



Minutes
Iowa Workforce Development Board Meeting
July 7, 2023
11 am – 12:00 pm
ZOOM

Agenda item 1. Call to Order

Chair Jay Iverson called to order the meeting of the Iowa Workforce Development Board (the Board) on July 7, 2023, at approximately 11 pm via ZOOM.

Agenda item 2. Roll Call

Members in Attendance

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Director Beth Townsend | 12. Mary Landhuis |
| 2. Director McKenzie Snow | 13. Brad Elliott |
| 3. Director Emily Wharton | 14. Alex Severn |
| 4. Interim Director Brian Dennis | 15. Kelly Barrick |
| 5. Jay Iverson | 16. Nick Glew |
| 6. Daren Westercamp | 17. Andy Roberts |
| 7. Jack Hasken | 18. Jason Shanks |
| 8. LuAnn Scholbrock | 19. Nancy McDowell |
| 9. Teresa Hovell | 20. Tiffany O'Donnell |
| 10. Kellie Gottner | 21. Drew Conrad |
| 11. Brad Elliott | 22. Todd Holcomb |
| | 23. Rita Grimm |
| | 24. Director Beth Skinner |

Members Absent

- | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Governor Kim Reynolds | 10. Charlie Wishman |
| 2. Senator Dawn Driscoll | 11. Jayson Henry |
| 3. Representative Dave Deyoe | 12. Josh Cobbs |
| 4. Alicia Stafford | 13. Senator William Dotzler |
| 5. Jessica Dunker | 14. Representative Jeff Cooling |
| 6. Ofelia Rumbo | 15. John Smith |
| 7. Deb Mauricio | 16. Kyra Hawley |
| 8. Matthew Nicol | 17. Amelia Alibasic |
| 9. Carrie Duncan | 18. Scott Thompson |

Shelly Evans called roll and advised Chair Iverson that quorum was established.

Agenda item 3. Approval of Agenda

Chair Iverson called the next order of business which was the approval of the meeting Agenda for July 7, 2023. The agenda was previously emailed to the Members of the Board.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Motion to Approve the Agenda for 7/7/23.

Scott Naumann motioned to approve the Agenda and Jack Hasken seconded the motion. Members of the Board in attendance voted on the motions by voice vote, which carried unanimously.

Agenda item 4. Discussion on the WIOA Infrastructure Funding Agreement.

Michelle McNertney presented. WIOA funding documents (Attachments 5 and 6) are used by the local areas to determine costs. WIOA Core Partner working group consists of policy leaders for Title I, II, III, and IV. Groups work together to develop policies and procedures. Infrastructure is last major piece for WIOA and needs to be executed to be fully in compliance with legislation. Group has spent last few years working together to draft this policy recommendation. Guidance was given for local areas to use to complete this process. Locally driven but each area needs to conduct on their own locally. How non-personnel related costs of workforce centers is paid for (operating costs, rent, equipment, etc.) that are not personnel related. Equitable distribution of funds for the programs. Could be based on square footage or number of customers. Consultation sessions held to go over policy more in depth. Feedback incorporated into policy recommendations. Example: reconciliation of core partner costs on quarterly basis and requested to do every 6 months. Ask board to consider and approve policy. Next step is to publish the policy. One year to execute the federally required Funding Agreement. No questions or further discussion.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Motion to Approve the WIOA Infrastructure Funding Agreement.

Teresa Hovell motioned to approve the WIOA Infrastructure Funding Agreement and Kelly Barrick seconded the motion. Members of the Board in attendance voted on the motion by voice vote, which carried unanimously.

Agenda item 5. Discussion on Merger of four Local Workforce Development Areas.

Michelle McNertney presented. Discussion on merger of four local workforce areas into one area known as Iowa Plains Local Workforce Development Area.

Updated in March SWDB meeting. Attachment 7 is history of local areas. Training provided in the summer on fiscal requirements. Question asked what happens if the area refuses the funds? CEO has fiscal liability of the area funds. USDOL advised funds could be refused. Western Iowa already refused. Currently have four local areas refusing funds. Five local areas remain. These other local areas will be known as Iowa Plains. None of the other local areas wanted to take on the risk of the additional areas. Focus is

continuity of services. IWD is now responsible for providing services. Dedicated funding for that area for total of all 4 areas. IWD has hired additional staff for these services. Need vote to combine these areas into one, operate as one local area. Will be more efficient use of funds. One staff for board, one local board, one one-stop operator instead of four. These areas are similar in wages, similar unemployment rates, and percentage of employment by industry. Labor Market Information supports one local area moving forward. Asking board to consider operation as one local area. State (SWDB) must operate same as any other local area. Committee will consist of members from the Iowa Plains area. Consistency and fairness.

Teresa Hovell – a lot of real estate for one board to manage. If it becomes unmanageable, can it be separated in the future?

Michelle McNertney – we have ability to change the local areas whenever needed. We have been through the process before and tried different approaches. Organically the CEOs in the local areas understood need for greater funding and combined areas on their own. Can change configuration. Amount of funding is driver. With increase in funding, can use it more effectively by having one area – Iowa Plains. Nebraska only has three local areas. Kansas City is also similar. While geographically may look intimidating, believe this is the right choice.

