NWX-DOL ETA BAT

Moderator: Michael Delaney
January 31, 2013
1:00 pm EST

Coordinator: Excuse me. This is the operator. I would like to remind all parties today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect. Mr. Delaney, you may begin.

Michael Delaney: Thank you so much.

Angie Campbell: Hi. Good afternoon. This is Angie Campbell with the Department of Labor and welcome to our first counsel teleconference.

Before I turn the meeting over to Lorenda for roll call, in the office here it's just myself and my assistant Mike Delaney. And as the operator indicated, the call will be - notes are taken for the call so that we can have official notes for the meeting. I'm going to ask the council to just bear with the process because it is the first time that we are conducting this meeting via teleconference. So it might be a little bit different but it is at least a step toward another direction that the council asked for us to go.

All right, so I'm going to turn the meeting now over to Lorenda. Lorenda would you begin the roll call?

Duane Hall: Angie?

Angie Campbell: Yes.

Duane Hall: Yes, hi. This is Duane. I'm not sure if Lorenda is on the call to hear what the operator said but Lorenda whenever you want to start the recording - if you want to start it with roll call you can push it now. But the operator asked that you hit star zero when you're ready for the recording to start.

                   And then also the - I'm not sure if everyone heard the operator. She asked that people identify themselves before they start speaking for the people dictating this.

Angie Campbell: Thank you Duane.

                   Winona are you on the line?

Winona Whitman: Yes I am. Good morning. Aloha.

Angie Campbell: Hi, how are you today?

Winona Whitman: Just fine. Thank you.

Angie Campbell: That's good. Let's wait a few more minutes for Lorenda and if she doesn't join us like say within the next couple of minutes would you at least begin the roll call for us?

Winona Whitman: All right. I will.

Angie Campbell: Thank you.

Winona?

Winona Whitman: Yes.

Angie Campbell: Could we just begin the roll call?

Winona Whitman: All right. Good morning everyone. This is our first teleconference for the Native American Employment and Training Counsel. And we will begin with a roll call.

Region one. Mr. Darrell Waldron?

Darrell Waldron: Present.

Winona Whitman: Region 2. Mrs. Anne Richardson.

Region...

(David Gipp): Hello. This is (DavidGipp) calling in.

Winona Whitman: All right. This is Winona Whitman. I am now doing the roll call.

Region three. Mr. Elk Richardson.

Elk Richardson: Here.

Winona Whitman: Region four. Mrs. (Kim Carroll).

Region four. Dr. (Rodney Stapp).

Dr. (Rodney Stapp): I'm here.

Winona Whitman: Region five. Jessica James.

Jessica James: I'm here. I'm present.

Winona Whitman: Region five. Mrs. (Christine Molle).

(Christine Molle): Present.

Winona Whitman: Region six. Mrs. Julia Davis-Wheeler.

Julia Davis-Wheeler: I'm here. Present.

Winona Whitman: Region six. Mrs. Lorenda Sanchez.

Lorenda Sanchez: Here.

Winona Whitman: Okay. Lorenda I'm doing the roll call now. And when I'm - do you want to continue or do you want me to finish the roll call and then you can proceed with carrying the meeting?

Lorenda Sanchez: You can finish the roll call.

Winona Whitman: All right.

Lorenda Sanchez: Thank you.

Winona Whitman: Okay.

Region six. Mrs. Roselyn Shirley.

Roselyn Shirley: Present.

Winona Whitman: How about me - Winona Whitman present.

Oklahoma. Mrs. (Carla Bowlan).

(Carla Bowlan): Hello everyone. Present.

Winona Whitman: Other discipline members. Mr. (Jacob Bernal).

(Jacob Bernal): Here.

Winona Whitman: Dr. David Gipp.

Dr. David Gipp: Here.

Winona Whitman: Mr. (Ryman LeBeau).

(Ryman LeBeau): Hello.

Winona Whitman: Thank you everyone. Lorenda?

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay. I missed part of the roll call. We have a quorum, yes?

Angie Campbell: We have 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 present.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay, thank you. And thank you Angie for arranging the teleconference. And welcome to all of the council members.

I guess we will move on the agenda.

Duane Hall: Lorenda?

Lorenda Sanchez: Yes.

