by Friday, May 19, 1995. Fax your response to the Council office at (512) 912-7172 or mail to:**

**Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness  
P.O. Box 2241  
Austin, Texas 78768**

**Survey on the Rule for Waivers of the Independent Staff and Direct Service Provision  
of S.B. 642**

**1) What distinguishes the S.B. 642 services listed in the background section from other education and training services? Would this distinction constitute a justification for their being treated differently in the rule?**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**2) Insofar as the S.B 642 list of services represents a continuum of services, is there a point at which there would be an advantage to the client to have decision-making guided by an entity separate from the local workforce development board/JTPA administrative entity?**

yes \_\_\_\_\_ no \_\_\_\_\_

**If you marked yes, at what point should an independent provider assume the decision-making role?**

---

---

---

**If you marked no, are there advantages to the client for allowing the board as administrative entity to have control of assessment of client needs and referral to education and training services?**

---

---

---

**3) Is the issue of independent service provision primarily a timing issue? Specifically, would boards/administrative entities be more disposed to take themselves out of the role of service provider if more of a transition period were allowed?**

yes \_\_\_\_\_ no \_\_\_\_\_

**If you marked yes, what would be the appropriate length for such a transition period?**

---

---

**4) What are the administrative barriers and liability issues associated with contracting out "front end" services such as intake and eligibility determination?**

---

---

---

**5) Which of the front-end services are most difficult in terms of administrative/liability issues to contract for rather than delivering directly?**

---

---

---

**6) How should competitive procurement rules apply to the services under question?**

---

---

---

**7) Which of the front-end services should/should not be subject to competitive procurement? Why or why not?**

---

---

---

---

---

**8) What type of organization do you represent? Please check.**

- Employer/Private Sector \_\_\_\_\_
- Organized Labor \_\_\_\_\_
- Independent School District \_\_\_\_\_
- Quality Workforce Planning \_\_\_\_\_
- JTPA Service Delivery Area \_\_\_\_\_
- Private Industry Council \_\_\_\_\_
- Community Based Organization \_\_\_\_\_
- Community College \_\_\_\_\_
- Other - (please write in) \_\_\_\_\_

**9) Additional Comments/Observations**

**Thank you for your input. All responses must be received by Friday, May 19, 1995.**



Attachment B  
**SDA Survey on Direct Service Provision**

Service Delivery Area: \_\_\_\_\_

Grant Recipient \_\_\_\_\_ Administrative Entity \_\_\_\_\_

1. Is your Private Industry Council incorporated? Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_
2. Is your PIC also the JTPA grant recipient and/or administrative entity? Yes \_\_\_ No\_\_\_
3. Indicate below any services that are provided directly by the PIC as the JTPA administrative entity/grant recipient **or** by the JTPA grant recipient/ administrative entity separate from the PIC?

intake \_\_\_\_\_  
 eligibility determination \_\_\_\_\_  
 assessment \_\_\_\_\_  
 case management \_\_\_\_\_  
 counseling \_\_\_\_\_  
 referral \_\_\_\_\_

classroom training \_\_\_\_\_  
     • occupational skills \_\_\_\_\_  
     • academic (ESL,GED,ABE) \_\_\_\_\_

on-the-job training \_\_\_\_\_  
 work experience \_\_\_\_\_  
 others (please list) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

4. Approximately what percentage of training participants are served through individual referrals?

\_\_\_\_\_%

5. Approximately what percentage of training funds are used to pay for individual referrals?

\_\_\_\_\_%

6. Please note any additional comments or observations below.

**All responses must be received in the Council office by 5:00 pm on Monday, May 23. Please fax your response to (512) 912-7172. Thank you for your input on this important issue.**

TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	Cameron County Waiver Request on Direct Services Provision
<b>Committee</b>	Worker Transition/Local Systems Committee
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Cynthia Mugerauer, TCWEC
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>This action item recommends for approval the granting of a temporary waiver to Cameron County to allow the local workforce development board to provide intake, eligibility and assessment services directly. The Committee initially considered this item at the April 20 meeting and delayed action pending additional study. Since that time, Cameron County has provided additional evidence to support its waiver request. The staff is recommending approval of this request with the conditions that the waiver will be temporary (not to exceed two years) and will be reviewed after one year to assess the progress of the area in removing the local board from the role of service provider.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	Cameron County's Revised Waiver Application

**ACTION ITEM**  
**CAMERON COUNTY WAIVER REQUEST ON**  
**INDEPENDENT SERVICE PROVISION**

**PURPOSE**

To present to the Council for final action the request from Cameron County for a waiver from the provisions of SB 642 and the Council's rule prohibiting local workforce development boards from providing services.

