



# SWDB BOARD NOTES

**Date: 5/15/25**

**Location: DMAAC Urban Campus**

## Minutes

### Iowa Workforce Development Board Meeting

May 15, 2025

11 am – 12:00 pm

DMACC Urban Campus

#### Agenda item 1. Call to Order

---

Chair Teresa Hovell called to order the meeting of the Iowa Workforce Development Board (the Board) on May 15, 2025, at approximately 11 am.

#### Agenda item 2. Roll Call

---

##### Members in Attendance

1. Dawn Driscoll
2. Barb Kniff McCulla
3. Director Beth Townsend
4. Keri Osterhaus
5. Brandy McOmber
6. Teresa Hovell
7. Kelly Barrick
8. Jack Hasken
9. LuAnn Scholbrock
10. Ofelia Rumbo
11. Nick Glew
12. Charlie Wishman

13. Jason Shanks
14. Mckenzie Snow

##### Members Absent

1. Laura Book
2. Scott Naumann
3. Jessica Dunker
4. Brad Elliott
5. Carrie Duncan
6. Tiffany O'Donnell

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

### Agenda item 3. Approval of Agenda

---

Chair Hovell called the next order of business which was the approval of the meeting Agenda for May 15, 2025. The agenda was previously emailed to the Members of the Board.

- ACTION ITEM: Motion to Approve the Agenda for 5/15/25.

LuAnn Scholbrock motioned to approve the agenda and Nick Glew seconded the motion. Members of the Board in attendance voted on the motion by voice vote, which carried unanimously.

### Agenda item 4. Approval of 2/21/25 Minutes (Attachment 1)

---

Chair Hovell called the next order of business which was the approval of the meeting Minutes for February 21, 2025. The minutes were previously emailed to the Members of the Board.

- ACTION ITEM: Motion to Approve the Minutes for 2/21/25.

Jason Shanks motioned to approve the Minutes and Nick Glew seconded the motion. Members of the Board in attendance voted on the motion by voice vote, which carried unanimously.

### Agenda item 5. Welcome by Teresa Hovell, Chair

---

Chair Hovell welcomes attendees.

- Welcome.
- Full agenda today. Going to allow public comments at the front end of the meeting to allow public discussions. Public comments will last for three minutes. Start with Jason Pontius, Associate Chief Academic Officer, Iowa Board of Regents.
- After Jason's time expires, please raise your hand, introduce yourself, and your three minutes will begin.

Jason Pontius, Associate Chief Academic Officer, Iowa Board of Regents. I'm here today to discuss the Iowa Workforce Grant and Incentive Program, which was authorized by SFJ560, and offer a suggested amendment to proposed list of occupations. Bill created criteria for list of high wage and high demand occupations and corresponding academic majors offered at public universities. List of occupations and majors it be updated every two years through collaboration between the workforce board and the Board of Regents. Bill states eligible program under the grant refers to a program of student or academic major jointly approved by the Workforce Development Board and the state Board of Regents. Two years ago, in alignment with statute, we worked with labor market information team at IWD to create list of occupations that earned at least \$40,000 annually and projected to have 1% annual growth or at least 50 new job openings each year. We matched our majors to these occupations using standard Federal Bureau of Labor statistics crosswalk. Past winter we again worked with IWD to match university majors to occupations like managers or others were too general and included too large of a list of majors. We expressed concern to the LMI team, but it was believed that we couldn't make changes due to the language of the bill. As a result, our board approved the list in February, and the approved list was provided to IWD. A month later we were approached again by the IWD LMI team. Upon further review they thought the list of majors was overly board. We were of the same opinion; we agreed and discussed alternative approaches to pare down the list while still meeting requirements of the law. Multiple options were discussed but no decisions were made. Bring us to today. We believe the recommended list before you is incomplete and some occupations need to be added to ensure both fairness and compliance with the law. Bill specifically includes all teacher preparation programs leading to bachelor's degree or teaching license, so corresponding occupations need to be added to address this. Fairness, some occupations not included on your list are aligned with majors that are already eligible under different occupations. Example, accounting major would be eligible for grant under the occupation of Financial Examiners. However, if that accounting graduate took a job as an accountant or auditor, they would not receive the incentive to stay in Iowa. This is why we propose including the occupation, accountants and auditors. We included other occupations on the list that have similar situation. To be clear, this adds occupations but does not add new SIPs or majors. Regardless of what you decide today, we still need to reconcile these two board approved lists for the good of eligible students and employers, as well at Iowa College Aid who administers the program. It's important to reach an agreement as soon as possible.

Teresa Hovell – your time has been met. Thank you very much. Any other public comments, please raise your hand online.

Matt Thompson, President of Indian Hills Community College. Today I am representing all of my colleagues at Iowa's 15 community colleges (CCs) who proudly educate and train over 120,000 Iowans annually. Thank you for providing time for the CCs to offer insight into the LDS program and list of eligible providers. In the past there has been a community college representative on the board to bring concerns to the table for

discussion on essential programs that provide a pathway to education and training for students. Emily Shields, Executive Director of Community Colleges for Iowa and I will remain on the meeting to answer any questions. The LDS list of eligible providers proposed by IWD today includes 46 occupations. We agree these programs are essential for the workforce and vitality of Iowa's economy. However, the current list eliminates 20 eligible occupations that CCs see as incredibly important to the future success of our state. We are recommending adoption of the full list of occupations submitted by the CCs. Some programs that are not included in IWD's proposal include criminal justice training, leading students to jobs as police and county sheriff's deputies, fire science training that provides a pathway for future firefighters, dental hygiene and dental assisting programs that lead to high wage and in-demand jobs and healthcare. Medical assistant programming that leads into the nursing procession and fulfills existing shortages in healthcare. Culinary science programming helps hotels, restaurants, and small businesses across Iowa who are desperate for had cooks and chefs to maintain the health of the culinary industry. The current proposal also excludes water and wastewater treatment technicians who are essential to keeping Iowa's drinking water safe. Every one of these programs are in high demand by employers across the state. The outcomes of the LDS program have been tremendous. 96% of LDS recipients are employed within the first year of graduation. 86.6% of recipients are employed within Iowa and the LDS completers earn on average \$12,512 more than those that are not in this program. Last year LDS had unspent funds at the end of the year and is projected again this year. We believe decreasing the number of eligible programs is not in the best interests of businesses and industry who have significant needs for these high demand occupations. We are advocating the board take action to accept the list of eligible providers submitted by the CCs.