Duane Hall: I'm sorry to interrupt. I was the first one on and the operator given some instructions about when to start the recording and she asked you to hit star zero to start the recording. So I guess if you don't mind hitting star zero on the phone. I'm not sure what that does but she asked us to have you do that.

Angie Campbell: Duane and Lorenda?

Lorenda Sanchez: Yes.

Angie Campbell: Hi. I'm sorry. We had a host for the call and we've already hit star zero. So we can proceed with the meeting itself. It is being recorded. Everyone doesn't need to hit star zero.

Duane Hall: Oh, very good. Thank you Angie. Sorry about that.

Angie Campbell: Thank you.

Lorenda Sanchez: I'm sorry. Do we have a different agenda than the agenda that I have in?

Angie Campbell: No ma'am. We're all on the same page.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay because it's a two page statement of urgency on mine or is that - or is Duane up first?

Angie Campbell: No, no. It's the two page white paper is up next and that will be followed by the presentation for Duane - his update on the education potential measure - and then we'll take - have some discussions and updates from the counsel and yourself - the chair - Lorenda.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay, thank you.

Angie Campbell: You're welcome.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay. So, Councilman (Bernal) - our two page white paper?

(Jacob Bernal): Yes. Good afternoon everyone. I just want to thank Chair Lorenda Sanchez for placing this item on the meeting agenda to discuss WIA acceptation advocacy and outreach efforts.

Start by - if everybody can hear me okay - I'd like to start by giving a little background. But I've been assigned to serve on the Native American Employment and Training Advocacy and Outreach Committee. This subcommittee has been tasked to develop and present to the full counsel a white paper on statement of urgency and that's for your deliberation and discussion.

Our presentation today consist of a little bit of information on the task background for flow strategy approach, the benefits, expectation, the formal request for training technical assistance and input suggestions and recommendations from the council - background. Evidently I do not expect to take the full 50 minutes, so.

The first critical matter identified by the subcommittee under this charge is the funding for the Section 166 program. The Department of Labor - funding for the Indian and Native American Employment and Training Program has experienced historical and dramatic decreases. I know you're all familiar with that - JTPA and now the Workforce Investment Act.

In fact the information provided to me by the council indicates national program at one time received $225 million in the late 1970's. That's non-adjusted for inflation. On July 1st 2012, the national program received an additional funding reduction of (unintelligible) percent. Today, we're at a funding level less than $55 million as provided by law and contained in the Workforce Investment Act. That's just a little information on the background - how we got here today.

Proposed strategy approach that I sent to Lorenda was divided into two phases. Phase one with no timeline established was one, to prepare a correspondence letter to the new secretary of labor and request a formal meeting to discuss this critical funding issue. Two would be define the critical issue in a document titled statement of urgency. This would be included in the aforementioned correspondence to the secretary.

Three, previously discussed but not finalized or prove issues - we're to restore the $55 million funding floor, request to increase funding to pre 1980 levels with adjustment for inflation. We'll also discuss requests for national assessment to document...

Angie Campbell: I'm sorry. Excuse me, Mr. (Bernal).

(Jacob Bernal): Yes.

Angie Campbell: Excuse me for a minute. Anyone who is on the call - we're receiving

                   background noise. So if you could please put your phone on mute if you have

                   the capability so that we don't have all of the background information. Thank

                   you.

                   All right, go ahead Mr. (Bernal).

(Jacob Bernal):   Okay. Thank you Angie.

                   And lastly they request a national assessment from Department of Labor to

                   document the Section 166 community's unemployment rate, job status,

                   education and any other social economic indicators that would help justify our

                   cause for funding.

                   Phase two, no timeline established was to communicate all the phase one

                   outcomes dispositions to the Section 166 grantee community. And we'd

                   hopefully develop a grantee - what I'm calling a legislative agenda or plan of

                   action - they would help unify us and mobilize the grantee community to

                   strengthen national resolve of the national programs.

                   Actually on phase two would be report the effectiveness of our efforts in

                   written correspondence and through conference presentations to the entire

                   grantee community. Moving on to the expected benefits. The most optimistic -

                   and believe it or not, I am very optimistic - would be the full restoration of pre

                   1980 funding. A step below that would be the restoration of funding to the WI

                   floor of 55 million.

                   Another expected benefit - number three - would be protection or hold

                   harmless from any provisions for the potential sequestration that may be

pending. Also to insure funding is adequate when the continue resolution expires in March. Those are the real hopefully expected benefits related to funding.

