

MINUTES OF THE C-WIB PLANNING COMMITTEE

November 14, 2012

In the absence of Committee Chair Betty Jo Brooks, Jim Dickerson called the Planning Committee to order at 10:52 a.m.

Committee members present were Jim Dickerson, T.R. Dudley, Harold Haldiman, Melinda Macker, Jinny Ryle-Kaemmerer, Susan Streit, and John Vaughn. In order to establish a quorum Doug Piant was added to the Planning Committee for today's meeting.

C-WIB members in attendance were Sarah Gallagher, Kathy Groves, Earl Horsefield, Patrick Kelly, Janet Kinnett, Nancy Montgomery, Shauna Qualls, Tina Sooter, and Russ Unger.

C-WIB staff in attendance included Alex Blackwell, Alan Galindo, Linda Gray, Jacque Moreland, and Kevin Stadler.

Other attendees included Joyce Davis and Deanne Stubblefield of Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA), Trish Rogers of Central Ozarks Private Industry Council (COPIC), Paula Curtman of Lake of the Ozarks Employment Services (LOES), and Wayne Hakes and Stacie Gurin of the Department of Labor.

Minutes

John Vaughn made a motion to approve the September 26, 2012 minutes, and T.R. Dudley seconded; the Planning Committee approved the minutes as written.

RFP's

Jim D. stated he did not have a lot to report on the RFP. We discussed it last month at the executive committee meeting. We received a number of questions from the state about the RFP, mainly about the process we followed in going through the RFP. We have answered all those questions and haven't had any indication of any problem at this point, but also haven't had any indication of a green light. We are still awaiting word. Jim talked with the state on Friday again about the RFP issue. They said they are working on it diligently, but we haven't had any movement on it. Jim stated he emailed the state and asked them if they would approve an extension in which they did.

LWIB Membership Recertification

Jim D. reported he and Linda G. are working very hard on the WIB board recertification process. I have discussed this with you all in previous full board meetings and with the caucus. As you know the report says that four private sector representatives on the board told the DOL when they called that they were retired. That is not allowable for a private sector slot. The state has made that clear to me that that is not allowable. It is something that I do not have any control over, it just doesn't fit the category. We will be working with the commissioners.

He will be working with those of you who had indicated that to the DOL. We did receive an interest from a new person for one of the private sector seats that is now vacant, so we are getting some people to come on board and you are going to be seeing some new faces around the table when we get through with that process.

Shauna Q. asked again when referring to the "state", as there is more than one state agency involved here, if you would please refer to the DWD or DES, and the same thing with the references to the DOL, if you are talking about the United States Department of Labor would you please refer to them as the USDOL, because my agency falls under the Department of Labor Industrial Relations for the State of Missouri, and we were frequently referred to as the Labor Department. I just want everyone on the board to be clear on what you are talking about. Jim D. stated when he refers to Shauna's department he calls it DOLIR, but will make it clear.

Nancy M. asked what counties the four retired board members were from? Jim D. stated he has only been able to identify two. He had Jan make some calls and she identified two who did say they had indicated they had retired, which was in Howard and Maries County. Who the other two are we don't know and haven't been told.

Earl H. stated that he had noticed in the minutes that Mary Hughes had said she was concerned about some things that Jim mentioned the state had told him that the people who work in private sector must be a power in the management decision making staff of the organization. That's not necessarily going to be right either. I guess she means they don't really necessarily have that position in their companies either. Is that a factor we need to consider? Jim D. stated definitely, and that is something else we are going to have to look at in this recertification process because you have got to have your policy making authority hiring and firing, the owner, or something of that nature. Most of our members in my opinion meet that category. We are going to have to be talking to each person that is nominated concerning that retirement issue and also those categories. This goes from us to the state and they will be looking at it and there is no sense in us wasting our time in trying to put somebody forward that is not going to fit the category.

Jim D. asked Linda if she had anything she wanted to add to this. Linda G. stated she has sent some emails out to some board members, if they have not already gotten back to her to please respond as soon as possible. Jim D. said he would entertain a motion for adjournment.

T.R. Dudley made a motion to adjourn the committee, and Sarah Gallagher seconded; there were no objections. The Planning Committee adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

MINUTES OF THE C-WIB OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

November 14, 2012

Committee Chair Earl Horsefield called the Oversight Committee to order at 11:01 a.m.

Committee members present were Earl Brown, Jim Dickerson, Sarah Gallagher, Earl Horsefield, Janet Kinnett, Melinda Macker, Doug Piant, Shauna Qualls, Tina Sooter, and Russ Unger.

C-WIB members in attendance were T.R. Dudley, Kathy Groves, Harold Haldiman, Joyce Jones, Patrick Kelly, Nancy Montgomery, Jinny Ryle-Kaemmerer, Susan Streit, and John Vaughn.

C-WIB staff in attendance included Alex Blackwell, Alan Galindo, Linda Gray, Jacque Moreland, and Kevin Stadler.

Other attendees included Joyce Davis and Deanne Stubblefield of Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA), Trish Rogers of Central Ozarks Private Industry Council (COPIC), Paula Curtman of Lake of the Ozarks Employment Services (LOES), Wayne Hakes and Stacie Gurin of the Department of Labor, and Presiding Commissioner Gary Jungermann.