Emily Shields – I wanted to share full list of difference between staff proposal from IWD and the community college list. In years past you can see what you approve is occupations but that translates into specific p[rograms. Those programs are determined using a national system that aligns occupations with programs. Department of Education staff can share more about that. I am going to read through the list of occupations noting that that translates into more programs than those occupations listed. I want to ensure there's clarity on the difference between the two lists. Includes web developers, veterinary technologists and technicians, web and digital interface designers, medical assistants, dental hygienist, dental assistants, compliance officers, firefighters, police and sheriff patrol officers, paralegals and legal assistants, chefs and head cooks, security and fire alarm system installers, cost estimators, title examiners, abstractors and searchers, human resource assistant, water and wastewater treatment plant and systems operators, bookkeeping, accounting and auditing clerks, secretaries and administrative assistants, payroll and timekeeping clerks, executive secretaries and executive administrative assistants. Each of these programs have current students enrolled. Numbers listed as 23-24 but during the current year there are more students being served in some of these programs. Some are small, such as wastewater, but critical to Iowa's communities, and some much larger, including police officers. 372 people receiving LDS in 2023-24.

Teresa Hovell – any additional public comments either online or in the room? One last call? We will end public comments. Thank you everyone for taking the time to be here today. I will remind you that the public is not allowed to be part of the discussion as we move forward. I appreciate the time you took in advance.

Agenda item 7. Update on Last Dollar Scholarship AY 26-27 List by Ryan Murphy, Division Administrator Labor Market Information Division, Iowa Workforce Development. (Attachment 2 - 2026-2027 Future Ready Iowa Last Dollar Scholarship AY 26-27)

---

Ryan Murphy, Labor Market Information Director at IWD. I want to review what was talked about in February at the last board meeting and how we ended up with these lists. We have 600 occupations that we produce projections and forecasts for. Our team uses things like:

- employment growth trends over 10 years
- occupational matrix, so we know which occupations are generally in each industry.
- use GDP in that modeling
- interest rates at the time to provide a 10-year forecast

So, we start with 600-ish occupations. Criteria in Iowa code that requires at least 1% growth or 50 annual openings. The code says 250 openings over 5 years we translate that to 50 annual openings. So, when we start with 600, we filter down to those who do not meet criteria based upon entry wage, which is \$14, also in code. The list started in 2017. In 2018 the list got longer because many occupations at entry level exceeded \$14. The Last Dollar Scholarship (LDS) there is some we use distribution of educational attainment across each occupation. This is produced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) to remove occupations that typically require higher than an associate degree or high school and below. I believe the list that we started with in February had 153 occupations for LDS for you to review and consider. Since then, we met with our colleagues at Department of Education and Iowa College Aid to talk about which occupations actually have programs within the state of Iowa at our CCs. That reduces the total eligibility down to I believe 93 for consideration and that's where we end up. The first attachment, I believe it's attachment 2, gives a full list of every occupation that met those criteria. Any questions so far? Over the years, around 50 is what the State Workforce Development Board (SWDB) has tried to aim for in the past. I made a note here on the with an X in the yellow columns if that occupation was on is on the current LDS list. I've also made a note in yellow if the CCs have selected that for their one of their five regional selections, and the number in parentheses is the number of colleges that submitted for their own regional occupation.

Nick Glew – unintelligible comments.

Ryan Murphy – Yes, they currently have it on their regional list. This is to give you the full picture of what meets the criteria. The second attachment 2.1 is IWD's recommendations by occupations. We've included the title of the job, the community college program, the enrollment we received that from Emily, who I believe received that from the

Department of Education, the additional jobs that the program trains for. The blue columns are the ones that that's the same labor market information growth openings, entry earnings that were in the original list.

Beth Townsend – I want to give everyone a little bit of background how IWD recommended list, a smaller version of the entirely eligible list. The statute sets out the Future Ready Iowa (FRI) statute indicates that the board is supposed to be doing. This exercise is to approve a list of high demand occupations. We start with a broad list and then, I think this is the fourth time we have gone through this exercise. Program started in 2018 when FRI statute passed after the FRI Alliance made recommendations to the Governor and the FRI Act was passed by the legislature. Kelly Barrick was a member of the FRI appliance, a broad alliance, with 40-50 members with several working groups. CCs, employers, K-12 were heavily involved in the process reaching a large cross section of individuals and stakeholders. Initially we aimed for 50 occupations. Keep in mind that the colleges do not train by occupation but by program. When you approve an occupation it doesn't necessarily mean it is a one for one correlation with the program. Something like registered nursing would be but that's not always the case and that's why sometimes you may have one occupation but multiple programs that align with that one occupation. When you approve 40-50 occupations it may mean you are approving a larger number of programs than occupations. The CC recommended list is 65 occupations but that translates to 74 different programs. Our recommendation this year is to focus and remove some of the occupations that are a little broader in nature and kind of return to our roots. Focus primarily on manufacturing and health care programs. Two of the largest industries in Iowa with health care as our greatest need, where we are critically manned, and have the highest amount of shortages. Need to encourage and incentivize Iowans to participate in these career fields, the purpose of what we are trying to do with LDS. Program created in 2018 and up through 2023 anybody was eligible for LDS. No financial means testing. Everyone who filled out a FASFA and LDS would pay the difference between any non-repayable financial aid and a student would be eligible for the average cost of a community college program, tuition, and fees. In 2023 legislature introduced means testing which narrowed the number of eligible applicants, now based on certain level of income. Todd Brown and David Ford are here today and could explain the eligibility requirements. In 2023 is when we saw the CCs were not able to give out the entire amount that had been allocated for LDS because they had a smaller pool of eligible individuals. Eligibility requirements were a legislative decision and it's their decision on whether or not they want to expand the number of individuals who are eligible for the programs. Our focus is to determine what programs we want to incentivize in order to meet workforce needs. That's why we are here today. When we put together the recommended list of programs of 45 occupations that translates to 49 programs to focus on areas of advanced manufacturing, health care, IT, and trades, because those are what we are hearing on a regular basis from employers and what we need in number of openings that are unfilled and need to be met. The current list is 63 occupations, and you could certainly approve 100 or 130 occupations. It's really up to this board be we think we need to emphasize and prioritize the dollars to get individuals to go into these high demand occupations.

Teresa Hovell – does anybody have any questions or comments they want to make?