The peripheral benefits would be to help unite the grantee community, help us be more proactive and share our story and strengthen and resolve and create a unified voice. And I think it's also an opportunity to build a strong relationship with the new co-chairs - (McCollum) and (Cole) - of the Congressional Native American Caucus.

The formal request for this white paper for counsel consideration is to retain a professional firm to help us in this endeavor. I confess I have limited abilities when it comes to legislative or political matters. But I did take the liberty to contact a DC firm to ask what - in their opinion - this would cost as an outside consultant. I received an unofficial bid back that would actually not exceed $5000. So part of the consultant service went to insure we act within our authority as granted to the Native American Employment Council by the Secretary of Labor to be in full compliance with the federal advisory acts rules and responsibilities.

So if the council approves this formal request not to exceed $5000, utilizing training technical assistance funds, we could then proceed to solicit bids, ask for proposals as required by DOL procurement law and policy.

So with that, that concludes my opening statements. I'm open for comments, your suggestions, recommendations, cajoling - anything you have to add. Thank you.

Lorenda Sanchez: Thank you Councilman (Bernal). Any comments?

Darrell Waldron: Yes, this is Councilman Waldron. His voice is a little soft. I'm not quite sure I heard everything but is he asking for $5000?

(Jacob Brunelle):   Correct.

Angie Campbell: Up to $5000 for a - out of the TA money to be set aside to be bid out for assistance in drafting the document for the advocacy - the urgency paper.

Darrell Waldron: And so would we just go about making that a motion to get it up for discussion?

Lorenda Sanchez: That would be in order.

Darrell Waldron: I'll make the motion that we put forth $5000 out of T&TA money for the white paper to be...

Elk Richardson: Excuse me Darrell. This is Elk Richardson. I just got a call from a grantee who originally was listening in on the call and was told that the call just went dead for the listening attendants.

Angie Campbell: Okay, thank you. We'll dial them back in.

Elk Richardson: Thank you.

(Jacob Bernal):   I don't know if we can dial them. I think (Laura), (Aaron) or (Ron D'Amico) did you just get on? No. I'm getting calls and texts as well that there's no audio. And I've recommended people to maybe disconnect and call back in. I don't know. Or maybe we need to call the operator.

Darrell Waldron: So do I hold my motion until we get people back on the phone or...

Angie Campbell: This is Angie and actually there's not necessarily a need for us to have everyone connected. What is important is that we do maintain a quorum of the advisory council members which we do have. So I'm going to have my staff here work with the operator but in the interim the council should and can go forward with discussions and any motions.

Elk Richardson: Will you let us know when you've got that resolved because we've got different grantees that are contacting us about it and they're eager to get back on or know what they have to do to listen in since it is a public meeting.

Angie Campbell: Certainly.

Elk Richardson: Thank you.

Dr. David Gibbs: This is Councilman Gipp. If it's in order, Madam Chair, what I would do is second the motion by Councilman Waldron regarding the T&TA money of $5000 to help develop the white paper and ask to see a statement.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay. We have a motion to approve up to $5000 out of the TA funding - money to help develop the white paper and a request for the statement of work by Councilman Waldron seconded by Councilman Gipp. Is there discussion?

Julia Davis-Wheeler: Yes. Lorenda this is Julia Davis-Wheeler. I appreciate the motion and the second. My question would be the documentation for the $5000. Do we have the documentation like the billing part? You know what I mean

Lorenda Sanchez: Well part of Councilman Gipps' motion was to have included a statement of work and I believe that Councilman (Bernal) presented prior in his presentation was that we would be looking at assistance in developing

appropriately the paper for the advocacy and outreach tasks which includes the education piece on our 166 program - the funding, some of the history and the need for our program in line I guess with being a new policy and as a part of follow-up from the October meeting. I think that was an outline that was presented.

Julia Davis-Wheeler: Okay.

Lorenda Sanchez: And Councilman (Bernal) is there something that you can add or maybe expand on for Councilwoman Davis-Wheeler please?

(Jacob Bernal): Sure. In addition to what Chair Sanchez just articulated, it also helped us flush out like a strategy or approach. It would help us with the white paper, the advocacy, the education to flush out what type of strategy approach of like phase one and phase two. But also I think it would help us to make sure we're within the Federal Advisory Acts role. We don't want to overstep our boundary and make sure it's a permissible activity. I think the consultant can help us there too.