Drew Conrad – with this realignment work, before deciding did you go back and look at the 2019?

Michelle McNertney – like for future consultation?

Drew Conrad – no, like 2 regions instead of one.

Michelle McNertney – we did not. Most of the work in 2018-2019 was a top-down approach. Learned hard way - not successful. Let it happen organically. Beneficial local CEOs were involved. CEOs in those areas chose to refuse the funds. Funding is number one reason for looking at combining areas. Benefit is that we have structure in place with other IWD programs to help with management structure and will put more money into the programs.

Andy Roberts – is there a one-stop shop in these areas? If someone is laid off in Sioux City where are the services?

Michelle McNertney – none of this will happen out of Des Moines. You have Sioux City, Spencer, Denison, Council Bluffs, Fort Dodge, and Creston. All these centers will still operate. Services will not change at the centers only entity providing those services. Services are provided out of the AJCs. My division will monitor services like other areas, but services will be delivered in western Iowa no different than any other local area.

Beth Townsend – Jay I don't know if you saw it, but Mayor O'Donnell has a question.

Jay Iverson – Mayor O'Donnell, go ahead.

Drew Conrad – while we are waiting what is the phase out for the one-stop operators in those areas?

Michelle McNertney – none of those areas had a one-stop operator in place. Worked with them to fade out contractor in place to transition those customers, if receiving services, will still receive those same services. Good job of transitioning those pieces out.

Jay Iverson – hearing nothing from the Mayor, no further discussion. Vote taken.

- **ACTION ITEM: Motion to Merger of four Local Workforce Development Areas.**

Andy Roberts motioned to approve the merger of four Local Workforce Development Areas and Jack Hasken seconded the motion. Members of the Board in attendance voted on the motion by voice vote, which carried unanimously.

Agenda item 6. Update on Future Ready Iowa High Demand Occupation List.

Beth Townsend presented. We are approving LDS list for fall 2024. Programs must meet the LDS statute requirements for wages and openings. Shows participation and enrollment rates. Community colleges also provided list. Historically board approved about 50 programs. Does not have to be the top 50 or first 50. Need to be judicious in what is approved as money runs out every year. Board is prioritizing this list.

Ryan Murphy – previously provided community college list but revised version is being show with changes requested by the community colleges.

Beth Townsend – Todd, I will ask you to confirm.

Todd Holcomb – community colleges made some tweaks and narrowed it down a bit. Director is right we are trying to stay close to 50. Community colleges started at 60 and ended up at 54. I think it's a good list.

Beth Townsend – once list is approved by the board, each community college gets to add 5 additional programs offered at their own location which will be unique to employers in their areas. Helps narrow the larger list.

Nick Glew – why asterisk?

Beth Townsend – shows it was not on 2022 list so no information on recipients. Not eligible so no prior year information.

Andy Roberts – list of skilled trades is registered apprenticeship available for this money?

Beth Townsend – good question Andy. I do not know. I don't believe they are eligible to apply for LDS. 2 private colleges do participate.

Ryan Murphy - St. Luke's and Mercy.

Tiffany O'Donnell – Cedar Rapids needs skilled workers. Can we consider adding?

Beth Townsend – programs not eligible. If taking classes at community college, if Registered Apprenticeship operated with community college as training provider, they are eligible.

Tiffany O'Donnell – not at Kirkwood.

Beth – RA training dollars available through 15B and 15C and other funding streams for RA. Support in expanding and increasing and would like to talk to Governor.

Andy – Welding. No disrespect to community colleges but pipe welding is not something you are going to find there. Something we need to look at as a funding source. I'm short on people and need for skilled trades is going to get worse.

Beth – 15B only employers are eligible to apply. Community colleges cannot apply for 15B. Must be employer with registered apprenticeship to receive dollars. We might want to talk to legislature about in making change to LDS so other training providers could be eligible for monies.

Alex Severn – What is all colleges?

Beth – may be looking at the previous list.

Alex Severn – Trying to understand community colleges recommendations. Economic standpoint but boots on the ground. What are occupations paying the most wages? I know balancing act but need to have people willing to fill those positions. Community colleges' recommendations, 10 programs are at the bottom of category for wages. 6 occupations that we are leaving out. Like jailers. Static field as well. Recommend we add those occupations, all that have top 25 wage category to this list. Wage will help define the occupations that are in demand based on the wages.

Emily Shields – community colleges may have not offered an occupation to this list, but they still have 5 they can choose.

Alex – feel like they are at a disadvantage.

Emily – totally get it - that's the point of regional selection.

Beth Townsend – Emily is right. When list created in 2018, recognized community colleges have unique programs for serving employers in their area. That's why regional list created. Wanted primary list to be programs primarily available wherever you go to college in Iowa.

Alex – as member of board using statewide list of statement of programs that should be available at the schools but not using the 5 to be specific. Understand list overall but would be nice for programs across the state. This doesn't speak towards what programs should the community colleges' offer. I don't think this is a good enough reason to leave it off this list. Include occupations in top 25 of entry wages on this list.

Beth – anyone else, comments, or conversation.

Jay Iverson – everyone has their own wants for this list, but we have always been short money. We can certainly work on that.