Nick Glew – I haven't been on this board for an extremely long period of time, but this is an annual exercise. Most memorable and if there is a stressful component of what we do, for whatever reason, I'm a little bit perplexed. I think we hear from different groups that are represented with different lists as we approach these meetings. I'm always perplexed by why it can't be resolved before we arrive at this hearing. We could approve all if we wanted to. Legislature criteria with means testing is great, plenty of resources available to equip, yes to focus on manufacturing and health care. I think from a boots on the ground perspective we just talk about whatever we can do to retain whoever we can retain in the workforce, especially in today's rapidly evolving economy. We are not a state that grows population rapidly, so the lens I'm looking through is whatever we can do to continue to have momentum in training whoever it might be, within reason. Still have prioritization within these lists. I feel like I think differently about this if we were consistently running a deficit in requests for LDS but I guess good this we are not. I'm kind of disappointed that we have to arm wrestle on this a little bit and figure out what the right way is to go. I would lean towards adopting, so let me restate this to make sure I'm looking at it correctly. Essentially IWD's list plus some additional occupations, 2 different occupations that as they look at their programs, look at what they did, what they are saying are the needs within various areas of the state and they're adding a few more they would like to see included. I would like to see this board consider adopting the recommended list of the state staff of IWD with the additional occupations as recommended by the CCs. So, if that's the list that they submit, that would be what I would like to see this board consider adopting this year.

Ofelia Rumbo – I would second that thought. The same question, do we have enough funds and if we expand the programs, will that allow different occupations or students interested in going into those specific occupations so that we can end up using all of the funding available.

Teresa Hovell - Anyone online who wanted to make additional comments?

Beth Townsend – Nick and Ofelia the current list has 63 occupations, and we are still not giving out the amount of money. Broadening the list is not the answer. SWDB's task is to determine how to prioritize high demand occupations. As Kelly indicated, it has never been about providing free community college. Never about paying for every single program or every single attendee of community college. The focus of the program was how do we incentivize lowans to go into the fields that are most in demand with employers. Keep in mind all CCs have five regional selections they can make, in which they add five additional occupations to the list that's approved by this board. If you approve 65 occupations today, they all get an additional 5 occupations to add as well. You will then have additional programs again because there's just not one for one. If we approve 45 programs, they each get an additional 5 so that gets us to about 50. We recognize we have limited funding. Clearly having a broader list of occupations as we do now is not a big factor in terms of whether we give all the money away because we are not doing that now with 63 occupations that are eligible. I think it goes back to an eligibility question that is for the legislature to decide and there is nothing that requires us to make decisions based on what we need to spend all the money that has been provided. Again, our charter is to decide how we prioritize as a state the occupations that support with state money and then leave it to the legislature to determine eligibility

requirements and funding. The original FRI grant started with \$18 million. That was overspent and so it increased a few times to approximately \$24 million. The last two years there has been a change in eligibility requirements, and we have not spent all of the funds. I don't think we will this year, even with a broader list of eligible programs.

Brandy McOmber – This is my first time, but I am in agreement with that. My question is if our focus is the demand, why would we be considering additional programs that appear to be having negative annual growth rate? Wouldn't it make more sense to reduce it and prioritize getting people into those programs? I guess that's what I am confused about.

Beth Townsend – Brandy do you want to introduce yourself?

Brandy McOmber – I am sitting in for, delegated for James Williams who was previously on the board. My question is whether we focus on the annual growth rate is the demand, shouldn't we be focusing on those demand areas?

Kelly Barrick – I just want to echo that. What Nick said is absolutely true. We definitely need to keep people in the state. Having gone through this exercise a couple of times, I think we need to be really cognizant of how we are using the funds. We want to use all the funds but it's not up to us after the legislature passed the means testing. That portion is out of our control, but our goal is to make sure that we are filling high demand jobs. When I looked at the lists and asked some back-and-forth questions to the staff, we did not create this in a way to that we could have different jobs like clerical or administrative assistant. Those jobs are needed but that's not the point of this money. My view is that these monies need to be focused on four areas that were outlined, specifically advanced manufacturing and health care. We need to maybe push the legislature to relook at the how the means testing is done. I think we all agree it's just well spent money and how we are using the money. We want to spend in the best way possible. Doesn't mean just to give everyone the money because they are employed in Iowa. I appreciate everyone's comments. This is just my view after seeing it a couple of rounds.

Ryan Murphy – I want to clarify just because you receive the scholarship, there is no guarantee that you would become employed in Iowa. No attachment to the scholarship that would require that.

Teresa Hovell – with that we will conclude the open discussion. We have a motion made and a second to have discussion. Would anybody like to make a motion to the board for discussion?

McKenzie Snow – sorry to interrupt and apologies that I can't be there in person. I had a conflict, but I've got David Ford, our Bureau Chief of Iowa College Aid, there as my designee and I have one clarifying question and also wanted to make sure that David had an opportunity to provide a little additional context again as my designee. Are any of the programs that have been recommended by the CCs but not by IWD experiencing a negative annual growth rate?



Ryan Murphy – There does appear to be some, yes. Tool and die makers, mechanical drafters. If you go to the CC recommendation list and go to the last page, the ones that the annual growth column that's highlighted in red. You can see where there is negative growth. Towards the middle of the page there is a column that says CC recommendations. Yes, means that's a recommendation, so there are multiple occupations that have a negative growth rate that are being recommended.

Beth Townsend – Thanks for the clarification Ryan. Just to be clear Director Snow, 3 of those that have negative growth are in the manufacturing area, which would be on the list that we have recommended which includes tool and die makers and mechanical drafts. It also includes human resource assistants, claims adjusters, water wastewater treatment plant operators, bookkeeping, accountants, secretaries, and medical transcriptions.

Nick Glew – again I think it is important to keep in mind that we are looking at the number we are splitting hairs a little bit. We are talking about 0 or 1 point. I think we are declaring that these jobs are going to go away. We talked about wastewater treatment. We know across the state that there are probably fewer of those types of roles as communities are collaborating together. Probably one person is doing more than in the past, but we will have systems that are growing in complexities, and we have to ensure we are still training those types of individuals. I would caution us not to dig in too much to these negative annual growth rates regardless of what the job is. There's manufacturing there. Some healthcare but they are really small numbers even though we declared them to be shrinking. We can continue our conversation, but I would actually make a motion that we would adopt attached 2.2, which is the recommended list from our community college partners. Again, a collaboration together with the workforce staff and with our boots on the ground community college leaders.

Teresa Hovell – we will first recognize Director Townsen's motion to approve the workforce development board's recommendations. Do we have a second? Any discussions about approving the workforce development board's recommendations?

MacKenzie Snow – I am going to defer moving forward to David Ford as my designee, but I wanted to make sure that there was clarification on how the occupations correspond to existing programs, which there appear to be about 34. David could you please provide clarification and then I'm going to sign off and have you move forward.

Beth Townsend - I'm not sure what we are, what the question was there, David, do you understand the question?