Julia Davis-Wheeler: Great. All right, thank you.

Lorenda Sanchez: That's it for the discussion on the motion?

Julia Davis-Wheeler: Call for the question.

Lorenda Sanchez: Question's been called for. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Julia Davis-Wheeler: Madam Chair? Madam Chair?

Lorenda Sanchez: Yes.

Julia Davis-Wheeler: Yes, this is Julia Davis-Wheeler again. Because we're on the telephone, do we need to do a roll call - yes or no?

Lorenda Sanchez: Angie is that appropriate for the record?

Angie Campbell: It is appropriate with the roll call so that we can have the documented consensus. So please state your name and the region and what capacity you represent the counsel.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay. All those in favor or not in favor, I guess you would state your name and your region or your other discipline and your vote.

Councilman Waldron?

Darrell Waldron: I vote in favor. Region one.

Lorenda Sanchez: Region two.

Anne Richardson: Not present.

Lorenda Sanchez: Region three?

Elk Richardson: Elk Richardson vote in favor.

Lorenda Sanchez: Region four?

Woman: She's not here.

Lorenda Sanchez: Region five?

(Christine Molle): Councilman (Christine Molle). I vote in favor.

Jessica James: Councilwoman Jessica James. I vote in favor. Region five.

Lorenda Sanchez: Region six?

Julia Davis-Wheeler: Julia Davis-Wheeler. For region six, I vote yes.

Carla Bowlan: Oklahoma 166 grantee. I vote in favor.

Lorenda Sanchez: Then the other disciplines in order. Mr. (Bernal). Other discipline.

Winona Whitman: Winona Whitman of Hawaii. I vote in favor.

Lorenda Sanchez: Other disciplines?

Roselyn Shirley: Roselyn Shirley Navajo Nation, vote yes.

David Gipp: David Gipp special institutions - tribal colleges. I vote yes.

Lorenda Sanchez: (Ryman Lebeau)?

(Ryman Lebeau): This is (Ryman Lebeau). I vote yes.

Lorenda Sanchez: And Lorenda Sanchez - yes.

Okay. The motion has been passed. And if Mrs. Campbell will work with Councilman (Bernal) on putting together the statement of work and what we need to issue a bid, that would be greatly appreciated.

Angie Campbell: Councilman Sanchez - Chairman Sanchez - actually under the - currently the T&TA funds are currently exist under 8A contract. And the portion of that contract that governs the advisory council is maintained here at the Department of Labor.

And so and I had just consulted with the contract office. There is no need for us to go out for the bid. We can - I can - the office worked directly with Mr. (Bernal) develop a statement of work and actually procure the services also.

Lorenda Sanchez: With the concurrence of the advisory board - advisory council?

Angie Campbell: Yes ma'am.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay.

Darrell Waldron: This is Councilman Waldron.

Lorenda Sanchez: Councilman Waldron.

Darrell Waldron: I would just like to say thank you for Councilman (Bernal) for all the work that he did. He did an excellent job bringing this forward. A heartfelt thank you.

(Jacob Bernal): Thank you Darrell.

Lorenda Sanchez: On behalf of the counsel, thank you very much. We look forward to the work ahead and please, you know, count on us. And as council members, we need to provide input or put a response to inquiries or feedback that Councilman (Bernal) and the work that we need. And I appreciate our cooperation and assistance in this task. Thank you.

(Jacob Bernal): Thank you. You're welcome.

Lorenda Sanchez: Is there further discussion that is needed on the two page white paper at this time?

Okay.

Angie Campbell: Okay. And we are running actually ahead of schedule. And I just got a notice from the second floor that there is still audio or at least we're having difficulty maintaining the calls - the volume of calls - individuals who are calling in. And we apologize for that. Again, it is our first teleconference. Thankfully we didn't try to do the video conference.

But in any event, we're trying to work with the system to try to get as many people on as possible. The call itself can only hold so many lines. And after a while it starts dropping off individuals. And I think that's what's happening. So we're going to try to increase the number.

In the interim what we're going to do - because we do have the quorum of the counsel - is to go forward and have the presentation of the DOL update on the education potential measure that was discussed and approved by AssistantSecretary Oates to the last meeting on October 18th.