Minutes

Russ Unger made a motion to approve the September 26, 2012 minutes, and Janet Kinnett seconded; the Oversight Committee approved the minutes as written.

At the April 2012 Board meeting the Board voted and approved to include the statement "The CWIB Board is extremely worried about the work overload of our staff. We are worried about their health and the future of their careers and would like to go on record that the Board is concerned" into the minutes of all future Board meetings. The motion was made by T.R. Dudley to have the statement included into all future Board meeting minutes, and was seconded by Earl Horsefield, the committee approved the motion.

DOL Monitoring & Response

Jim D. reported we have already talked about the monitoring, and will be covering the monitoring and our response in more detail in the Chairman's report during the full board meeting. Most of what he talked about regarding the board and the DOL monitoring, is partially what he just referenced about the recertification discussion. Also involved in that is the comment about long term vacancies in the counties where we can't get the board seats filled even though we have got board members and commissioners trying to get the seats filled. I've indicated to the DWD that this two member per county structure that we have had for many years may have to change in those cases where we've got counties that just cannot get their seats filled.

We are not going to be allowed to sit here for a year or more with seats that have been empty. It also affects our 51% private sector representation in some cases because in the case of the two we referenced in the report, they are both private sector seats. That means even though we are above our 51% in total slot representations, when you get those vacancies it affects us and that is what the report is talking about.

Jim D. stated he has talked with the caucus twice now about the fact that we may need to revisit that policy. It's probably more of a touchy issue with them because they tend to think more about people from their county type of things. They also understand that they have been unable as commissioners to get seats filled. It is just not going to be a choice where we can do that anymore.

Russ U. asked if that structure changes what is the process then? Does it start with the caucus? Jim D. stated it starts with us. Shauna Q. asked if we change the bylaws then? Jim D. said yes, and then he would take it to the caucus and ask them to approve it also, because it has to be both steps.

Jim D. stated that his thinking and discussions with the caucus has been that it probably will mean that the seats will probably gravitate in some cases to the larger counties, because that's where you will have a bigger pool of people to select from. Our traditional structure has always been to keep all of the counties basically equal, but it has resulted in these long term vacancies, and we may have to change that.

Earl H. stated that it will save money for the board because we will have less people traveling. Jim D. stated that it depends on where we are meeting.

Earl H. stated that DWD told us we did not necessarily have to have two per county. Jim D. stated that the DWD have never required us to, that it is the local bylaws policy. Shauna Q. stated that the DWD or workforce development has never said that, it is our bylaws that say that. Jim D. said that in fact they may ding us a little bit if we had everyone from Columbia, but there is nothing there that requires from DWD or DES or anyone else that requires we have so many per county.

Earl H. stated that we do have a requirement of following the direction of the office of the Governor, correct? As well as DWD directly, correct? Jim D. stated yes. Earl H. stated so we have had some of those we have had to deal with Shauna. Shauna Q. stated she understands that and that is why she wants it clarified of whom we are talking about. Jim stated he will go into more detail about some issues like the retirees and that type of thing.

Jim D. stated he received a letter from DWD. Our response in the original proposal was to take care of that problem in our recertification which is due by January 15, 2013. He then received a letter back from Clinton Flowers with DWD that said basically they couldn't wait that long. So he went back to Clinton in a telephone conversation to see how they wanted that to be implemented not waiting that long. Because it appeared to be getting into the realm of going to people and telling them they no longer qualified and that was it. Clinton then went to Julie Gibson and came back to me by telephone and said that Julie said we could wait until our recertification.

Monthly Reports

Earl H. asked if there were any questions or concerns about the monthly reports. The October reports were distributed to C-WIB members in advance of the meeting.

Trish R. of the Rolla career center reported things have been running smoothly. Staff have been moved around due to losing our DWD staff person at Fort Leonard Wood. A COPIC staff person has been moved to the Fort Leonard Wood office to assist the other staff person that is there.

We are told that the state intends to allow the veteran's representative position to work 50% of the time they are there to provide Wagner Peyser services. There has been good participation in the workshops. We have passed the three hundred mark as far as attendance is concerned. The National Career Readiness Certification (NCRC) continues to increase. We are practically writing OJT's every day. Yesterday and today we had a veterans recognition. Staff will be treating all veterans that come in to a piece of cake and a handshake.

EUC traffic for extended benefits is slightly up but still down much lower than when we got started, and we are still seeing a lot of those extended benefits customers that are calling in to change their appointment, even though we tell them if you change your appointment and or fail to come in it is going to place your UI benefits at risk, but they don't seem to care.

Russ U. asked how many veterans do we serve? Trish reported it varies. We usually have around a hundred each month, some of those are repeat customers. Not all of them go through veterans services. Many of the veterans are served just like any other customer which is not necessarily identified, and that is simply because they do not need to meet with a veterans representative. We did just write our first OJT for this year with a veteran.

Earl H. asked if it was a separate program and Trish stated it was the Show-Me Heroes program through the veterans services.

Joyce D. of the Mexico career center reported they are down one DWD staff person. An EUC staff person was hired as part-time in October, which helps with the staff reduction. The Jefferson City Career Center is about the same, busy with workshops. The EUC customers have all been having to go to workshops, so that is making us have a captive audience and is probably why the workshop numbers have increased at all of the career centers.