David Ford – Bureau Chief, Iowa College Aid. Director Snow is referring to is as we go from the occupations list down to the actual programs of study list, our analysis would be that the occupations list as it stands when we limit it to the programs of study that actually exist at CCs that offer those programs of study, they existed at least 3 college campuses and they had enrollment of at least 15 students. That would functionally be 35 programs of study. When the occupations list gets mapped out to what are called programs of study, back mapping it to occupations doesn't go back the same way. I describe it often as going from Goggle Translate from English to French back to English. It doesn't. What

you put in doesn't what comes out the other end. Our analysis is the 35 would result in 35 programs of study and looking at enrollment in those programs and the most recent year that we have data, which is AY 23/24, that enrollment would be about 60 to 70% of what is the current enrollment for that program. Would result in annual expenditure projections of somewhere between \$9 and \$13 million for those programs of study. There are a lot of programs of study that link to it but the applied filter of the meeting 3 college offerings and actually having student in the programs. When we apply those filters, that list functionally becomes 35 programs of study. Todd, correct me here, there are 82 programs of study on the list.

Todd Brown – unintelligible.

David Ford – there are currently 78 programs of study offered at those campuses. The last fiscal year we expended about \$5.75 million less than the appropriation for that fiscal year. I wanted to provide some clarification on those pieces.

Beth Townsend – list of 65. Saying only 35 programs available.

David Ford - If you get rid of duplications, some of the programs an occupation can be a program somewhere else a different occupation might link to the exact same program of study.

Beth Townsend – for every occupation on IWD at least one CC that has that program available.

David Ford - The list that you recommended. Yes.

Beth Townsend – may not be available at 15

David Ford - we apply the filter of 3 or more. What we have seen historically is that anything 1 or 2 generally ends up on the regional list.

Beth Townsend - if we approve 45 occupations, students wanted to find similar at least 1 CC, maybe more.

David Ford – correct, yes.

Kelly Barrick I'm sorry. So just to clarify with the information you shared, you were echoing this list, or what was the, what was the comment that we should take away there?

David Ford – so the list, the motion that is on the table is related to the programs of study recommended by IWD and as we are looking at the resulted impact of that, functionally they would be between 35 and 42 programs if we added in the one CC but we are projecting that we would expend approximately \$9.2 to \$12.3 million dollars in that year based upon most recent year enrollment.

Beth Townsend – unintelligible.

David Ford – I think the difference between two lists; significant difference is it will result in number of students be awarded scholarships and expenditure of the appropriation.

Beth Townsend – unintelligible.

David Ford – I don't believe that any of them were zero. I don't believe any of them were 0, no, but I think the list there, the column header, I believe maybe on that. I had a, I had the same readability on the size of it. It had unduplicated headcounts. Those are actually when you compare the actual program of study, there are duplications of headcounts. It's just within a particular occupation there aren't necessarily. That's where I made that analogy of the. English, French, English idea when you back map it, it duplicates those back out. So, we are looking at, let me just grab my notes here really quick. What is before your consideration? Currently we estimate 35 programs of study would be available using 23/24 enrollment data that would have 14,261 students enrolled in those programs. Typically, about 35% of the students enrolled in a program receive an LDS of about \$2300. So, applying those numbers is where we projected our estimates that we would expend between \$12.9 and I'm sorry, \$9.2 and \$12.8 million in that program.

Nick Glew - I guess my question back Why is that My question back would be then why are we at such a deficit in spending based on what you're projecting with what I feel like are really minimal changes to the list? What is changing because that's a much bigger number than what we are hearing is going to be utilized in this fiscal year?

David Ford – the biggest changes, there are currently 78 programs of study for students and this list we have about 35 programs of study that would be offered on the statewide list and not on the regional list. That's where our estimates go between 35 and 42 and we add in the regionals. We have so far about half the number of programs of study that is currently on the list that we offer scholarships to.

Kelly Barrick – So of the programs that you're recommending, help us understand the businesses that are needing it because we want to make sure that the programs that you're offering are students that are going through the programs and they're then looking to hopefully be employed to Nick's point in the state of Iowa, but there are businesses that are saying if you don't offer this program, we're not going to be able to hire these people.

David Ford – Juust to be clear, we don't make the recommendations for the programs, and we basically take the rules, and we apply them to the parameters and then students are awarded the scholarships. So, we're not necessarily recommending any programs, we're just sharing what would the result be of the lists that are before you for clarification. It does appear that it's about 40 programs fewer than we currently administer. To Director Townsend's point, underspent about just under \$6 million in the most recent fiscal year with 78 programs. So, moving from 78 to 35 would decrease the enrollment by about 40%. So, we wouldn't anticipate fewer dollars expended in the upcoming appropriated year.

Nick Glew – Did you just say the new list is substantially fewer programs of studies than the

current list. Therefore, these big numbers that you were saying \$12 million, I don't know, your projections, those are based on the current list?

David Ford – yes.

Kelly Barrick – unintelligible.

Beth Townsend – Again, for a list that recommends 45 occupations, you're saying there are at least 10 occupations on the list for which there's no training available at a CC in Iowa. Could you give us the names of those occupations so we could, because everything that's on our list is also on the CC list at 65. There's no training available in the state, we should remove them from that list as well. I mean, there's no reason to approve occupations for which there's no training. So, can you identify those 10 occupations?

David Ford – There are not 10 occupations. The difference is that when you look at a list of 45 occupations, occupation 1 and occupation 2 might have the same program of study. So that even within the occupation zone, there's a 45 list. 1 through 5 might all have the exact same program of study to lead to that occupation. So, for example, occupation might be accountant, accountant tech, manager. The program of study at a college is the same program. So, when you look at non-duplicated programs of study, and you then go off of that list, you go from 45 occupations, but there are only 35 programs of study that lead to those 45 occupations.

Beth Townsend – So then how many occupations are you saying from the 65, which are just basically our list plus an additional 20, how many programs are there from the 65 that the CCs have recommended? It must be less than 65 if 45 gets you 35 programs, I'm assuming 65 occupations get you, what's that number?

David Ford – That would be an additional 19 programs, so 64 would equal 54 programs of study. So, they don't, it's not like a parent where you have one and then it automatically gets bigger. There's duplication and programs of study. The full list would result in 54 programs of study at least 3 institutions, knowing that we would have approximately 7 or so regional programs that would be beyond that. We've estimated that enrollment to be around 1,100 to 1,500 students statewide. So, the estimated increase on the regional list would be about 8 to 11% of the total appropriation. So, another ballpark, \$2 to \$3 million.

Nick Glew – Can we get clarification for yellow?