So I'm going to turn this meeting now over to Duane Hall who is the primary contact and he has worked with Social Policy Research Development Team on this next proposal. Everyone should have received in advance the documents - four separate documents. So if you could please refer to those as Duane speaks, that would be helpful. Duane?

Duane Hall: Yes, thanks Angie.

Hello everyone. This is Duane Hall. And as Angie mentioned, the documents on the credential goal was sent out to the council members. And so let me just go over those documents so you know what I'm referring to.

There is a document. It's a five page document and at the top it says implementing a credential goal for the Native American Section 166 program. That's the main document that I will be referring to and providing information on. There are two additional documents. One is called instructions for completing the CS program quarterly performance report. It's a one page document and it just provides the instructions on what the credential rate is and how it's calculated.

And the third document is actually our form - the ETA 9084 form. That's the form that we report on our participants. And that's a draft form that you'll see there's a new section in there - section D for the credential rate.

So I'm going to begin with the five page document on the department's proposal for implementing a credential goal for the Native American 166 program.

So I think going back - as you all know - this initially started out as an education measure in that it would be a measure to be in lieu of one of our

common measures. So currently we have three - what we call - common measures - the education or entered employment rate, the retention and the average earnings rate. And the idea was to have a credential goal in lieu of one of the three common measures.

So we sent a proposal forward. We sent the counsel's proposal forward through to the assistant secretary. And the assistant secretary made a decision on that, you know, she didn't want to lose the three common measures. But what she - her decision was to that the program could add an additional credential measure. However, that credential measure would be optional. In other words, you wouldn't have to choose the measure if you didn't want to.

So we - after the secretary's decision - assistant secretary's decision - we worked on implementing this - her decision. And we had concerns with the fact that if this was an optional measure, we were concerned that maybe only a small number of grantees may opt to choose it. And then I think our efforts would have been all for not because we would implement this and then we wouldn't have anybody or very few people choosing it.

So what we proposed and we got approval from ETA on is to make a slight change to that. And what we're proposing is to make it a credential goal rather than an official measure. And so you may think we're just talking semantics here. What's the difference between a goal and a measure?

Well a goal and a measure are essentially the same thing. However the term measure - as used in ETA - usually refers to a calculation or an indicator that measures a grantee's performance. So it's like an official identifier to measure how well a grantee's doing. However a goal would be - it would be something that we strive for, not something you would either fail or fail to meet or meet. It would be something that you would simply strive for. There wouldn't be

any - we wouldn't determine whether you failed it or didn't fail it. It would be something that we want all grantees to strive for.

So all grantees would be - we would collect information on the credential goal and we would determine how grantees are doing and we would - through the council - determine what an appropriate credential rate goal would be. And then we would, you know, we would give training and we would try to get grantees to strive to meet this goal. So that's what we're proposing.

So what is the credential goal? How is it calculated? What is it? What are we talking about? So what we're talking about as a credential goal or credential rate - if you will - what we're talking about is indicated on page one of this document in the square box there. We would look at all the people who exited from the program. And of those people that exited for the program, how many of those individuals obtained a credential. So if you look at the document, it provides the definition on page one of the document.

So, you know, on the surface you would say well that's not really fair because not all our grantee - all our participants - are striving to get a credential. We have a lot of people that come into the program who are looking for jobs that are not trying to get a credential. We have people in work experience and people who complete work experience successfully - they don't get a credential.

So that would seem unfair. Obviously logically you would say well the way to do this is to say of the people who were in training - those people that were in an activity where they could get a credential - that's the people who we should measure and that's the people who should be in the calculation. And all that makes sense.

However here's our thoughts on this. And this is something that even if you go back to the menu of measures, we made that decision as well on the menu of measures. There needs to be a certain number in the base of this credential. So for example, we wouldn't want a grantee to have say 50 exiters but only one person put in training. And if that person got a credential, they would have 100% credential rate because they only put one person in and that one person got a credential.

And so what we wanted to try to achieve with this credential is we don't want to give any incentive for individuals or grantees not to put people into training. So, you know, a grantee may think well I'm not sure if this individual will get a credential. Maybe I won't put him in training. I don't see that happening but it could happen.

So the way we have it calculated, whether you put a person in training or not, they're still going to be calculated in the credential. And that way it takes out those kinds of decisions on whether you want to put somebody in training. So on page two of five it kind of explains our methodology for looking at all - tracking all exiters and those that get a credential.