Deanne S. of the Columbia career center reported they are still busy. There is an OJT coordinator that is based out of our office. We see her one day a week as she is out the rest of the week marketing. The workshops attendance has increased, but unfortunately won't be reflected in the report this month as the computer was down and the information was unavailable.

Paula C. of the Camdenton career center reported the OJT coordinator got two Show-Me Hero contracts. The traffic seems to be up.

The traffic in Lebanon is up a little, which might be because of the holiday on Monday.

Earl H. asked Alan Galindo to give a Rapid Response report. Discussion was held on the Rapid Response program. Alan presented a handout to the board in addition to the report sent out in the packet. Earl H. thanked Alan for giving the Rapid Response report.

DOL Gold Standard Evaluation Update

We have been having ongoing discussions with the US Department of Labor consultant, because our enrollments in the two restricted categories, CORE and CORE Intensive category. The numbers were not coming up as quickly to the total that they wanted to see. They were afraid we were not going to reach it in the time frame they had envisioned. On the other hand our subcontractors were concerned because anyone that falls into one of those two categories they cannot for instance send them to school. As we knew going in that they were getting people who really wanted to go to school and we were having to tell them no and it was

also affecting their ability to spend their funding. I had a long ongoing discussion with all of the subcontractors and with the USDOL consultant and asked the consultant if we didn't change the percentage of people we were putting into those categories, how much longer would the study have to run, how much longer would that stretch it out. He projected that it would be extended another year. After hearing that the subcontractors indicated that they would rather go ahead and raise the percentage to get the enrollment thing over and get our part of the study gone.

We did agree to raise those categories by two percent. There is also an agreement that if those numbers all the sudden start jumping up and are much higher, that we will revisit that topic and adjust the percentages again. They were afraid that by our not having enough numbers in those categories we were going to affect the study, which we don't want to do, as we did agreed to do the study.

Jim Dickerson made a motion to adjourn the committee, and Janet Kinnett seconded; there were no objections. The Oversight Committee adjourned at 11:27 a.m.

MINUTES OF THE C-WIB BUDGET COMMITTEE

November 14, 2012

In the absence of Committee Chair David Miller, Jim Dickerson called the Budget Committee to order at 11:45 a.m.

Committee members present were Jim Dickerson, Patrick Kelly, Nancy Montgomery, and Shauna Qualls.

C-WIB members in attendance were T.R. Dudley, Sarah Gallagher, Kathy Groves, Harold Haldiman, Earl Horsefield, Joyce Jones, Janet Kinnett, Melinda Macker, Doug Piant, Jinny Ryle-Kaemmerer, Tina Sooter, Susan Streit, Russ Unger, and John Vaughn.

C-WIB staff in attendance included Alex Blackwell, Alan Galindo, Linda Gray, Jacque Moreland, and Kevin Stadler.

Other attendees included Joyce Davis and Deanne Stubblefield of Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA), Trish Rogers of Central Ozarks Private Industry Council (COPIC), Paula Curtman of Lake of the Ozarks Employment Services (LOES), Wayne Hakes and Stacie Gurin of the Department of Labor, and Presiding Commissioner Gary Jungermann, Mike Oldelehr and Kelly Schwartze of Williams Keepers.

Minutes

Nancy Montgomery made a motion to approve the September 26, 2012 minutes, and Shauna Qualls seconded; the Budget Committee approved the minutes as written.

Monthly Financials

Jacque Moreland presented the budget for PY2012 as of September 30, 2012. The first page is our overall budget this year. The budget is about 7.3 million. We are 36% expended overall. C-WIB Administrative Entity is at 29%, CMCA is at 45%, COPIC 39%, LOES 31%. We will be receiving additional NEG/OJT funds but I do not have the exact amount for that yet. Please note that LOES and COPIC are slightly lower than what they should be right now due to the NEG funds that have been extended until June 30, 2014.

The next couple of pages are the expenditures by month. It is a Statement of Revenues and Expenditures report from October 1, 2012 through October 31, 2012. The first column is just the month of October, the second column is our year to date.

The next pages reflect a comparison from last year to this year so you can see the increase or decrease. The first column shows you what we spent as of October 31, 2012, the middle column is where we were as of October 31, 2011, and the last column shows the percentage of change and it list everything by line item.

Discussion was held on the financials. We are in the process of moving some OJT funds back to ARRA at the state's request, and all the funds that we spent in NEG/OJT will be freed up to be spent this year. Those funds had to be spent by September 30, 2012. We did DWD a favor by fixing those funds for them. All the money that we have moved we can use for NEG/OJT funds.

Jim D. asked if there were any further discussion on the financials? There was none. Patrick K. made a motion to approve the financial budget, and Nancy M. seconded; there were no objections. Motion carried.

Tentative PY11 Audit-Williams Keepers, LLC

Mike Oldelehr, CPA, partner with Williams-Keepers, LL presented the C-WIB PY11 Independent Audit Report, which included a summary of the audit results and management letter. Mike stated this report is a "final" not "tentative" audit report.

The independent audit report was conducted in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Mike presented an overview summary of the audit to the board members. The board members received a copy of the audit prior to the board meeting. Discussion with questions and answers was held on the findings of the PY11 audit.