**BACKGROUND**

Section 4.10(a) of the Workforce and Economic Competitiveness Act states that a local workforce development board cannot be a direct provider of workforce training and services unless it obtains a waiver from the Council. The law further specifies "that the request for a waiver must include a detailed justification based on the lack of a qualified alternative for delivery of workforce training and services in the area." Senator Ellis, in a letter to Chairman Frost indicated that waivers were put into the legislation to accommodate areas with a limited number of service providers and "should be granted only in cases where there are no viable alternatives."

At its September 1994 meeting, the Council adopted Rules for Waivers on Independent Staffing and Direct Service Provision in order to establish procedures and standards for the granting of waivers. Prior to presenting the rule to the Council for approval, the Council staff published the rule in the Texas Register for a 30-day comment period and brought together system stakeholders to negotiate the language in the rule. The final rule, which was adopted by the Council, reflected the public input received through both processes.

At the Council's April 20 meeting, the Council delayed action on Cameron County's request for a waiver on direct service provision. After a presentation by Cameron County officials and discussion with the Committee, it was unclear whether the action being requested by Cameron County was for a waiver or for a rule change. Cameron County representatives did present a legal opinion arguing that the services (intake, eligibility determination) that the Cameron County board wanted to provide should be considered as operational functions, as opposed to services as defined in the Council's adopted rule. In response to this discussion, the Council asked that the staff assess the impact of such a rule change, include local input into the process, and report on the results at the June meeting. The action item addressing the issue of the rule change appears as a separate item in the briefing materials for the Worker Transition Committee.

In regard to the waiver request that was scheduled for action, the Committee did not make a specific recommendation due to the lack of evidence presented to the Council justifying the need for such a waiver for Cameron County, and the desire of the Committee to receive additional information on the impact of a rule change. Since that meeting, and in consultation with one of the bill's authors, Representative Rene Oliveira of Cameron County, it was determined that a waiver was needed for Cameron County to provide the services in question and that the county would present additional documentation and evidence as required by the rule. It was also agreed 1) that the request would be for a temporary waiver not to exceed two years, and 2) that the evidence presented by Cameron County would be specific to its unique situation (explained below).

After consultation with TCWEC staff, Cameron County re-submitted its waiver request (Attachment A). TCWEC staff received the revised request on May 12 and forwarded it to Worker Transition committee members with a memo indicating the staff's plan to recommend approval of the waiver.

## **DISCUSSION**

The revised request stresses that the one-stop center in Brownsville is in full compliance with Senate Bill 642 in that the board does not and will not operate this center, which was procured through a competitive bid process. Similarly, a planned one-stop center in Harlingen will replicate the Brownsville model. The two-year waiver request asks for a transition period to bring the remainder of the service delivery system in Cameron County into full compliance with SB 642 and the adopted rule. The justification submitted indicates Cameron County desires a waiver for assessment services as well as intake and eligibility services, as originally requested.

Cameron County has already developed a strategic plan for transition to a new service approach and requests a two-year transition period to bring the plan in full compliance. In effect, Cameron County is moving in the direction envisioned in SB 642 but has undertaken its activities in a different sequence than in 642, in which board formation precedes development of a strategic plan and establishment of the one-stop system.

The waiver requests also includes a statement of concern regarding disallowed costs that could arise from turning over eligibility determination to a contractor whose staff is not trained in JTPA processes. The application also cites considerable investment in the PIC's staff for training in how to do assessment and service planning in accordance with the JTPA amendments. It is anticipated that within the two-year framework, the state may be in a block grant environment which will be more amenable to the requirements of 642 and the Council's rule.

The recommended approval (below) includes a provision for the Council to review the status of the county's efforts to come into compliance with the requirements of SB 642 and the Council's adopted rule. This provision will allow the Council to assess the impact of any changes in federal law and to ensure that the transition to independent service delivery can be completed in two years.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

TCWEC recommends to the Council approval of the waiver request from Cameron County for the board to directly provide intake and eligibility determination and assessment services, with the following conditions:

The waiver is temporary in nature and is granted for a maximum of two years, with a one-year review by the Council to assess progress of the area in removing the board from the role of service provider and to assess any changes in state/federal law that may impact the situation.

## WAIVER REQUESTS

Texas Council On Workforce and Economic Competitiveness Staff after review of the Cameron County's application for certification as a local workforce development board, determined a waiver was required for the independent services provided by PIC pursuant to Sec. 4.10 (a), in the Adopted Rule Preamble which states:

- (c) Separate Service Provider Requirement
  - (1) Sec. 4.10 (a) of the Workforce and Economic Competitiveness Act require that a local workforce development board may not be a direct provider of workforce training and services unless it obtains a waiver from the council.