So what would be the established goal or the target for the credential rate? We went back and looked at PY2010 and PY2011 and in fact we can calculate the credential rate now based on the individual records of spur data that is submitted by grantees quarterly.

So we went back and looked at PY2010 data and PY2011 data and we found that in PY2010, the credential rate - as we're calculating it - was 6.2% in PY2010 and 6.4% in PY2011. So I know these percentage rates seem low but again, it's important to remember that the rate is calculated on all exiters and not all exiters are striving to get a credential. And also we have to keep in

mind the socioeconomic characteristics of our individuals that we serve in the program.

As you all are well aware, you know, a lot of our participants face a lot of challenges. And it is, you know, it's a significant achievement when we get our participants to achieve a credential.

So as I mentioned, we can currently calculate this - the credential goal - based on the information that we have. And this is calculated in Bear Tracks. And Bear Tracks has exiters in it. And it also tracks people who attain some type of degree.

And even though we can calculate this and the data is collected in Bear Tracks, we feel that it is important to enhance Bear Tracks to make the credential rate even more accurate and more intuitive for the grantee and make it easier for the grantees to be able to count somebody as getting a credential.

And but what I mean by that is - if I can give you an example - right now, if somebody gets a credential in the Native American Program, you have to wait until they leave the program before you can count them. And some of our participants may get a credential like their GED but they're still in the program. And so you have to wait until they exit. And sometimes our grantees may forget or there's reasons why they don't get entered.

And furthermore, you can skip the field in Bear Tracks that where you would identify somebody getting a credential or not getting a credential. And so we're sure that, you know, there's a lot of grantees that, you know, they just skip over that field where they would record that because - as you all know - it's not a measure. It's not something that you have to - feel that you have to complete.

So with the enhancements of Bear Tracks, you know, we would provide an added check. So if a grantee was exiting someone, you would get a popup message saying did this person receive a credential. We would also enhance the different types of credentials that people can get.

So we feel that we need to make enhancements to Bear Tracks to better track the credential rate. With that said, I think, you know, we can begin in PY2013 I guess. What are we in now - PY2012? Yes, PY2013. This July - July 2013 - the beginning of the new program year. We feel like, you know, we can begin getting training at the conferences and kind of getting the word out - kind of letting grantees know that this is something - a goal that we would like our grantees to strive for, teach them how to record that in Bear Tracks and start giving them training on the importance of putting people in training.

So in this document, I provide the items that we feel we need to make - the changes that we need to make to Bear Tracks. And then on the last page it's just kind of an illustration or a visual of what it looks like in Bear Tracks to collect information on individuals getting a credential.

So with that, I'll stop there and I'll open it up to questions. Before I do that, I just want to check - I asked (Ron D'Amico) to be on the line. (Ron) were you able to get on the line? Is (Ron D'Amico) on this line?

Yes, I don't think - he sent me an email. He said he couldn't get on the line. But that's fine. I just wanted SPRA who, you know, provided guidance to us on implementing the calculations.

Angie Campbell: Excuse me Duane.

Duane Hall: Yes.

Angie Campbell: This is Angie. And only the council members or the staff here at the Department of Labor have the access at a speaker mode. In fact Mr. (D'Amico) could be on the line but he doesn't have the - he can't speak.

Duane Hall: Oh, okay. That's fine. So thank you Angie.

                   So that's our presentation of the credential. That's what we're going forward with on implementing a credential goal for the Native American Program. And I'll open it up to any questions.

Elk Richardson: Duane this is Elk Richardson.

                   For a grantee that would choose to use this education credential goal, would exiters that they have that - who exit with the intention of attaining that goal, would that go against the grantee as far as the other three measures because the goal would be the education credential for such and exiter - not necessarily an employment centered outcome?

Duane Hall: Yes. Good question Elk. Again, I want to make clear this isn't a measure. So it's not something the grantees pass or fail. So it doesn't really matter what your goal is - I mean what your actual credential rate is. We're just saying here's a goal that we're encouraging people to strive for.

                   So it's not a pass or fail and also I should add it's not something that grantees choose or not choose. Currently it's embedded in Bear Tracks to make the calculation. So it doesn't matter - there's nothing where you choose or not choose. We automatically get the data. What we want to do is train people to know - to strive for getting more people in training and getting people a

credential and make sure that, you know, until changes are made to Bear Tracks that people are aware that they should click the field indicating where they got - they received or didn't receive a credential.