Ryan Murphy - we received this table from Emily Shields, and I believe yellow represents new occupations but I would prefer someone from that organization speak to that.

David Ford - What's the question? I'm sorry.

Ryan Murphy – what do the yellow highlighted occupations represent?

David Ford – I am going to have to defer to the CCs to answer that.

Teresa Hovell – are the CCS willing to describe if the items highlighted in yellow are new to the list or were existing?

Kristie Fisher – sorry, are we able to speak?

Teresa Hovell – please answer the question that they just presented about the highlighted yellow lines. Are they new?

Kristie Fisher – yes, that's my understanding.

Ryan Murphy –one thing to clarify, I think Dave said this a couple of times, but the IWD recommended list does include occupations that have at least one program at a CC while the CC recommended list, I believe, had to be offered at least 3 CCs across the state, so that's one of the differences you're seeing. We did not take into consideration the number of CCs that offered that program. We looked at occupational demand.

Kelly Barrick – For the discussion of the board, I guess my question would be when I was looking at these two lists prior to coming today, one of the big differences that I saw and the reason for my comments around what are we focused on is, again, I know that there are a lot of industries that need labor right now, but when I'm looking at the list that's recommended massage therapists, barbers, there are occupations on here or occupational titles that lead to qualifications that the CCs are asking for that I don't think fit our FRI criteria, which then led me to compare to what was recommended by the IWD which I do think fit. So, I'm a little, I understand that there's a lot of information that maybe we didn't have coming into it today but based on the information that we had coming into the meeting. I'm skeptical of this list and how broad and general it is to the point of what our board can control, and again that's separate than what I think the means testing and how the funds can fully be used is.

Teresa Hovell - Do we want to vote on the director's motion to approve the Iowa workforce? recommended list or are there amendments?

Beth Townsend – Well, again, I think we need to, to Kelly's point, look at, do we really need to be spending state money to train secretaries and executive assistants or some of the occupations. Again, this is not about spending all the money. It's not about approving everything that's eligible. It is about what do we as a state workforce board want to establish as our priorities in recognizing where the high demand occupations are, and if this list and if this group decides it's, it is these long lists that the CCs have recommended, fine, but I just want us to be clear about what it is that we're recommending. I see Ophelia has a comment.

Beth Townsend – yes.

Ofelia Rumbo - This is just for clarification and to make sure I'm understanding. This is to address high demand job shortages, not so much to make education affordable. Is that what we're saying? OK.

Teresa Hovell - the motion on the floor is whether or not to approve the Iowa Workforce Development recommendation for the LDS occupations.

Jack Hasken - I'm zooming in. I would like to make that motion to approve the 2.1 attachment for the recommendation by the Iowa Workforce, IWD.

Teresa Hovell – are there any amendments?

Nick Glew – I'd like to make a motion to amend, to make an amendment to adopt the CC list excluding executive secretaries, executive administrative assistants, and travel agents.

Teresa Hovell – is there a second to that amendment?

Charlie Wishman - seconds.

Teresa Hovell – who seconded that?

Charlie Wishman – Charlie Wishman.

Teresa Hovell – thank you Charlie.

Charlie Wishman – yep.

Teresa Hovell – any discussion?

Nick Glew – I am going to amend my motion to not exclude the two that I had excluded, and my motion would be to fully adopt the CC list as presented in our packet.

Teresa Hovell – the motion is to approve the CC recommended occupation list. Is there a second?

Charlie Wishman – second.

Teresa Hovell – Charlie was that you again?

Charlie Wishman – yep.

Teresa Hovell – Thank you. Any discussion?

Nick Glew – Now we're back. I apologize. You know, I guess as a board member, my statement would be that again, I start by saying this is year two for me. Many have much more experience in this exercise, there's lots of data here that you all are much more versed in. We can look at data, we can see minor little points that might flag a data point more than the other. Data is great. I think it's an important piece to consider. I also think the perspectives of our CCs, their job is to be in our communities, to really understand and work with our local employers to develop programming that best aligns with the needs of our state. I understand the role of this particular program in prioritizing

key industries. As a former economic developer myself, I will say while we can prioritize key industry sectors and key clusters, we're in tough shape as a state when it comes to workforce and I think that's just going to continue to accelerate. We have these little minor differences between what the department recommends and what our CCs recommend. I think if we're operating within the statute within the intentions of adopting the full CC list does not put us as a workforce board out of bounds from a legislative perspective. Then I think adopting the CC list makes all the sense in the best interests of Iowans as a whole. My comments are just related to the amendment that was presented here just moments ago.

Beth Townsend – so I think Teresa we have 2 motions. We have my motion to accept the IWD list, and we have Nick's motion to accept the CC list.

Nick Glew – unintelligible.

Beth Townsend – your amendment was to essentially adopt the CC list as presented in attachment 2. I am just trying to make a cleaner way to understand.

Charlie Wishman – the original motion was by you and then it was amended.

Teresa Hovell – okay, right.

Beth Townsend – we need to vote on the amendment.

Teresa Hovell – correct.

Beth Townsend – and then you amended the amendment. So, your first amendment was let's accept the CC list absent the executive assistants, secretarial, and travel agents. Then you amended that to say let's just accept the whole thing.

Nick Glew – unintelligible.

Beth Townsend – so your amendment is to just accept the CC list. So, we need to vote on the amendment first.

Teresa Hovell – any additional conversations or amendments? We will vote on Nick's motion to accept the occupation list as presented by the CCs. All in favor. Is. Opposed. Is. We will be doing a roll call vote.

Michelle McNertney – do you want to do it Teresa?

Teresa Hovell performs an individual roll call vote.

## ROLL CALL VOTE – Action Item 7

Voting Members					
No.	Name	Organization	Affiliation	YES	NO
1.	Dawn Driscoll	Senate Appointed by President	State Senator		X
2.	Barb Kniff McCulla	House of Representatives Appointed by Speaker of the House	State Representative		X
3.	Director Beth Townsend	Iowa Workforce Development	Director		X
4.	Keri Osterhaus as Designee Interim Director Sarah Willeford 7/7/25 Stacy Cervenka	Iowa Department for the Blind	Director or Designee		X
5.	Brandy McOmber as Delegate for Interim Director Beth Townsend	Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation Services	Administrator IVRS or Designee		X
6.	Teresa Hovell Chair	Vermeer	Business		X
7.	Kelly Barrick	CIBC Bank USA	Business		X
8.	Jack Hasken	Jackson Manufacturing, Inc.	Business	X	
9.	LuAnn Scholbrock	Coloff Digital	Business	X	
10.	Ofelia Rumbo	Merrill Manufacturing Company	Business	X	
11.	Nick Glew	Community Savings Bank	Business	X	
12.	Charles Wishman	Iowa Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO	Labor	X	
13.	Jason Shanks	Plumbers and Steamfitters Local #33	Joint Labor – Management Apprenticeship Program	X	

Teresa Hovell – Tied 6 to 6.