Beth – we always run out of money. As we move to get list approved, ask that we consider we don't want to put maintenance on the list, there are no programs. When making proposal include the – Ryan what's best way to articulate wants for this list?

Ryan Murphy – occupational title would be clear or go by # system with annual opening ranking. Some duplicates there but we can clarify.

Beth – do we have a voting member that is brave enough to make a recommendation.

Todd Holcomb – would make a motion to accept the community colleges list of 54 occupations.

Beth – Todd you are not a voting member.

Andy Roberts – I'll make recommendation to accept the community college list of 54.

Alex Severn – can we vote on adding the 5 categories that were left off the recommendation?

Jay Iverson – we have a motion on the floor. No second though.

Beth – vote on original motion and Alex provide second motion.

Alex – would I vote no on the first and yes on the second – awkward. Helpful if we had list and voted to add and subtract from it. I want to support community colleges, but I want to add to the list.

Beth – no sure if any cross over between the top 25, I'm sure there is.

Alex – there is.

Tiffany – can we move with an amendment.

Jay Iverson – wondering if Andy could change motion, what does that look like to combine?

Jim Irwin - Person who made original motion must make the amendment otherwise is fails without the amendment.

Tiffy – did not have second.

Jack Hasken – would second motion to approve community colleges 54 recommendations.

Jay Iverson – we have a motion and second. Any further discussion on that?

Beth – let's be clear. Motion is to approve the community colleges list of 54 without amendments.

Alex – understand how that works. Person that moves this motion would have to accept my amendment. Or after we vote motion to amend the list.

Andy – amend motion now.

Alex – would move to add the top 25 entry wage occupations that were not recommended by the community colleges.

Michelle - trying how to filter to that.

Alex – row 8 column F.

Jay – good note from Emily in chat.

Alex – Volume N as in Nancy. The ones in green are top 25 category, I believe.

Michelle – change list from 54 to 60.

Emily – I believe I put in the chat the top 25 wages that we had made recommendation.

Beth – proposing list of 79 programs Alex?

Alex – no. $54 + 6 = 60$.

Beth – proposal to add programs in top 25 that are not on community colleges list.

Alex – that's correct.

Beth – 6 additional.

Michelle – 6 additional, I have highlighted.

Jay Iverson – Roberts Rules.

Beth Townsend – I think our AG is on the phone and he should give us his advice on how to bring the motion. Kevin are you still on? I don't think we have any of our lawyers on the call.

Jim Irwin - You have to accept ...

Jack Hasken – Jim you cut out; you'll have to ...

Jim Irwin – Whoever made original motion must accept the amendment to their motion or it fails. He made the motion, his motion was seconded, now you either have to vote on that. Must have an amendment attached to that motion. If he does not feel comfortable after adding that amendment, then it is totally up to him. It's his call. So, I

don't know who made the original motion, whoever made the original motion must accept the amendment. If he does not accept the amendment, we cannot vote on it.

Beth Townsend – Hold on. Kevin's audio is not working so I am asking him to put in the chat if Jim Irwin, who is not a voting member, if his directions are correct because I want to make sure we are following the AG's recommendations when we put forth the motion.

Jay Iverson – Kevin says that is correct.

Beth Townsend – okay.

Jay Iverson – so Andy it's up to you.

Andy Roberts – I am fine with whatever. I do not believe that is the proper procedure but either way I am good with it. On any motion you can make three amendments on any motion that is on the floor. You go to the three and you vote on the third one and if it doesn't pass you vote on the second one, you vote on the second one and if it doesn't pass, you vote on the first one. If it doesn't pass you go back to the original motion and you vote on that, but I will change it to whatever will make everyone happy.

Beth Townsend – Kevin what would be the best path forward now, if you could put that in chat.

Nick Glew – I think we can consider the amendment that was proposed. We would then vote on and second, and we would all then vote on the amendment that would get added to the original motion and then we come back and vote on the amendment.

Rita Grimm – I am going to step in here to. I was an FFA member of parliament procedure, and I have Roberts Rules of Order up and I don't know if you follow Roberts Rules of Order. It is correct that you can have a motion and then another person under Roberts Rules can move the amend the motion. That requires a second. After that is seconded then you need to vote on that and then go back and vote on the amended motion, if the amendment is accepted. If the amendment is not passed you go on to vote on the motion as it was or someone else can make an amendment. I'm sorry I am a lawyer and I just had to step in.

Jay Iverson – No that makes sense. That is excellent. So, we need Jack to be okay with the second or can someone else make a second on the amendment.

Rita Grimm – anybody can second the amendment.

Jay Iverson – okay.

Nick Glew – I'll make a second on the amendment.

Jay Iverson – alright any discussion on that? Are we voting on the amendment right now?

Shelly Evans – Jay who made the second on the amendment?

Jay Iverson – Nick. Alright.

Beth Townsend – so Jay can you restate what the amendment is so that everybody is clear on what we are voting on? We have had a lot of discussion.

Jay Iverson – The amendment is, so Alex can correct me, but it is basically adding six more categories –

Beth Townsend – Six more occupations.

Jay Iverson – Six more occupations to add to the 54 so it is now a total of 60 occupations.