## BACKGROUND

The Cameron County Judge will expand the membership of the Cameron County Private Industry Council to comply with the membership requirements of the Workforce Development Boards. Cameron County PIC is incorporated and a non profit agency. CCPIC is the grant recipient and administrative entity of JTPA.

CCPIC established a consortium in 1992 to pilot a Workforce Center in Brownsville. The members of the consortium included; Texas Employment Commission, Cameron Co. PIC, Texas Department of Human Services, UT Brownsville and Brownsville ISD/Adult Continuing Education.

TEC moved to a new office and allowed the consortium providers to utilize the facility for a "One Stop Center". A strategic plan was developed and each agency repositioned staff to provide training and workforce services at the center. CCPIC received JTPA 8% funds from TEA for the program administration of the center. CCPIC solicited proposals for the program administrator and Brownsville ISD was awarded the contract.

The center was selected as one of the pilot sites for the DOL One Stop Grant. The program operator will be funded through the DOL grant for PY 95-96. These funds will enable the Workforce Development Board to meet all of the requirements of S.B. 642: Section 5.01. This model is being replicated in Harlingen, Tx. The program operator is Texas State Technical College.

### Consortium Model

This model formed a consortium to establish an integrated one-stop system. Staff from each agency are co-located at the center to provide the core services:

- GED (Computer Aided Instruction)
- Case Management
- Counseling
- Career Planning
- Job Search
- Life Skills
- LMI Automated Interactive LMI System
- Assessment (Career Aptitude/Interest and Basic skills)
- Common Intake
- Individual Referral to Post Secondary Training, OJT
- Supportive Services

The delivery system of this model includes two tiers of services: 1) partnership agencies provide core services at the center which establish a common point of access for information and services that address the needs of all individuals; 2) referral/workforce services to programs through agreements or electronic linking.

NOTE: Until there is a block grant system it is important to recognize that the respective partners in the system are responsible to their state agencies and must comply with the state/federal regulations that have administrative authority over their agency.

**\*JUSTIFICATION FOR WAIVER:** The request for a waiver must include a detailed justification based on the lack of an existing qualified alternative for the delivery of workforce training and services in the workforce development area.

1. **The Cameron County Workforce Development Board application demonstrated substantial compliance of the Adopted Rule, Section 252.3 of Chapter 252, Local Workforce Development Boards, Title 10, Texas Administrative Code.**

The Cameron County Private Industry Council established a workforce development center in Brownsville that is in full compliance with S.B. 642. The board does not operate the center. The board procured the program operator through a competitive bid process. The board subcontracts all training services. This enables the board to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the one-stop centers to ensure that performance is consistent with state and local goals and objectives.

2. **A two year waiver is requested to fully implement the Cameron County Workforce Center Strategic Plan. This document provides evidence that this is a new service approach which is unique to Cameron County. A transition period is needed to enable the WDB sufficient time to develop a plan which will bring the Board into compliance with requirements set forth in S.B. 642 and the Council's adopted rule.**

The Consortium model is a new service approach in designing an integrated delivery system through partnership agreements. Unique characteristics: (Described in Strategic Plan)

-The partnership agencies reposition staff to provide services at the center.

-DOL Grant provides funds for a Program Operator. The Program Administrator serves as the service provider of the center. The program administrator is responsible to develop an interagency policy manual, automated case management system, integrated delivery/reporting system, and schedule quarterly consortium meetings.

-The consortium has developed a strategic plan that defines the; vision, mission, scope, philosophy, governance, partnership, organization, facility, funding sources, general population, center's technology and goals.

-The partnerships were established to enable the respective agencies to ensure that the center complied with state and federal regulations.

-The Workforce Development Board is liable for JTPA funds. Disallowed costs during the transition is a major concern. For example, the State does not have a Waiver approved by DOL to share JTPA property for the five pilot sites.

The JTPA amendments in 1992 had a major impact on the JTPA system. There were major revisions to TDOC's JTPA policies and procedures. Our agency has spent over \$22,000 in staff training for the Operation Division. There is no other service provider that is adequately trained to perform the JTPA functions and services as a result of these amendments.

-CCPIC did a cost comparison to ensure that our costs were comparable. CCPIC has met and exceeded all performance standards for the past ten years. We had no findings reported in our (1994-95) Annual Financial Audit. We have never had any disallowed costs reported in our TDOC monitoring reports.