Beth Townsend – I didn't vote.

Teresa Hovell – we forgot you Director. No. The motion failed 7 to 6. We will now move to the motion to approve IWD recommendation for occupations for the LDS list. All in favor. Is. Opposed. Is. We will be doing one more roll call vote. Teresa Hovell performs an individual roll call vote.

- ACTION ITEM:** Motion to Approve the Last Dollar Scholarship AY 26-27 List.

Members of the Board voted on the motion to approve the Last Dollar Scholarship AY 26-27 List (attachment 2.1) by voice vote, which was carried by a vote of 9 to 4.



## ROLL CALL VOTE – Action Item 7

Voting Members					
No.	Name	Organization	Affiliation	YES	NO
14.	Dawn Driscoll	Senate Appointed by President	State Senator	<b>X</b>	
15.	Barb Kniff McCulla	House of Representatives Appointed by Speaker of the House	State Representative	<b>X</b>	
16.	Director Beth Townsend	Iowa Workforce Development	Director	<b>X</b>	
17.	<b>Keri Osterhaus as Designee</b> Interim Director Sarah Willeford 7/7/25 Stacy Cervenka	Iowa Department for the Blind	Director or <b>Designee</b>	<b>X</b>	
18.	<b>Brandy McOmber as Delegate for</b> Interim Director Beth Townsend	Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation Services	Administrator IVRS or Designee	<b>X</b>	
19.	Teresa Hovell <b>Chair</b>	Vermeer	Business	<b>X</b>	
20.	Kelly Barrick	CIBC Bank USA	Business	<b>X</b>	
21.	Jack Hasken	Jackson Manufacturing, Inc.	Business	<b>X</b>	
22.	LuAnn Scholbrock	Coloff Digital	Business	<b>X</b>	
23.	Ofelia Rumbo	Merrill Manufacturing Company	Business		<b>X</b>
24.	Nick Glew	Community Savings Bank	Business		<b>X</b>
25.	Charles Wishman	Iowa Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO	Labor		<b>X</b>
26.	Jason Shanks	Plumbers and Steamfitters Local #33	Joint Labor – Management Apprenticeship Program		<b>X</b>

Teresa Hovell – this passes. Alright we got the first one done. We are on to the second.

Agenda item 8. Update on Future Ready Iowa Grant AY 26-27 List by Ryan Murphy, Division Administrator Labor Market Information Division, Iowa Workforce Development. (Attachment 3 – Future Ready Iowa Grant AY 26-27 List)

Ryan Murphy discussed the Future Ready Iowa Grant AY 26-27 List.

So, the FRI grant was also enacted at the same time as the LDS, but the focus is on occupations that require a bachelor's degree. We kind of start with the same process, 600 occupations, use the filtering of at least 1% growth or 50% annual openings, and then \$14 an hour. I believe there's \$425,000 for this grant the last time we did this. This is attachment 3. Our friends at Iowa College Aid can confirm this but that money went very fast because it's not a large pot of money. Last time we approved 6 occupations for the FRI grant. I'm highlighting those in yellow of what were selected last time. The 6th one did not meet the \$14 an hour criteria, so it did not make the cut this round. It was a preschool childcare type of work teacher at an entry level wage. Unfortunately, the number didn't come in this time. This list you're looking at is everything that met the criteria highlighted in yellow was what was selected last time. Any questions about that?

Beth Townsend – So again, you can approve the entire list, but with only 425,000 Iowa College Aid has recommended that we only approve a small number of programs like we did the last time, which was 6. This time they've recommended 5. They are highlighted in orange, actually not yellow. Any questions?

Nick Glew – Just a point of clarity as we transition from the prior topic to this topic as far as equipping NextGen of workforce. Give me a little bit of history of how this one aligns. Like we're not talking about manufacturing and healthcare anymore we're talking about, I mean, this looks to be all education. So just give me a background on, or no, the highlighted ones. The highlighted ones are the top 5, right?

Beth Townsend – unintelligible.

Nick Glew – but the one's in gold are again, I think the ones that we selected.

Ryan Murphy – ones in gold last time selected.

Beth Townsend – Yeah, registered nurses, elementary school teachers, secondary teachers, middle school teachers, and then child, family and school social workers,

Nick Glew – the whole list the ones we are the only 5, we had 6, that we selected last year.

Beth Townsend – That's right, because of the limited funding. Just for your context, Nick, so this, this was a program that was created at the same time as the LDS and the idea was to provide a scholarship program for degrees that would be also high demand. I believe the original appropriation was around a million dollars. We were never successful in getting people to or getting that amount awarded because the eligibility requirements were pretty extensive. There were some modifications made to eligibility, but it's still, you know, if you want David to explain those, I'm sure he can, but because of the limited amount of money, so the legislature went back in and basically said we don't need to give you a million dollars because you're not giving away a million dollars, so they reduced the funding. We're now at \$425,000. It will go fast, right, because these are in high demand occupations and there are a lot of students signed up for the programs, So. If you want David to explain the eligibility, I'm sure he's happy to do that.

Nick Glew – unintelligible.

Beth Townsend – we're just recommending approving the same list we had from the previous year, less the one obviously that didn't qualify.

Ryan Murphy - And so maybe this will help also background on why these were selected last time the SWDB had discussed it . During COVID or right after in the stress that nurses and the teachers were feeling and the pressure that they're having to keep incentivizing them to stay within those professions or include get students to go into those professions is why that was selected.

Beth Townsend - Well, Nick, to answer your question, I guess there's nothing really, if you wanted to recommend some other occupations, I don't have any, we've just been asked to keep it to a small number. That's where we're at is if we're, you know, whatever we approve, let's only approve 5.

Nick Glew - I guess what I struggle with just given the broader context of education right now and how our economy is growing across the state where we're seeing big projects and new investment in the state and ensuring we're equipping that pipeline that needs to grow. Does it need to grow at the same rate that our educational workforce, you know, needs to grow? Maybe the answer is yes, My mind just in non-data driven anecdotal thoughts would suggest, I don't know, are we hitting it out of the ballpark by just, you know, focusing these on? I mean, nursing, great that aligns with the prior conversation. I don't know the answer to education maybe and if as staff you say yes, then I'd say great, let's, you know, let's continue it, but. It just seems to be perhaps disconnected with what we're seeing in just new capital investment across the state.