Shauna Q. asked why the dues and subscriptions went up? Mike stated if you look at the dues and subscriptions under administrative it went down. It might have been a reallocation issue. Jim D. clarified that we are talking about two different categories. Shauna is talking about program expenses versus administrative expenses. Jim D. suggested if Jacque did not have the information right now, to look into it and get back to the committee.

Nancy M. asked about the insurance cost. Jacque explained that we pay the insurance not only for the career centers but for every small office. Last year we had to meet admin expenses so more of it went to admin. This year it went to program where it was supposed to. It is a program cost, we also pay for all of our equipment in all nineteen counties and the insurance on that. Jim D. stated there is a corresponding drop there Nancy under the admin category where it went from about 22,000 to 10,000.

Shauna Q. asked about page 7, the language states "employee status as a contracted employee", she does not understand the definition of a employee as a contracted employee. Mike asked if C-WIB had any employees last year on a contract basis? Jim D. stated no we did not have any. Mike stated that needs to be struck from the report.

Mike Oldelehr stated there were no instances of non-compliance, or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards. All the way around this was a good report and a "clean audit" with no material weaknesses.

Jim D. thanked Mike for his presentation of the PY11 audit. He asked if there were any further discussion of the audit? There was none.

Sarah Gallagher stated she wanted to commend the C-WIB staff for doing such a good job on this, to have this kind of report that does not have any deficiencies, and we really appreciate it. Shauna Q. stated she would like the modifications that were requested to be made.

Nancy M. made a motion to take the audit to the full board for approval with the requested modifications, and Patrick Kelly seconded; there were no objections. Motion carried.

Patrick Kelly made a motion to adjourn; there were no objections. The Budget Committee meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL REGION WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD

November 14, 2012

Chairman Jim Dickerson called the Board to order at 1:06 p.m.

C-WIB members in attendance were Jim Dickerson, T.R. Dudley, Sarah Gallagher, Kathy Groves, Harold Haldiman, Earl Horsefield, Joyce Jones, Patrick Kelly, Janet Kinnett, Melinda Macker, Nancy Montgomery, Doug Piant, Shauna Qualls, Jinny Ryle-Kaemmerer, Tina Sooter, Susan Streit, Russ Unger, and John Vaughn.

C-WIB staff in attendance included Alex Blackwell, Alan Galindo, Linda Gray, Jacque Moreland, and Kevin Stadler.

Other attendees included Joyce Davis and Deanne Stubblefield of Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA), Trish Rogers of Central Ozarks Private Industry Council (COPIC), Paula Curtman of Lake of the Ozarks Employment Services (LOES), Wayne Hakes and Stacie Gurin of the Department of Labor, and Presiding Commissioners Kenneth Kunze, Gary Jungermann, Ray Schwartz, and Danny Rhoades.

Minutes

Nancy M. made a motion to approve the September 26, 2012 and October 24, 2012 minutes and Kathy G. seconded. All in favor, motion passed.

Planning Committee

Jim D. stated that he will try to keep the report short as most everyone was present at the individual committee meetings. The Planning Committee met today and I gave a report on the current RFP process. The DWD is still reviewing the process we followed and we are basically just extending contracts until such time as the state communicates with us. Concerning this issue, I have answered a number of questions regarding the process. No objections have been brought up at this point in time, but we just don't have any answers from the DWD at this point.

Jim D. stated that we also discussed our WIB membership recertification. We specifically covered areas that I will be covering more in my discussion of the USDOL monitoring. Our main concern there is board membership and qualification specifically private sector members. I will be talking with the caucus after this meeting concerning that very important issue. We've talked about it before and we are going to talk about it again.

Oversight Committee

Earl Horsefield reported the Oversight Committee met and approved the minutes of the September 26, 2012 meeting. He asked Jim D. to give a report on the USDOL Monitoring & Response. Jim D. stated he would give the report during his Chairman's report in the full board meeting.

We are waiting on the DWD regarding the RFP's. Discussion was held on the WIB recertification.

A report was given on the Career Centers by Paula and Trish. Earl H. asked Trish to explain the OJT program.

Trish R. explained the OJT program is broken down into different pots of money. The Show-Me Heroes OJT program is the most recent addition that is to assist our veterans. All of the career centers throughout the state of Missouri are working diligently to place as many as we can into full time jobs. As we mentioned we have all started making those placements. We also write OJT's for our regular dislocated worker program and adult program. The National Emergency Grant (NEG) has an OJT program for the long term unemployed.

Discussion was held on the shared to work program and how it works. Alan Galindo gave an updated handout on the Rapid Response report.

Budget Committee

Jim D. reported the budget committee met and approved the minutes of the September 26, 2012 meeting.

The monthly financials were presented by Jacque Moreland, they were reviewed and voted on and approved. I think everyone here was present during that committee meeting.

The audit was reviewed and the committee needs to present that audit for consideration to the full board for vote. Jim D. asked if there were no further questions on the audit he would need a motion to approve and accept the audit. This needs to be done before it can be forwarded to the state. Earl Horsefield made a motion to approve the audit; and Harold Haldiman seconded the motion. Jim D. asked if there was any discussion? Earl H. stated he wanted to give everyone who worked on this a big thank you because he knows it was a lot of work and it looks really good to him and he has seen a lot of them.