Beth Townsend – and the six occupations that you are referring to Alex are recommending adding to the community college recommendations are 1) Correctional Officers & Jailers, 2) Diagnostic Medical Sonographers, 3) Elevator Installers & Repairers, 4) Aircraft Mechanics & Technicians, 5) Electrical & Electronics Repairers, Commercial & Industrial Equipment; and 6) Statistical Assistants. Is that correct?

Alex Severn – That is correct.

Beth Townsend – and Shelly let's make sure the Minutes reflect exactly what is it, the programs that we are adding.

Shelly Evans – got it.

Beth Townsend – alright Jay back to you.

Jay Iverson – Yep. So those in favor of the amendment that we just discussed.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Amendment to Motion to Approve Future Ready Iowa High Demand Occupation List. Amendment is to add the following occupations to the community college list of 54: 1) Correctional Officers & Jailers, 2) Diagnostic Medical Sonographers, 3) Elevator Installers & Repairers, 4) Aircraft Mechanics & Technicians, 5) Electrical & Electronics Repairers, Commercial & Industrial Equipment; and 6) Statistical Assistants).

Alex Severn motioned to add an amendment to the pending motion to approve the FRI High Demand Occupation List and Nick Glew seconded the amendment to the motion. Members of the Board in attendance voted on the motion by voice vote, which carried unanimously.

VOTE: The ayes were unanimous.

Alright that motion to amend passes. So now we need to vote on the original motion.

Nick Glew – correct.

Jay Iverson – so that is what Andy had motioned and Jack has seconded. Any further discussion on that?

Beth Townsend – and the motion was to approve the 54 programs recommended by the community colleges for the LDS program. Correct?

Jay Iverson – correct.

Rita Grimm – and then amended to add the six.

Beth Townsend – to add the 6 that we just voted on, correct? Is that correct Andy? Is that your understanding of your motion?

Jay Iverson – Andy are you still there?

Andy Roberts – that sounds good. Yeah, I am good. *(Andy's motion is to accept the community college list of 54 and add the additional six occupations that were just approved in the amendment to this original motion).*

Beth Townsend – thank you.

Jay Iverson – alright with that said, all in favor?

- **ACTION ITEM:** Motion to Approve Future Ready Iowa High Demand Occupation List and add the additional six occupations approved in the amendment.

Andy Roberts motion to approve the FRI High Demand Occupation List with the approved amendment and Nick Glew seconded the amendment to the motion. Members of the Board in attendance voted on the motion by voice vote, which carried unanimously.

VOTE: The ayes were unanimous.

We made it, that was interesting.

Agenda item 7. Update on Grant High Demand Occupation List.

Beth Townsend presented. Next vote is on Iowa Grants High Demand Occupation List and this is the program, remind me Ryan Murphy that has the \$275K or is this the \$4 million?

Ryan Murphy – This is the \$275K program originally started with the LDS that was not funded for multiple years until this year.

Beth Townsend – program would create bachelor level programs for lowans. Legislature resurrected this program. Programs need to meet eligibility requirements for the FRI statute. Is that correct Ryan?

Ryan Murphy – yes.

Beth Townsend – A similar process. 94 programs. \$275K available. Open for questions or discussion.

Alex Severn – Assuming we are trying to limit this list down, correct?

Beth Townsend – Yes. Very limited funding should not approve all 94 programs, but you could if you wanted.

Alex – do you have recommendation on how many occupations we are shooting for?

Beth – I don't. I believe Mark Wiederspan is on the call. College Aid expects programs funds will be expended in the first few days of the application period. However even if that is true, no real way for us to predict what programs will be applied for to receive the funding. We don't know I guess is the best way to say it.

Drew Conrad – Beth is a means test put in place as well like the LDS?

Beth Townsend – I don't know.

Ryan Murphy – Director I believe Todd Brown may be on the call. Todd if you are available?

Todd Brown – no means test on this program. No way to limit as long as student qualifies, can receive funds if enrolled in eligible programs aligned with high demand occupations this board approves. Was there another question?

Beth Townsend – Can you confirm that the funds will be exhausted within the first few days that it is open?

Todd Brown – Yes but dependent on number of occupations approved. With 94, it will probably be the first day and the money will be out. We would have to prioritize within that first day. A more limited list would be beneficial to give students time to effectively apply before deadline hits.

Beth Townsend – this is my recommendation. Go down to about 27 because we know that IT occupations are in high demand in Iowa. Special education teachers, anything computer related. Maybe to 30 but I wouldn't go much below that because, to Todd's point, limited availability of funds.

Tiffany O'Donnell – I just also want to say we should think about the level impact that we can have. Maybe making it a small list because these are private institutions.

Beth Townsend – no, these aren't just private as I understand it. If you attend a regional, you would still be eligible.

Tiffany – Perfect. Even then with such a small amount of money makes me wonder if we get intentional and target?

Beth Townsend – to Mayor O'Donnell's point there are some occupations on there like, for instance, sales reps. Do we really want to, while it may be high demand, is that something we really want to put our educational dollars into? Insurance sales agents. Some in the top of the list that you could remove.