**\*EVIDENCE:**

1. Cameron County Strategic Plan
2. BISD Contract
3. CCPIC/TEC Cost Comparison
4. CCPIC Operations Staff Training Expenditures Report
5. CCPIC 1994-95 Annual Financial Audit

TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	JTPA Title III Third Quarter Fiscal and Performance Reports
<b>Committee</b>	Worker Transition/Local Systems Committee
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Texas Department of Commerce Staff
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>At the last committee meeting in April, members received a briefing on JTPA Title III Fiscal and Performance Reports for the end of the second quarter for PY94. At the June meeting, members will receive a briefing on performance and fiscal for the end of the third quarter for PY94.</p> <p><i>Note: The JTPA Performance and Fiscal reports can be found in the Evaluation and Performance Committee section.</i></p>
<b>Attachments</b>	



TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	Status of the Contractor Awards for the PY94 Statewide, Regional and Industry-wide Project Request for Proposal (RFP)
<b>Committee</b>	Worker Transition/Local Systems Committee
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Sarah Bailey, Texas Department of Commerce
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>The Texas Department of Commerce released the Request for Proposal for Statewide, Regional and Industry-wide Projects in September 1994. Eleven proposals were submitted and reviewed during November and December 1994. After extensive review, two proposals were selected for negotiation and contracting. The successful proposers were Tarrant County SDA and Richland College of the Dallas County Community College System. The Tarrant County Contract is for a total of \$1,398,668 to target dislocated workers with no post high school education laid off from industries secondarily affected by Defense and defense related cutbacks and closures. The second contract with Richland College will be for a total of \$1,260,000 to serve older dislocated workers in the Dallas Metroplex. The older dislocated worker is, as with the Title II older worker, a more difficult segment of the population to serve. This contract will utilize the resources of the college which have been developed specifically for the older worker and apply those resources to Title III eligible persons. Both contracts will extend through PY95.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	

FULL COUNCIL

## Agenda

### Full Council June 2, 1995 Doubletree Hotel - Phoenix North Room Austin, Texas

- 8:30 a.m. Call to Order  
Announcements  
Approval of Minutes
- 8:45 a.m. Public Comment
- 9:00 a.m. Committee Reports and Consent Agenda Action Items
- Recommendations on Evaluation Criteria for Vocational Education Programs
  - JTPA/Vocational Education Coordination/Evaluation Report
  - Resolution Regarding the State's Preparedness and Capacity for Maximizing Use of Block Grants
  - Systems Development Activities and Research Issues for the Performance Measurement System
  - Framework for Adult Education Assessment
  - Title IIA and IIC Local Plan Approval
  - Modification to the JTPA PY94-95 Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan
  - Food Stamp Employment and Training Program State Plan
  - JTPA Title III Local Plan Modification Approval
  - JTPA Title III State Plan for Dislocated Workers
  - Designation of the Gulf Coast Workforce Development Area
  - Recommendations on Part One of the Plan for Common Application and Eligibility Determination System
  - Employment Service State Plan
  - Quality Work Force Planning Responsibilities and Funds in Regions with Multiple Workforce Development Boards
  - Cameron County Waiver Request on Direct Service Provision
- 9:45 a.m. Action Item: Statement on the Adult Education and Literacy Resources to Meet Identified Need
- 10:15 a.m. Break
- 10:45 a.m. Briefing Item: Update on State and Federal Legislation
- 11:45 a.m. Briefing Item: Update on School-to-Work Implementation Grant
- 12:00 p.m. Briefing Item: Update on the Formation of Local Workforce Development Boards
- 12:15 p.m. Adjourn

NOTICE: Persons with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and who may need auxiliary aids or services, or persons who need assistance in having English translated into Spanish, should contact Mita Gosdin, 512/912-7158 (or Relay Texas 800/735-2988), at least two days before this meeting so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	Statement on the Adult Education and Literacy Resources To Meet Identified Needs
<b>Committee</b>	Full Council
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Raul Ramirez
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<i>Note: This item can be found in the Intervention Committee section.</i>
<b>Attachments</b>	

TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	Update on State and Federal Legislation
<b>Committee</b>	Full Council
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Cynthia Mugerauer, TCWEC
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>The Council will be briefed on the status of national legislative proposals to consolidate workforce and vocational education. Two versions have been introduced by Republican Representatives Goodling and Senator Kassebaum. Each propose block grants to states. The Kassebaum bill directs 25% of the block grant to educational programs for vocational education and school-to-work type programs, 25% to employment and training programs, and 50% for the Governor's discretion. Goodling's "Career Act" specifies four separate block grants: youth workforce preparation, vocational rehabilitation, adult training and adult education and literacy. This legislation also requires local workforce development boards. The Council will also be briefed on the outcome of the state legislative session, with emphasis on action taken on SB642 and the workforce consolidation.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	<p>Summary of HR4407 (the Career Act) proposed federal workforce legislation (Goodling).            Summary of proposed federal workforce legislation (Kassebaum) to be filed.</p>