Shauna Q. asked that the modifications she previously mentioned be made. Jim D. asked that the modifications be included in the motion made by Harold Haldiman and seconded by Earl Horsefield. Harold and Earl agreed to include the modification in the motion. Jim D. asked if there were any further discussion, and there were none. The board members present unanimously approved the audit.

The Executive Directors report is next on the agenda. However, Jan V. developed some health issues and discomfort in her chest over the weekend and was hospitalized. Jan is out of the hospital now but unable to be at today's meeting. She is feeling much better.

Chairman's Report

Jim D. reported on the USDOL monitoring and our responses to that monitoring. Jan V. has been informed that DWD has accepted our response. My understanding is that that response becomes part of a DWD response back to USDOL, and that I understand is still pending. It is not just our answers but their answers to issues we don't even know were in the monitoring.

Jim D. stated he will cover on what we responded on the findings they had on our monitoring. The first finding they said we had a lack of a youth council. We have had a youth council all along. What occurred in that instance was that prior to the USDOL visit we were able to review a couple of different states monitoring reports from USDOL. During that review we discovered that there were categories of representation that were required for the youth council that we had never had. I want to point out that the DWD always knew who we had on the youth council and never said that we didn't have everyone we need on the youth council.

We went to work and started adding members of those categories to the youth council and by the time the USDOL arrived in our region we had that problem corrected. The youth council is fully constituted and that problem is cleared up.

The second finding pertains to what they refer to as the lack of business majority and that is created by our vacancies, that was created by our people who said they were retired. Also in not meeting criteria for membership, basically as a private sector person in most cases. Jim D. stated he has already talked to the board in what we are doing in that category, and he will be talking to the caucus about that later on today, as far as what we need to do to correct those deficiencies. We are moving quickly on that and our actual response said that we were going to have that corrected in sixty days, and I told you earlier they then came back and said why don't we just do it as part of the recertification, so that is where we are with that right now. We plan for our recertified board to meet the necessary criteria.

Jim D. stated the third finding pertained to lack of proper process or designation of one stop operators. That goes back to this RFP issue I've been talking about all day. Again, I will point out that DWD was always aware that we had not RFP'd Adult and Dislocated worker programs and career center operators, and nobody ever said anything.

Then all of a sudden after the USDOL visit we were told, as well as the Kansas City region, which was also part of the monitoring, that we needed to RFP these services almost immediately. We made quick turnaround, you all were part of the process, and part of approving the RFP. The state wanted us to be ready by September 1, and we were. We RFP'd and advertised. It is on our website and we got two competing bids for the Northern eight counties of the region, and one bid a piece for the Lake of the Ozarks region, and the Meramec region.

Jim D. stated the evaluation committee met and we developed a new point evaluation system in conjunction with DWD. That's what was used in evaluating proposals. They were evaluated and immediately submitted to the state with recommendations. The DWD is still reviewing that RFP process. They did approve the RFP itself before we ever put it out on the street, but now they are reviewing how it was implemented and what occurred. That is where we are on that, and we have acted on that particular finding.

The next finding was no conflict of interest disclosure statements. We have had a few board members who have not yet executed those statements. Linda G. is working on that. She has about three that still need to be turned in. The finding also called for the staff to execute conflict of interest statements which has now been done. Jim D. added that on the evaluation committee that evaluated the RFP bids, all committee members re-executed the conflict of interest statement, and I also personally vetted each member before appointing them to make sure that I couldn't see any potential way there could be a conflict of interest involved.

Shauna Q. stated for clarification, that basically Jim D. is saying based on his review that he did not find where any current member of this C-WIB board, and Jim D. said any current member of that evaluation committee in this particular process that he is talking about.

Shauna Q. asked if we have any board members that are members of the subcontractor groups? Jim D. stated no. Shauna Q. stated she wanted to make sure because that would be a conflict of interest, and Jim D. stated we did not.

Jim D. state the next finding was the delay of WIA program exits. A lot of this finding pertained to particular youth programs. The board members have all heard him refer to our exit meetings that we have monthly. Those meetings are processed of the subcontractors coming forward with a list of current customers that they believe have in short terms either succeeded or terminally failed in the program. In other words they have jobs that make them self sufficient or they just have disconnected from the program and won't even respond.

The finding referred to some instances where the case notes were indicating services were being offered and yet also referred to the fact that they couldn't locate the person. That is a slim possibility if you are talking about offering some services but not a very good one. What we have done is Jim D. has asked each subcontractor to submit a list of any of those potential instances where this is occurring, and we are in the process of reviewing each one of those cases, and in those cases I guarantee you where we are in a situation in which either we can't locate them or we can locate them but we actually have not been able to talk to them in months, we are going to exit them. We are just not going to do that other thing anymore and the subcontractors know this, and we have assured the state this and have responded this way in our response.

Jim D. stated that he has to say, and this may sound bad, but the subcontractors tell him that the youth program is worse for this than the adult dislocated worker actually. They really have to be careful and work with these people quickly and intensely or interest is lost and that type of stuff. It has been a problem and we are just going to have to cure it, we don't have any choice, and that is where we are with that.