Ofelia Rumbo - I see here teachers and instructors all over. As an option, are we selecting secondary school and middle school teachers because those are not included in that category? Or how is that?

Ryan Murphy - those occupations are more specific to those levels of education. Now there are teachers in the workforce that don't necessarily fall into these categories. So, the other is kind of a category that we don't have a specific categorization for your type of teaching, so they get put there. That makes sense. I should also point out that it is sorted. The list is sorted by the total annual openings. I mean, if you didn't notice that the top 10 are in green.

Ofelia Rumbo - I would suggest for the board to consider including something in criminal justice as I don't see that here. I also see that in our area as a high demand. They are not ranking very high, so just as a consideration. I see compliance officers and then probation officers and correctional treatment specialists.

Teresa Hovell - Ophelia, are you making a motion to add criminal justice?

Ofelia Rumbo – yes.

Brandy McOmber - just a question on the second page there's Iowa code requirements, correct, and the occupation has to have at least 1% annual growth or 250 job openings, and the probation officer has less than 1% annual growth as well as less openings. Is that something we can even consider, we need to stay true to the Iowa Code requirements as well. On the bottom, it has the list of Iowa Code requirements because it says entry level wage and then the next one is occupation has at least 1% or 250 so I'm assuming it has to meet all of those criteria.

Ryan Murphy – Clarification, so the Code says 250, but we do not produce. 250 over 5 years. We do not produce it at a 5-year level, so we proxy use 50 annual openings, so that's how I met the requirement.

Nick Glew – unintelligible.

Ryan Murphy - Yes, everything on this list meets a requirement.

Teresa Hovell – Is there a motion to approve the list as indicated.

Beth Townsend - I would just say somebody makes a motion with the 5. I mean our friends at Iowa College Aid have suggested that we keep this a small list. We don't have to. We only have \$425,000 but we could certainly come up with a list. There's nothing magical about 5, if you want to do 10, that's fine, just keep in mind that there's limited funding available for this program. I would recommend the board do is just make a motion with the occupations you want us to vote on.

Nick Glew - just one comment and I appreciate the highlighting of the green column, which is total annual openings suggesting the top 10, is that what that is, of annual openings. Just an observation, we have 3 of 5 that are in that top 10 and 2 that that are not. I guess I'm inclined to go generally with the recommendations, but one perspective from the marketplace, if I put my banker hat on as we work with businesses and individuals are really in towns of all sizes across Iowa. Probably more particularly in rural Iowa's, this, this line of accountants and auditors catches my attention of all of these. We have several that are in this top 10. There's another education, but then we, you know, there's things like finance managers, business operations managers, accountants are 1234. Accountants are number 5 as far as total openings. From my perspective, what we see in the private sectors is something that I wouldn't mind considering adding in addition to the healthcare and education roles that are represented. I'd actually make a motion to include registered nurses, elementary school teachers, accept special education, accountants and auditors, secondary school teachers as printed there, middle school teachers. Continue to retain the child, family, and school social workers as highlighted on the presented list. It would basically be all of the gold highlighted lines but replacing where we had 6 last year, we're down to 5, we would add accountants and auditors to the list.

Teresa Hovell - Is there a second to that motion?

Jack Hasken – I'll second Nick Glew's motion.

Teresa Hovell – is there any discussion? All in favor. Is. Opposed.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Motion to Approve the Future Ready Iowa Grant AY 26-27 List.

Nick Glew motioned to approve the Future Ready Iowa Grant AY 26-27 List and Jack Hasken seconded the motion. Members of the Board in attendance voted on the motion by voice vote, which carried unanimously.

Agenda item 9. Update on Iowa Workforce Grant and Incentive AY 25-26 List by Ryan Murphy, Division Administrator Labor Market Information Division, Iowa Workforce Development. (Attachment 4 – Iowa Workforce Grant and Incentive AY 25-26 List)

---

Ryan Murphy discussed the Iowa Workforce Grant and Incentive AY 25-26 List.

I'm back and I'm sorry I'm back. This is the 2nd round of the Iowa Workforce grant and incentive program. This is a program where we work with the Board of Regents (BOR) to create a list that both can agree on. In the fall I sent over the list, and we went through the same process. The criteria is a little different. I believe it's \$40,000 entry salary, which is different than the two previous grants and scholarships. Sent over all eligible occupations that met the criteria. In the winter we had some discussions and meetings and BOR sent over the list that they would like to recommend, which included 85 jobs, 143 programs. We felt that it was fairly broad and had another conversation related to, is there a way to focus on healthcare, advanced manufacturing, and IT. Jason Pontius came back with a more stricter criteria list of different scenarios. One we liked used at least 1% growth and at least 50 plus openings with a high salary, and so that's the list that we're recommending. After further review, we also would like to include additional teaching occupations. I don't have the count with the teachers, but up until the teacher's occupations, we were at 29 occupations for this grant.

Beth Townsend - to Jason's point, we do need to include the teachers. IWD's recommendation for the \$6 million scholarship program that is the workforce grant and incentive program is contained in 4.1. We would add elementary school teachers, secondary school teachers. I believe there's middle school teachers and special ed teachers. I think there's 4 different categories of teachers that we would add to that list. Not surprisingly there's no difficulty in distributing the \$6 million across the four universities. The first time the program was created a couple of years ago, so this is really only the second time we've had to approve a list for the Regent's University. Last time we didn't get done in time. Basically, just had to accept what the Regents' recommended, which was essentially, I think most of their programs, if not all of their programs. We are trying to do this a little bit earlier so that we could have some time for the BOR to respond or review the list that the board adopts. We want to try to focus and prioritize what the high demand occupations that we're trying to incentivize and support. Ophelia, to your question in terms of education assistance, there are a lot of different tuition assistance programs in the state of Iowa across both CCs and our Regent universities as well as our private universities. This is not a tuition assistance program. It's really about an additional scholarship that we can incentivize people to go into these high demand occupations.

Ryan Murphy – I would add that we've included the education program in the second column in green. One of the concerns we had is that was mentioned prior was occupations like managers all other, chief executives. If you look at managers all managers on page 2, it's actually blank on the first page but actually opens up 20 programs. It's very broad, which includes things like sociology, general, political science, and government, other, international relations. It's very broad, and chief executive is similar.

Beth Townsend – unintelligible.

Teresa Hovell – Director was that an official motion to approve?

Beth Townsend – yes.

Teresa Hovell – okay.