Kelly Barrick – Beth and Mayor, I was thinking along the same lines. If we look at the list and the annual rankings down to 23, special education teachers. Within that I think if we take out sales agents and a couple of them. Main industries we should focus on are teachers, nurses, social workers, and technology that we deem appropriate. I think it would be more impactful if we could get down to top 20.

Beth – I agree.

Tiffany – I would go even further and do top 10.

Jay Iverson – I agree top 10. I agree with what Kelly said.

Beth – Any other questions? Does anyone want to propose 10?

Alex Severn – looking at entry wages and sorting by that, what Kelly is proposing, would leave out engineer, electrical engineers, mechanical engineers, industrial engineers. What does appear at the top of the list is the IT fields, like software developers and I strongly encourage that we include in top 10. Computer systems analyst. Suggest focus more on wages than how many positions there are.

Beth – that's going to limit education Alex. Unfortunately, we do have a need. We also have another list we are going to consider with a \$6.4-million-dollar budget towards bachelor programs. This is not the only bachelor level programs we are going to consider today. Don't feel like we need to get it all in this list we have another list of regions coming up to consider. I would submit to you that engineers are a better program as opposed to paying for engineers out of the \$275K. Nursing and teachers are what I would focus on.

Tiffany – do we want to be intentional about that? We keep saying that. Those two keep coming up. Not a lot of money and will go fast. How badly do we want these people and do we really drill down? To your point Director Townsend, in the next round with the larger pot, we can broaden.

Beth – need to drive people into healthcare and education and while wages may not be as high as we would like, huge demand for them. Any other question or thoughts from any other board members, especially voting members?

Nick Glew – could we look at the top 30 and exclude anything that was not nursing, teaching, or IT?

Beth – we can do anything we want Nick.

Nick – trying to look through the list and get it down to 12 or something.

Beth – Kelly says registered nurses, elementary, middle school, child, and family special ed would be 6 programs.

Jack Hasken – I would agree with Kelly Barrick's recommendation. For the amount of money and the importance of those fields, I would so that is a motion.

Beth – Kelly are you making a motion?

Kelly Barrick – I want to comment. I appreciate what Alex is thinking but our conversations over the last few minutes, I would love to see teachers and nurses making more money. Having the higher wage where is it going to affect people, these people really care about their profession, still join this area with the ages, would like this program to really support them. Making motion to move forward with registered nurses, elementary school teachers /ex special ed, secondary teachers, ex special, middle school teachers, child family & school social workers and special education teachers and preschool.

Jay Iverson – and Jack would you like to second that?

Jack Hasken – I would love to second that.

Beth – we did include child family and social workers?

Tiffany – only was left out of that one.

Beth – we do have that other larger program.

Tiffany – exactly that's why I would support this motion.

- **ACTION ITEM: Motion to Approve Iowa Grant High Demand Occupation List Areas.**

Kelly Barrick motioned to approve the Iowa Grant High Demand Occupation List and Jack Hasken seconded the motion. Members of the Board in attendance voted on the motion by voice vote, which carried unanimously.

VOTE: The ayes were unanimous.

Jay Iverson - Alright we are good with that one.

Agenda item 8. Update on Iowa Workforce Grant and Incentive Program High Demand Occupation List.

Beth Townsend – Now we have the Iowa Workforce & Incentive grant Program Occupation List. Todd, I believe this is the program that has \$6.4 million, is that correct?

Todd Brown – very close, \$6.5.

Beth Townsend – Program that we must collaborate with the Board of Regents and they already approved their list. Regents roughly approved 488 majors for this program and did not include any masters programs even though legislature does allow for master level programs to be eligible. For instance, your masters in social work or education would be eligible under the program. If approved, could get agreement from the Regents to

approve those programs. Is Rachel Boon on the call, anyone from the regents, do they want to comment on why their list is so expansive.

Rachel Boon – 448 is the number across the institutions. If you want to narrow it down, it's about 75-80 majors for each institution. Went with occupations that matched bachelor level and stuck there partially because each of masters is doctoral level are all eligible for other college aid or loan forgiveness. Primary majors funneled into those graduate degrees are all included in bachelor degrees. Pathway for all of them. With \$6.5 million across 3 universities, small amount to spread around.

Kelly Barrick – Looking at new jobs that are coming up, how you consider those jobs that aren't on the list if there is not a program for it? In discussions we leave those out. How do you start a program instead of just going off a program you have? How do we put a program on there that you should consider starting.

Rachel Boon – based on the way this law was written this list will need to be updated every 2 years. In terms of program development, the universities have a lot of processes to make determination about programs. Industry advisory boards give guidance on emerging needs. Same true for engineering, healthcare, and arts and sciences.

Drew Conrad – I can chime in. UNI in academic positioning process. Standing up a BSM program, data analytics program, several new applied engineering programs. Driven by advisory boards representatives tied to those academic units.

Kelly Barrick – thank you.

Beth Townsend – I feel obligated to point out some majors on this program that I am not sure meet the high demand definition that we are looking at including art directors, multimedia artists and animators, designers, and technical writers. It's an expansive list.

Rachel Boone – Point of clarification, list on the screen is the occupation list. This is the one that Ryan Murphy pulled that met those criteria. These are not the programs that you are looking at, these are the occupations.