The next finding is unnecessary cost charged to grant funds. This relates to the belief of the USDOL monitors that in some instances too much food is being bought at meetings, in other words a lot more food than was needed to feed the people who attended. So we are tightening up on this and are trying to lengthen our confirmation of attendees from the day before to three days before so that Jacque has a better idea of the number of people who are going to be in attendance and we can tailor our food order according to that.

The next finding is follow up services not provided to all youth. In at least one instance, and this is a function of staff cuts that have occurred. There was an instance where that follow up was not occurring in all instances, it was in most instances but not all. The instruction has been issued that that is not acceptable. We have agreements that require follow up in all instances and that is what it needs to be, and we will be monitoring that to make sure that occurs.

Jim D. stated the next finding is lack of proof of eligibility for youth services. This one is a disagreement. I happened to be in on part of the discussion that involved a particular case. It involved a particular interpretation of what makes a person eligible in the youth program. We had responded with our understanding of that eligibility criteria. I knew at the time, and I was involved in that discussion, that there was some disagreement. I checked with several people and they did not agree with what was being said in the finding. We are just going to have to wait. This response is going to USDOL and I assume there will be some settlement of this issue. It is really only one of the areas that I feel like there is a disagreement between what was said and what needs to be done in that area.

The next finding was objective youth assessments not conducted at the time of intake. We have changed that particular system now and the youth assessments will be conducted at the time of intake in all instances now.

The final finding the state sent us was the area of excessive use of the sixth criterion barrier for youth eligibility. That criteria is needs additional assistance. It is a fairly broad criteria. Jim D. stated it was a criteria he would have to say from his experience that the DWD encouraged us to develop because it allowed us to enroll more youth. It opens up that eligibility area and you can place more youth under that criteria. What the US Department of Labor monitoring found was that it was being used excessively with large number of total pools of youths were coming in under that criteria.

Jim D. stated in looking at the numbers there was no question that this barrier was being used a lot. You just can't argue that point. When you are looking right at the numbers don't sit there and argue that it is not the truth because it was. So we are going to develop a process that I will be talking about with the planning committee in the future as well as the board, where we can lessen the use of that particular barrier.

T.R. Dudley asked is the SPYC program doing a good job preparing youth, or is it some of the same problems?

Trish R. stated the SPYC program is the temporary summer involvement. This particular area that we are talking about right now, several years ago the DWD wanted to see more youth brought into the program, so they allowed for the plan to include an additional barrier which was identified by the WIB. That was the barrier that was approved, which was the lack of work history special needs barrier.

Trish R. stated that yes we have used that barrier a lot because the majority of our youth coming in had never worked before, or have not had a significant work history. Apparently that has now been deemed as not an appropriate thing to do.

Jim D. stated he didn't think they said it was not appropriate, he thinks they just said it was being "over used".

Joyce J. stated if it is appropriate and it fits the categories for a lot of our rural communities then that is the choice we have to use.

Jim D. stated they are saying it is being over used, which translates into the other barriers are not being used enough.

Shauna Q. stated yes then it becomes a "catch all" and Jim D. said right. Shauna Q. she is reading what it says on page four, and it also says or sounds like it is used in conjunction with youth who have fiscal and or mental barriers. Jim D. said correct. Shauna Q. said it's just not lack of work history alone.

Jim D. stated that again he points out they are not saying not to use the barrier at all in his understanding, they are just saying in their opinion it is being over used and the other's therefore are not being used enough.

Joyce J. stated that there are examples in there of kids mowing lawns and that is what the kids in Dent county do, and they get paid for mowing lawns all day, and it can't be used as their work barrier.

Jim D. said we have sent this response in that you have in your hands. We have only been asked to elaborate in one area and that was in the area of board membership vacancies and recruiting people for those vacancies. We did provide additional response for that area. Our entire response has now been accepted by DWD and has apparently been forwarded on along with the state's portion of their response to USDOL for their review. Jim D. asked if there were any other questions?

Jim D. stated the next item I have to cover is the letter, or the process that we have been going through with the Missouri Attorney General's office. As some of you know all during that period of our election process and all of that, I received a letter that said they had received several complaints that C-WIB is violating the sunshine law. They asked for a response to those allegations, as well as some specific allegations that we were holding meetings out in the parking lot. I responded to that letter and now have received an answer.

The board members should have in front of them a copy of the letter and our response.

Jim D. stated the parking lot meetings was not mentioned in that response. The two instances of the potential problem they pointed out centered around the May 21 personnel committee meeting, and you all know I wasn't at that meeting and didn't know anything about it, but they say that the meeting was closed and from looking at the minutes shouldn't have been, and I've got to review those minutes, but from my understanding, and Nancy we heard some of this in the first special personnel committee meeting, my understanding was that those raises that were proposed which were never implemented, but were proposed did involve some discussion about people's personnel evaluations. If they did, you're talking about individually identifiable personnel records which is an area where you can close a meeting, but if that was the case I don't know that I agree with that assertion. But that's one thing they nailed us on.

Jim D. stated that the second thing was that we did not include the personnel committee report on the meeting notice for the next board meeting. I didn't know there had been a meeting so I didn't know it needed to be on the notice, and I pointed that out to the Attorney General's office.

