



Policy Committee Minutes 3 December 2008

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Michelle Fields

Agenda Items

- ❖ Welcome our newest Policy Committee member: Sherry Keys-Hebron!
- ❖ Approve Board Resolution #12-03-2008-04: Policy Committee minutes from the 10/22/2008 meeting.
 - There is continuing discussion around online classes. Michelle will survey counties on their online education policies.

Motion to approve minutes: John Bridenbaugh

Second: Kathy Oliver

All approved; motion passed.

- ❖ New Policy – P7-701: Glossary of Terms
 - This is a new policy, added because of auditor recommendations and requests from our counties.
 - The terms defined deal mostly with eligibility, particularly dislocated workers.
 - Upon Committee approval, it will go up for public comment for 30 days.

Motion to put P7-701 through public comment: Kathy Oliver

Second: John Bridenbaugh

All approved; motion passed.

- ❖ Revised Policy P7-504: Incumbent Worker Training
 - This is an existing policy revision in draft form, not yet through public comment.
 - The state **will** allow training wages as part of the IWT costs, despite some previous issuances from ODJFS; however, clarification should be made on what kinds of wages are allowable (no overtime, after regular work hours, etc.).
 - The state issued a transmittal letter allowing employer match to go as low as 10% for some employers utilizing customized training for IWTs.
 - Individual Employment Plans (IEP) are no longer required.
 - IWT trainees will be reported in SCOTI via “mini-IWT registration”.
 - Upon Committee approval, it will go up for public comment for 15 days.

Motion to put P7-504: IWT through public comment: Kathy Oliver

Second: Kent Kahn

All approved; motion passed.

❖ Policy Revision - P7-502: Individual Training Accounts (ITA)

- This is an existing policy in need of significant changes.
- Some things now covered include issues like: student aid, the definition of “dependent child”, appropriateness of training, conflict of interest, and others.
- Comments:
 - ◆ Is it still a requirement to have one core and one intensive service? Michelle will check.
UPDATE: Confusion may have been caused because Bruce Madson had asked DOL if Ohio could get a “sequence of services waiver”. DOL’s response was no waiver is necessary since, if it is appropriate for the customer to go through core and intensive quickly, it can already be done.
 - ◆ The policy needs to discourage counties/systems from setting specific time frames for levels of service. For example, some counties currently say a customer must spend at least 30 days in core services before they can be considered for intensive services.
 - ◆ ITAs are available to out-of-area residents, but this customer will get the lower of either their residential county or the county they have chosen. Residents of other counties who are Dislocated Workers should be treated like Area 7 residents for purposes of the ITA cap.
 - ◆ We need to remember the goal of an ITA is to get the person employed, not necessarily to get them an education. The ITA is available as a means to get someone a job if they cannot get one with the current skill set.
 - ◆ Student loans should be discouraged, but counties should not discontinue ITAs when they learn a participant has taken out a student loan. Maybe counties should counsel these students on responsible loan management.
 - ◆ Should training result in self-sufficient employment? For example, retail manager (in demand but not always self-sufficient). Is “something better than nothing”? Can the policy allow exceptions?
 - ◆ Does the state set a “living wage”? Michelle will check.
 - ◆ Four-year degrees can only be funded if the student can show they have less than two years left until graduation.
 - ◆ We should keep the ITA cap at \$15,000 but encourage system-wide policies. Monitors will start issuing findings if systems are working together on things like ITAs and supportive services.
 - ◆ If the participant is related to someone in the chain of approval for ITAs, another person must handle that file. Options could be a confidential case load or referring the customer out-of-county. More discussion will be held on the webinar with the ITA workgroup.

- ◆ If a participant moves counties, the file should remain with the original county until a formal transfer is made in SCOTI and the participant wishes to move counties and the receiving county is aware of the transfer.
- ◆ A webinar will be set up to finish working on this complicated policy.

❖ Tracking Tool update

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned and the Committee returned to the full Board for reporting.

The next regular meeting is scheduled for February 4, 2009. The Committee will be contacted shortly for participation in a webinar to finalize revisions on P7-502: ITAs.