Ryan Murphy – Yes, attachment 4A is the major titles that were approved by the Board of Regents. This is what you were referring to, right Rachel?

Rachel Boon – it is.

Beth Townsend – yes, art and design, art education, astronomy. I am not, we have limited money, and I am not sure these are the programs that we should be supporting in a high demand list. I would submit to the board.

Rachel Boone – and if I may, point of explanation, everything that is on there we used the federal occupation list, the CIP to SOC matches created by BLS which was used to create this list. Based on CIP to SOC we connected to this list.

Beth Townsend –Any prioritization, like employer needs- we need more registered nurses, teachers, engineers?

Ryan Murphy –It's a tool used nationally to connect occupations to programs that help get people into those occupations. Does not prioritize just connects the two that sit in separate piles but need the matching where people flow from education into the workforce.

Drew Conrad – what I would recommend, and I am not a voting member, to Beth's point what I would suggest we focus on most demand occupations. As Ryan suggested those programs that match to them in the pipeline. I think it is a challenge for the group to narrow programs. Focused on workforce needs here. That's what I would recommend. I am just an observer to the process.

Alex Severn – I don't mean to be a pain, but I don't see an attachment 4a in the email that contains these documents. Does anybody else have them, it would be helpful to move through this?

Beth Townsend – Shelly can you resend that email to Alex with the attachments?

Shelly Evans - I will.

Alex Severn – I have the original 6/14 but not 4a in that email.

Drew Conrad – it might have been sent out as a separate email if I remember correctly.

Michelle McNertney – Attachment 4a came later and Shelly is working on that.

Beth Townsend – this list has not changed. We got it from the Regents, and we haven't made any changes.

Alex Severn – okay thank you.

Beth Townsend – I think Drew is right. This board does not have the capacity to vote on 448 programs but we could identify industries we want identify as high demand and approve those. We can go back to the Regents to identify special programs that each university would then qualify in that area. I believe that's what you were recommending Drew, is that right?

Drew Conrad – yes that's right.

Beth Townsend – okay any thoughts on that from the board members?

Jack Hasken – as a voting member I like what Drew suggested. I live that every day in my business and I want those people educated to come into the industry. I like the idea. I would make a motion to that point.

Beth Townsend – I think before we get to the point of making any motions before we get confused like the last time, let's talk this out. Decision on which industry we want to tag as high demand.

Jack Hasken – right that was going to be my suggestion. Let's go back to that list if Michelle can populate that.

Beth Townsend – Do we have it by industry?

Drew Conrad – as I look at the list, several occupations that really require a graduate degree. Example, lawyer, nurse practitioner. Probably should have been weeded off since focus has been on recommendations from Board of Regents is undergraduate programs.

Beth Townsend - this board is not limited to what the Regents considered. This board is not limited to only bachelor programs. Let's say in healthcare where we know we have a need; you can do that, and we can go back to the Regents and ask them to reconsider. I understand why the Board of Regents focused on bachelor programs in these initial years but not a limitation under the statute the board must operate under. If board list looks a little different which it sounds like it will since we are going to vote by industry, that will take off a number of programs the Regents approved. We can go back to them and negotiate, collaborate and come to an agreement as to what that list should be.

Ryan Murphy – Director can I just point out that occupations, to Drew's point, is important – the master's degree level. Nurse practitioners taking on a bigger role in rural Iowa with staffing issues, especially in rural Iowa. That would be an occupation that I personally think would be important to look at.

Beth Townsend – I agree. We know from the Childrens' Mental Health Board there is a need for master's level social workers, behavioral specialists, to serve, especially in rural areas. There aren't as many programs as we would like to support those. This might be an opportunity to get increased traffic. Brian is the interim IVRS agency director. So, Brian if you have any thoughts on this subject, we would love to hear them.

Brian Dennis – You have already hit on some of them with the rural disabilities. You see a real provider gap there. Like a nurse practitioner could do, a counselor therapist as well. Cascade affect throughout local areas and many industries and how local areas function. Those are some areas that need help in getting as many people as we can in those programs for those labor force needs.

Beth Townsend – maybe to make this a little easier, Rachel do you have any recommendations in terms of the industries that this board would approve would be the most palatable for Regents to consider?

Rachel Boon – Certainly, I have heard you talking about education and healthcare and those are obviously really important to all of us. The task before us based on the legislative language is for programs matched to occupations that met the criteria that was provided. That was the task. We did not look at it from a standpoint of prioritizing a particular occupational area because that was not the task assigned. We were to look at all high demand occupations that matched the criteria and then match our programs to it.

Tiffany O'Donnell – I just want to be sure that when we talk healthcare that we have mental health in there. Make sure that mental health support and occupations are specifically in there.

Jay Iverson – so Kelly had a note in that chat that I agree. To narrow list to social education, healthcare, technology, engineers.

Tiffany O'Donnell – I agree, it's a lot. Would there be a way for us to see a draft of that breakdown by industry?

Beth Townsend - Ryan put together a list for me just to get my own head around it. I don't know if we can share it but maybe not since it was not part of the board package.