Those are the only two areas in that entire letter that I felt like they said we had a potential violation. The rest of the letter I take as constructive criticism. It calls on us to provide more detailed information in particularly our public notices that are posted. So the public has a better idea of exactly what is going to be discussed. One example they used was listing personnel. If you are going to be talking about salary increases you have to list salary increases, and I agree with that. The public is looking at a notice and trying to decide whether to attend a meeting or not, they need as much information as we can give them. I think it's a great suggestion. So you will be seeing changes in both our agenda which will look a lot longer, not that the meeting will be longer, but will have more information on it, and the public notices will be longer.

Nancy M. asked when we post them aren't those categorized as tentative agenda notations? Jim D. stated yes. Nancy M. stated you can put as much information on there as you can but you can't list everything that you are going to talk about.

Jim D. said in his response to the Attorney General's office to this last letter, that was my question to them. What are you going to do if it's not in your public notice, yet you get to the meeting and something else needs to be discussed and the agenda is amended, are you

going to say we can't discuss it because it wasn't in the public notice that was posted a week ago? I've asked them that question and I haven't got the answer to it yet but in this case that they are talking about, the agenda was amended, no it wasn't in the notice and yes it should have been in this case, but again you never can anticipate something may come up at the last minute, the day before. I've asked them this and am waiting for an answer on it.

Joyce J. asked if they realize that we all don't live in the same town? A lot of travel is involved.

Jim D. stated he just felt like they really found one problem area, and felt like they made some very good suggestions we could use to improve both our agenda and the public notice and I am not going to argue with them about that.

Earl H. stated there was other things to consider too. He was on the zoning commission for about eleven years and believe me these sunshine law violations happen all the time, and they always say well it's easier to ask forgiveness than permission. One of the things they always bring up is the privacy laws require us to close a lot of these meetings for real estate, for personnel discussions whether it's salary or not, it may be related to some kind of a problem with a particular employee and you cannot do that in public without covering yourself, you have to do that in private.

Jim D. stated that our policy that we try to work with if you are talking about somebody's individual personnel record, evaluation or something of that nature, then I think you are in closed session territory. Just because you're talking about personnel doesn't mean you have a closed meeting.

T.R. Dudley stated he thinks there is less scrutiny to add an agenda item if it's not something you have to vote on. I think specifically if it's something you have to vote on, that needs to be posted and allow the public to know that you are voting on an issue.

Jim D. stated that he thinks in this case they could see that raises were involved and it wasn't on the agenda, that probably got us slid over into a bit more trouble.

T.R. Dudley said also on the issue of you can't just have an open ended posting of we are going to go into closed session. You need to pinpoint those. If you are going to go into it for personnel that subsection that needs to be highlighted. Jim D. stated he agrees with that suggestion.

Jim D. stated he doesn't see any real problems in the letter. We did respond very quickly to their inquiry, and like I said what started their inquiry is apparently because several people called them and complained.

Next I want to talk about our performance standards. We are in the process currently in negotiating with DWD regarding those standards. What occurs is the DWD in this instance had gone to USDOL regional office and had negotiated for the statewide performance standards. Then DWD made proposals back to each region on what standards they wanted us to meet in order to tie in with the standard they already negotiated. Where that resulted for us was a big increase in the adult wage and a hefty increase in the dislocated worker wage, as well as an increase in that numeracy item and small increases in the other categories.

Alex Blackwell and I had a conference call yesterday with DWD. I discussed with them their proposal for our different standards. We disagreed on the adult wage. The adult wage in this region, the standard, for the past year has been considerably higher than even the dislocated worker wage. We were fighting that wage standard at every exit meeting. It was just nip and tuck. I got the state in the call yesterday to lower our standard that they were proposing in that wage area to an area that I believe we've got a much better chance of making it.

Shauna Q. asked what were they proposing and what did you recommend? Alex B. presented the following breakdown of the negotiated performance levels for each category:

	DOL/DWD negotiated rate:	DWD/CWIB negotiated rate:
Adult Entered Employment	65%	65%
Adult Retention	85%	81%
Adult Average Earnings	\$11,750	\$11,000
DW Entered Employment	70%	68%
DW Retention	90%	90%
DW Average Earnings	\$14,000	\$12,500
Youth Placement	68%	64%
Youth Attainment	63%	74%
Youth Literacy/Numeracy	50%	50%
WP Entered Employment	67%	66%
WP Retention	81%	81%
WP Average Earnings	\$12,000	\$12,000

*These rates are for a 180 day (6 months) time period.

Jim D. stated that you all know and we've discussed it before and have had huge problems on the Literacy Numeracy measure before, and have even been put on probation by the state on that measure. We've really worked hard on it and we are doing much better on that, and I thought we could make 50% without much difficulty.

Earl H. asked if that was within two years? Jim D. stated no that is every year that we do that. Jim D. stated that he will be talking with the state again. He will be calling them before he leaves here today and he will be agreeing because he had not during the call yesterday, to the numeracy rate. Jim D. will be proposing a lower rate to them in dislocated worker. Nancy M. stated so you will be proposing a lower rate for the OJT? Jim D. stated it will be a lower starting rate all the way around, anyone put on the program.