Ryan Murphy - the long-stapled list, if you're in the room or online, the one with 7 pages, that is the full board of Regent's recommendation. The shorter list which has the IWD recommend with the check in there, that is the list that from IWD regarding our recommendations. Now our recommendations are on the full 7 pages if you're an electronic version, 4 stapled if you're in the room, attachment 4, that's even easier. Thank you. Ours is 4.1 so we just shrunk the larger list into the IWB recommended list with the recommendation of yes, including the teachers.

Nick Glew – unintelligible.

Teresa Hovell – we have a motion to approve the IWD recommendations. Is there a second? Plus, including teachers. Any additional discussion?

Jack Hasken – I second.

Ofelia Rumbo – does it include secondary special education?

Teresa Hovell – it does include secondary special education. Any additional discussion? All in favor. Is. Opposed.

- **ACTION ITEM: Motion to Approve the Iowa Workforce Grant and Incentive AY 25-26 List.**

Beth Townsend motioned to approve the Iowa Workforce Grant and Incentive AY 25-26 List and Jack Hasken seconded the motion. Members of the Board in attendance voted on the motion by voice vote, which carried unanimously.

Agenda item 10. Discussion on WIOA One Stop Certification Standards by WIOA Core Partner Working Group, Wendy Greenman, WIOA Title I and Title III Bureau Chief, Iowa Workforce Development. (Attachment 5 – WIOA One Stop Certification Standards)

---

Wendy Greenman discussed the WIOA One Stop Certification Standards.

December came to the group with an overview of the certification at process. First round in 2022. Need to review standards and go through the process again.

- Requirements
- Timeline with updating standards
- Working with local workforce areas
- Updated standards

Met and completed 2 consultation sessions. Got a variety of feedback from local stakeholders. Feedback was in the area of standards that seemed to be duplicative. The group took feedback and implemented changes and combined categories. Version shows track changes. Final documents send to local areas, boards, chairs, and staff in April. Additional feedback and none were received. Hope to approve to local can work on their certification process of the IowaWORKS AJCs for this certification period.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Motion to Approve the WIOA One Stop Certification Standards.

Beth Townsend motioned to approve the WIOA One Stop Certification Standards and Kelly Barrick seconded the motion. Members of the Board in attendance voted on the motion by voice vote, which carried unanimously.

[Agenda item 11. SWDB 2025 Legislative Session Overview by Michelle McNertney, Executive Director of Iowa State Workforce Development Board.](#)

---

Michelle McNertney provided the legislative session overview. The session ended this morning. SF603 was an update to Iowa Code Chapter 84A which is the Iowa Workforce Development chapter of the Iowa Code. Includes language related to this board. We have been trying to make the Code more concise and impactful. This bill took out language that is essentially duplicative of the federal language on federal workforce legislation. Removed references to WIOA because legislation is up for reauthorization so it will change throughout our Code and administrative rules. Updated language to be more general so that when federal legislation changes we are not out of compliance. 84A dictates what committees for this board and is more generic with the rights to create and utilize committees and their work via Bylaws. No longer codified to do certain things. At our next board meeting we will go over all of the existing committees and take a hard look at how you want to use committees moving forward and potentially make changes to the Bylaws.

[Agenda item 12. Director's Report](#)

---

Director Townsend provided her report.

- Acknowledge Wendy Greenman's last meeting with IWD. She is moving to a different position elsewhere. Thank you Wendy for your great support of IWD and this board and wish her well in her future endeavors.

- Introduce Brandy McOmber. James Williams resigned his position in mid-April of Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) division. Director Townsend was appointed as interim. Brandy is the Deputy Director. Governor Reynolds appointed me as interim director until we hire a replacement. Brandy is Deputy Director for VR and since I can't vote twice, Brandy is the designated voting member for VR pending the new selection of a new administrator. Continue to move VR into alignment, make more efficient, more customer centric, help VR staff leverage resources and tools that AJC staff has. Make faster progress now and excited about that.
- UI bill passed both in senate and house. Reduces the wage base for employers by 50%. Currently pay taxes on first \$38,400 for every employee. Go down by 50% to approximately \$19K starting next calendar year. Reduces max rate allowable under Iowa law from 7 or 8% to 5.4%. Consolidates tax tables. Went from 21 to 8 experiential rating. Went from 8 tables to 4. Designed to make more streamlined and efficient, easier to understand and more transparent. Estimated we are going to save employers about \$975 million in taxes. We are just shy of \$2 billion in the UI Trust Fund. Paying out between \$250 - \$300 million a year in benefits but collecting \$400 to \$450 million every year. Solution is to bring in less money because UI can only be used to pay UI benefits. Hopefully free up resources for employers to be able to increase wages and provide more benefits to do expansion and growth and make us more competitive. We are 33<sup>rd</sup> in the country in terms of our current UI structure. Make us more employer and business friendly and hope to lead to more investment in Iowa that will attract more businesses.
- April UI rate related at 3.5% ticked up 1/10 of a point. Good new ticked up to 2.1 of point for labor participation rate at 67.2%. Added 5,200 jobs in April and 5,000 workers to workforce in April. If we can continue to add jobs and workers, I'm okay with a little bit higher UI rate. Easier to keep UI rate down when you have fewer people in your workforce. I would prefer to have high labor force participation rate.
- DOGE group stood up by the Governor. Workforce, Local structure, and technology. Providing information to the workforce group. Will be making recommendations to the Governor which are due in September.
- A lot of WARNS. Whirlpool has been paused layoff of 650 employees. Keeping mobile until and RAPID response team busy. Has not impacted UI rate. Average remains at 9 weeks. RCM is working to help Iowans who get laid off. We are well positioned to help individuals find new jobs and quicker than we have ever been able to do that.
- ID.Me fraud decreased in UI program by 99%. Went from several thousand to a few hundred. Paying several hundred thousand to \$630.
- Still working with UDSOL on workforce training grant - \$30 million. USDOL paused everything pending election and about one year response. Working with Governor's office and remain hopeful we get approval from USDOL as legislation intend on providing grants to employers to address high demand needs.

Ofelia Rumbo – any money in internships?



Beth Townsend – we do have funding for internships. The Summer Youth internship program which was announced in March. We get \$250K each year from legislature.

- STEM part of IWD grant program about \$750K per year. College age internships. Money goes very quickly.
- WBL strategy trying to help employers set up registered apprenticeship or quality apprenticeship programs or internship programs.

Teresa Hovell - A reminder if anybody would like to host our late summer early September meeting, please reach out to Shelly, and with that we will adjourn our board meeting. Thank you.

Motion to adjourn.

Adjournment.

---

Chair Hovell adjourned the meeting of the Board at 12:47 pm.



Shelly Evans - Executive Assistant to the SWDB