Ryan Murphy – Director I do not have one that would be clear cut to an industry since these do cross. I could put one together that could reflect the primary industry that that occupation is employed in.

Kelly Barrick – I think to tackle this that would be helpful for us. I know we have already delayed this vote a couple of times because of our meetings and technology. I don't know where we are on timeline but based on this discussion, if we could at least narrow the list down to those industries. If anyone would propose any other industries then we could quickly get approval with the ability to move forward on it. If our task is different than what Rachel laid out, we need to start with industry level and go occupation by occupation.

Beth Townsend – We are on a very tight timeline trying to stand up this program for this fall or next fall.

Rachel Boon – this fall.

Beth Townsend – In order to keep people enrolled/approved for scholarships, this is something we need to turn around and get agreement with the Regents. We obviously need to trim it a bit and focus this list in high demand areas. Is that something we could work with you and come back to the board with more focused list?

Rachel Boon – Director happy to work with you on that. Time crunch is a factor we need to consider in that process. Want to return to legislative language and make sure we are following intent of what legislators asked us to do.

Jay Iverson – is there a way to craft this decision to acknowledge those fields that we are looking at. Not talking about a lot of money and it's not going to go far in the scheme of things. Appreciate essence of time but wondering if someone could make a motion that narrows it done.

Kelly Barrick – looking at list, SOC column appears to have industries that tie to that. If 29, starts with healthcare industry. 25 is the education industry. That would be one way to look at it. Can't sort it that way but only way I think as a board that we could start to narrow it down by industry. Board needs to stay in line with legislation.

Beth Townsend – Kevin is going to review legislation. Since it is in the first year, we could take broad approach since legislature gave a short time period. Big lift for Regents and it will be more difficult with longer delays. We could vote for the first year and accept Regents' recommendations. Next year with more time we could work with Regents to

narrow and prioritize list with focus on industries. Doubt we can narrow 448 major list in sufficient time to allow Regents to implement program effectively by August. Don't want to jeopardize program because of timeline and short turnaround time. In meantime get more information on how scholarships were distributed and Regents have more tailored list. Getting more scholarships in industries and areas we want to promote, healthcare, education, IT, engineers.

Drew Conrad – is list that gets approved only for the coming year for 2 years like LDS?

Beth Townsend – no requirement in LDS that requires vote every 2 years.

Drew Conrad – assumed it was legislatively mandated.

Beth Townsend – No the board can look at this whenever. 2-year window was chosen after talking with college student aid and community colleges, that's the runway they need to implement changes. Said too difficult to change every year. In this case would make exception and approve in first year. Kevin the question is could we revisit this list next year and vote in the spring? Rachel's indication that even a week delay will be tough for Regents to implement.

Alex Severn – what are we trying to vote on, the occupational list or the program list?

Beth Townsend – Doing it easily we could accept the program list provided by the Regents. Voting on program list provided by the Regents.

Alex Severn – okay.

Tiffany O'Donnell – do we need to include in our motion that this is for one year, only way I am comfortable doing that.

Beth Townsend – doesn't need to be part of motion since board has ability to visit the list whenever they want to. Kevin, I don't believe there is anything in legislation that prohibits this? We couldn't between now and January change how awards were distributed but can revisit in the spring.

Kelly Barrick – for planning purposes for the schools do not indicate 2 years, realizing time crunch now, but hate to approve one thing and not let them know is might not be a longer-term process.

Rachel Boon - since I have legislative language, it says workforce development board in collaboration with the Regents, shall update the list at least once every two years. No restriction on looking at the list again. To Mayor O'Donnell's concern I agree with Director Townsend that it does not need to include stipulation for one year. I would take that guidance and share it with the institutions, so we are clear where this stands right now.

Beth Townsend – Let's be honest, the legislature changed the LDS requirements and we thought once you were enrolled in a program and received LDS it would be available until you finished program. Legislative change this year, no one was grandfathered in for the means testing. Even if prior recipient, no guarantee that the legislature will not make changes in funding, requirements, eligibility from year to year. In perfect world we

could give Regents 2-year runway. Rachel has indicated her support and let's revisit in the spring and can come up with a more precise list. I think we can get the Regents to agree we need to do that. Approving the already approved Regents' list would mean once we vote on this today, they can go and that's what they really need. Could make motion with one year caveat, Mayor O'Donnell and I think we would all be good with that.

Tiffany O'Donnell – I will make that motion. Motion to approve the list as the regents recommended and revisit in one year.

Beth Townsend – let's say we will revisit in 2024.

Tiffany O'Donnell – okay, to review in 2024. Thank you, Director.

Jay Iverson – do we have a second?

Jack Hasken – I will second.

Jay Iverson – Any further discussion?

Alex – I would be for removing some of the programs that we had earlier discussed as potentials to take off that may include art, music, food science, Spanish languages. To limit programs not meeting the definition of high demand.

Tiffany O'Donnell – I don't know if those were on the Regents' list.

Beth Townsend – they are.

Jay Iverson – there are a lot of others. The 29 and 25 list was substantial and we could add to that too. Once again, I am a conservative taxpayer and I hate saying this, but \$6.5 million dollars is semi meaningless in all this anyway, unless we narrow it down. We will roll with the motion that is on the table. It is what it is.