Shauna Q. stated so just to clarify for the whole board the way this whole scenario works out is USDOL and DWD get together and they come up with statewide proposals for these performance measurements. Jim D. stated correct. Shauna Q. stated then like for Missouri it is a single measurement for whatever criteria. Jim D. stated correct. Shauna Q. stated then after that DWD goes to each WIB region then modifies through proposals and negotiations. Jim D. stated that is right. Where DWD is now since they have already agreed with USDOL on statewide measures, in negotiating with the region when they are all totaled up, the average has to have a reasonable chance of meeting what they already negotiated with USDOL. Shauna Q. stated then you take all of these combined regions performance measurements for a given criteria/objective, then you add those and average it, and that average has to come up with what the state negotiated between DWD and USDOL. Jim D. stated yes or they miss their performance.

Jim D. stated where we are kind of significant Shauna, and it was pointed out in a conference call yesterday and we have been aware of this for some time, there are fourteen workforce regions in the state of Missouri. Our performance tends to range anywhere from ten to fifteen percent of the total state performance. We are a bigger region and enrolling more people, so our performance affects their statewide performance more than other regions do.

Shauna Q. stated in a simple example you only have two regions with a measurement negotiated with DWD and USDOL. One got 100% and the other got 80% those averaged together would be 90%. Jim D. stated as long as they were equal in participants and whatnot.

Jim D. stated he has said before in particularly the youth area, our region tends to enroll many more youth on average than other regions, so it really impacts in those areas.

Nancy M. stated she has a couple of things she wants to present. We don't have to vote on anything, just ideas. Jim D. stated let me bring them up Nancy since it's not on the agenda. Nancy M. stated ok.

Jim D. stated some members including Nancy M. have brought up to me the possibility of meeting the full board bi-monthly and the executive committee not. So that we don't have some members having to come to a meeting every month. The truth of the matter is I know it's hard, particularly for the private sector members to attend if you are an executive member especially a monthly meeting. I am only presenting this today, because it is not on the agenda but I am presenting it for your consideration for you to think about. Personally I don't have a preference. You saw today that I had to chair two different committee meetings because people could not make it. They couldn't make it for good reason, they've got jobs and they have to attend to those.

Jim D. stated that also the suggestion has been made, and this has been brought up to me before, and there is many sides to this coin, that we consider having all of our meetings in Jefferson City. Because if you look at the entire region it tends to be more of a central location. I say that and I am looking over here at T.R. Dudley and it is not good for a person from Potosi. It is just not black and white. I don't have a preference, but these things are being discussed and so I told Nancy that I would bring them up under the chairman's report. I bring both of them up for your consideration for you to think about. We are not going to make the decision today.

Jim D. stated the full board would meet every other month and not have an executive meeting. Jim D. stated it has been suggested to him for the full board to meet quarterly, and I don't like that. I want people to be more connected than that. I don't want to be standing out on a limb for a quarter, that's just not my way and I don't want to do it that way. You can vote otherwise but I don't want to do that. So it would be a full board meeting every other month and it would be letting the executive committee out of their meeting responsibilities in the off months.

Nancy M. stated then we would all just meet six times a year, the executive committee would meet on the same day as the full board and everybody would be done and we only need to meet every other month. Jim D. stated right. Nancy M. stated with gas prices and the economy and your right, getting us out of work for a whole day every other month is doable. Jim D. stated that is the first proposal just to think about and the second would be to have all of the board meetings in Jefferson City.

Russ Unger asked if the executive board would meet before the full board meeting? Jim D. said they could or they may not meet at all, we might just start using that as sometimes in that off month you might have something come up that has to be acted upon and we might do it that way. It used to be the full board met every month, then we went to this full board and the executive committee. Jim D. stated he doesn't have a problem with the suggestion either way. I can see the need for some board members to have their meeting schedule reduced.

Earl H. stated if we do bring it up as a formal proposal he would like to have a cost analysis with it. Jim D. stated ok.

Joyce J. asked if we do pursue that, I think the ones that are in Russ's position I think we need to talk with them about which months might be bad or which ones are good. Jim D. said ok I am going to put this on the agenda for our next meeting and we can discuss it and come to some kind of decision, but I just wanted to let you know that it was rattling around out there and to give you plenty of time to think about it.

Earl H. stated that even if we think about it as a temporary proposal regarding board membership, he would like to have an alternative of doing it another way, and one way would be to have the current board members grandfathered in until that position is no longer occupied and then go to like one member per county. Like if you had two and you wanted to go with one later on, you would grandfather it until one board member was no longer in that spot and not have to be replaced.

Jim D. stated the only problem with that is that I can't get DWD to recertify some of the existing board members.

Earl H. stated then you have to replace those until we replace the by-laws, I mean if the by-laws were to be changed and the proposal was brought up then I would like the option of voting down a grandfather clause. Jim D. said ok.

Nancy M. asked where were the bids submitted for the audit? Jim D. stated they were advertised in the Rolla Daily News, Lebanon Daily Record, and the Jefferson City News Tribune, as well as being placed on the website. We sent out eight bid packets to auditors. We received three bids. Those bids were from Williams Keepers, Verkamp & Malone, and Fick, Eggemeyer & Williamson.

T.R. Dudley made a motion to adjourn, and there were no objections. The Board meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m.