## OVERVIEW OF THE "CAREERS ACT"

- o The Workforce Preparation Reform proposal would consolidate over 100 existing education, training, and employment assistance programs into 4 consolidation grants to the States

- o Such consolidation grants would include:

- 1) **A Youth Workforce Preparation Consolidation Grant** -- consolidating Vocational Education; School-to-Work; and JTPA's Summer Youth Employment, Year-Round, and Youth Fair Chance Programs.

Under such a consolidation, programs would be built on a model integrating academic, vocational, and workbased learning, and enhancing State and local employer input in the design/development/delivery of programs.

- 2) **A Vocational Rehabilitation Consolidation Grant**

- 3) **An Adult Training Consolidation Grant** (including programs for Disadvantaged Adults and for Dislocated Workers). This grant would also consolidate programs for Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers and Native Americans, however these programs would be held at the national level, through a federal-level set-aside off the top of the Adult Training grant.

- 4) **An Adult Education and Literacy Consolidation Grant** (including all Adult Education and Literacy programs).

- o The legislation will:

- ✓ Provide maximum authority to States and localities in the design and operation of their workforce preparation system;
- ✓ Drive money to States -- and down to local communities to the actual points of service delivery;
- ✓ Require the involvement of local employers in the design and implementation of local systems -- through employer-led local Workforce Development Boards; and
- ✓ Require that service delivery be provided through a one-stop delivery structure.



Employment and Training Program  
Contact: John Lederer, (202) 624-5335  
May 10, 1995

## The Workforce Development Act of 1995

On April 26, the majority staff of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee released a discussion draft outline of new legislation, tentatively titled the Workforce Development Act of 1995. The Senate outline would consolidate programs authorized under 14 major statutes, creating a single workforce development block grant to states. Recent discussions with Senate committee staff indicate that committee chair Sen. Nancy Kassebaum (R-Kan.) intends to develop legislative language based on these principles in May, and submit them as proposed amendments to her Job Training Consolidation Act of 1995 (S.143, see *Legisline* dated January 10, 1995), rather than introduce them as a separate bill.

As the outline indicates, the committee is considering the creation of a single block grant, with 25 percent of the funds going to Governors, 25 percent to Chief State School Officers, and the remaining going into a flex account. Policy regarding the use of flex account funds would be established by Governor-convened partnerships that include representatives of organizations providing workforce development services at the state and local levels, elected officials, and the private sector. States are required to establish one-stop service delivery systems.

A separate funding stream would be established for provision of voucher-based vocational rehabilitation services. These services would be coordinated with other training services and accessed through the one-stop system. Administration of vocational rehabilitation services would come out of the Governor's 25 percent set-aside.

The outline also describes a systemwide accountability system whereby the statute would identify state benchmarks for achieving broad workforce goals relating to education and earnings gains. States would establish performance measures consistent with those broad federal goals and any statewide strategic goals.

The outline also proposes to establish a federal-level Workforce Development Partnership to administer the block grant, similar to the existing School-to-Work Office, comprised of staff and resources from the Departments of Labor and Education. Policy guidance for the office would be established by a nine member Governing Board.

TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	Update on the School-to-Work Implementation Grant
<b>Committee</b>	Full Council
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Anne Dorsey, TCWEC
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<i>Note: This item can be found in the Career Foundation Committee section.</i>
<b>Attachments</b>	



TEXAS COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE AND  
ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Agenda Item Information

<b>Meeting Date</b>	June 1, 1995
<b>Agenda Item</b>	Local Workforce Development Board Update
<b>Committee</b>	Full Council
<b>Type of Action</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Briefing/Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Briefing Item (Action at next meeting) <input type="checkbox"/> Action Item
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	John H. Fuller, TCWEC
<b>Summary of Item</b>	<p>Seven areas of the state were issued grants in December of 1994 to plan for the establishment of Local Workforce Development Boards and a network of Workforce Development Centers. The grant period has been extended until August 15. Two applications for board certification have been received in the Council office. Others are developing their applications. This briefing will provide the Council with a report on the current status of these seven grant recipients.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	Handout: Grantees Status Reports

HD  
5715.3  
.T4  
T388  
1995