Alex Severn – let me offer as an amendment and see if anyone wants to second it to remove those programs that I put in the chat. In my opinion, I understand the time crunch, a ton of work has gone into this and appreciate everybody's work doing that, but I don't want to throw up my hand if we know those are the occupations or those are the programs that are not meeting the criteria. Feel it is against our duty to just go ahead and spend the \$6.5 million due to the time crunch. Do believe there are some programs we could remove. Offer that as an amendment and if anyone wants to second, I threw them in the chat.

Drew Conrad – I am not a voting member but Alex I would push back on a few of these. My work in communities and rural districts, arts and music, a lot of school districts struggling to get music educators. A few I would push back on.

Tiffany O'Donnell – absolutely. World language, that's a non-starter, I am not getting rid of that either. See the rabbit hole we are going down here. I am not pleased with us being in a time crunch and that is a conversation we should have after; how did we get

ourselves in this position of compromise. That's why I offered up that motion so that we have the freedom to reevaluate.

Beth Townsend – I can tell you how the time crunch occurred. Legislation was passed this last session. I believe Governor signed the bill in late May / early June. June 14 meeting we had technical difficulties. Received Regents' list prior but we were not able to vote. Legislation and bill approved in early June, so we have three months to implement. That's the reason for the crunch but we will not have that next year. Jay I would call to see if there is a second for the amendment. Go from there.

Jay Iverson – Okay. Is there a second to Alex's amendment? Hearing none, that one dies.

Alex Severn – one additional amendment I would suggest, and I know we are under a time crunch, suggest amending it to strip the motion and task IWD to provide consolidated list with industries identified and require us to vote within a week on that consolidated list. Is that clear what I am asking for?

Jay Iverson – Yes. Does anyone want to second that?

Kelly Barrick – Jay I have a question. Are we able to do a vote via email or do we all need to get together and form quorum again? I agree on the time crunch. To Director's point, we did have a meeting earlier and we did not have quorum with enough people joining. I don't like the time crunch either, but I am hesitant to say we can't get anything done because then this money isn't going to be used.

Beth Townsend – we would need to hold another meeting, establish quorum, and vote.

Jay Iverson – Does anyone want to second Alex's other amendment? Alright that dies too. Let's go back to the original motion. Is there any further discussion?

- **ACTION ITEM: Motion to Workforce Grant and Incentive Program High Demand Occupation List.**

Tiffany O'Donnell motioned to approve the Board of Regents' list with agreement to revisit the list in 2024 and Jack Hasken seconded the motion. Members of the Board in attendance voted on the motion by voice vote.

VOTE: Ayes. Nay by Alex Severn.

Jay Iverson – alright it passes.

Agenda item 9. Presentation of 2022 Future Ready Iowa Annual Report.

We have one more item with Kathy Anderson for our annual report. Presentation by Kathy Anderson. By law I will provide this report as well on the 2022 Last Dollar Scholarship program. 7,764 enrolled; 100 less than previous year. 3,299 participants completed: 27 less than previous year. Associate degree Nursing had the most participants with 1,619 with Licensed Practical Nurse Training in second with 679. Also included Computer

Programming, Automotive Tech, Medical Assistant, Welding Tech, Radiology Tech, Diesel Truck Tech, Transportation Storage and Distribution Managers, and HVAC. 17 institutions participating in program. These numbers do not include the numbers from the 2 private institutions. Mentoring program had 46 mentors working with 57 students in information technology and healthcare. Employment outcomes for 2021 showed 95.7% were matched to employment and 85% were employed in Iowa. Up from about 86% in previous year. Estimated annualized inflation adjusted wage was \$52,666. Females \$54,513 and males \$50,972. Age breakdown under 25 was \$56,180 and 25 and older \$53,342. Any questions?

Jay Iverson – someone want to make a motion to approve the 2022 report?

Jay Iverson – Any further discussion? None.

- **ACTION ITEM: Motion to Approve the 2022 Future Ready Iowa Annual Report.**

Andy Roberts motioned to approve the 2022 Future Ready Iowa Annual Report and Jason Shanks seconded the motion. Members of the Board in attendance voted on the motions by voice vote, which carried unanimously.

Jay Iverson - Alright we made that happen. Thank you all very much. We covered a lot of ground. Interesting meeting. Big thanks to Jack for covering for me the last couple of times.

Jack Hasken – you're welcome.

Jay Iverson – Michelle or Shelly, anything else?

Michelle McNertney – no, just motion to adjourn.

Beth Townsend – our next meeting is September 20 in Forrest City, and we hope to see you all there. It is important that you attend in person. I think it is important that the board get out of Des Moines and appear in person across the state. Encourage you all to attend in person if you can. Appreciate all the lively discussion, this has been a great meeting.

Jay Iverson – that next meeting will have a tour of Winnebago too which will be super interesting. Anyone want to make a motion to adjourn?

- **ACTION ITEM: Motion to Adjourn.**

Jack Hasken motioned to adjourn, and Alex Severn seconded the motion.

Adjournment at approximately 12:53 pm.

Shelly Evans

Shelly Evans - Executive Assistant to the SWDB