Elk Richardson: Okay. I mean in initially looking at this, it just seems like why would I place much emphasis on striving for credential outcomes when the real measure - what I'm being measured by is employment centered outcomes. And it seems like it would work in conflict.

Duane Hall: Yes and I think that's - Elk that's a very good point. It was going to be - there was going to be a conflict no matter how we did it Elk because I think even under the best scenario where we asked - we put forward to the assistant secretary to have a credential - an education major - in lieu of one of the common majors, we were still going to be required for people to get entered employment. That still would have been on there and you would have had one of the others - either the retention rate or average earnings.

So, you know, under the best scenario, you still have this conflict where you have people that you're trying to (unintelligible) but at the same time getting credential. But having said that, I think there's a perception that somehow if you put somebody in training that that's going to go against your employment because you're not trying to get them a job.

Well, you know, if we believe the statistics, statistically they tell us that, you know, if you have a credential or an education, you got a better chance of getting a job. And because we don't count people until they exit. So if somebody goes to school and you have them in a community college or something like that, that doesn't hurt your entered employment rate because as long as they're - you have them on the program and they're going to

community college - they never show up in any performance. It's only when they exit.

So when they complete college or community college and you exit them, we hope they take that degree or certificate from them - from that community college or college or whatever and they get a job. And statistically they're supposed to have a better chance of getting a job.

Elk Richardson: Yes. And I don't disagree with that. I mean that's really what occurs a lot of times with our classroom training participants. But how do we - with the credential goal being on the 9084, how do we prevent it from in fact seeming to be an item that we're measured by because it's going to show up there whether you call it a goal or a measure. It's going to show up there as it's reviewed. That data's going to be compiled and analyzed.

Duane Hall: Yes and, you know, we are going to compile it and analyze it but it's not going to be a goal - a measure. It's going to be a goal. And again, you know, I'm sure, you know, folks may think well that's semantics. But the reason we put it on the form and, you know, if that's a suggestion by the advisory council, you know, that's certainly something we may want to take into consideration.

But the reason we put it on the form is first of all, you know, we didn't put it under section E performance results. And, you know, we consciously made a decision that it just says credential rate. It has its own section - section D. We didn't want to put it under performance results indicating that's something to do with performance.

So there's, you know, there's certain things in the department. The budget - for example - they ask for performance. There are certain things that, you

know, grantees, you know, you ask for performance for maybe when you're giving waivers. As you all know, like when the SGA comes out, you get a waiver based on the grantee's - based on satisfactory performance. So those are the type of things where, you know, you wouldn't want to use a credential, right.

But I think we would, you know, I think we want to encourage grantees to put more people in training because according to the statistics, you know, having a credential, getting education, you have a better chance of moving into the middle class and staying in the middle class.

The other thing on the form Elk is that we felt that grantees need to see how they're doing on it. I mean we could leave it off the form and calculate it internally. But, you know, I think grantees, you know, if we set a goal, you know, they would want to see, you know, what it is.

So maybe just quickly on, you know, well what would we make the goal? Well I, you know, I gave an example in this document. Let's say you made it 10%. Well, you know, there's a lot of ways you can get to the 10%, you know, put more people in training or, you know, get more people a credential the way we have it calculated. But if you went from a 6.4% rate that we have in PY11 to a 10%, really you would increase - you would increase people in training from 3000 to 5000.

So you'd have almost 2000 more people in training which is a good thing and you would get the people who obtained a degree would go from 530 to 830. So you'd make a substantial increase there. So that's what we're trying to do here - just bring it to the grantee's conscious that hey, yes we have work experience. We got to find jobs but, you know, training is important and

getting a credential is important. We want to kind of improve that. We want to set a goal where we improve that.

And that doesn't hurt your other majors because you put somebody in there. It's only when they exit. And the only thing - if (Kathy McDonald) from the Dallas Inter Tribal Center is online. She makes me well aware of this and she does have a good point. The only way it hurts you is that if you have somebody in a two year program for example and you don't pay for four year college. So once they're done with the two year program associates degree, they go onto a four year degree.

Well they're not going to, you know, if they're in college full time, they're not going to get a job. So after - and if you exit them and they go onto a four year college, they didn't enter the labor market after they left their program. So in that case you would get credit for the credential because you got them a two year associate's degree but you wouldn't get credit for entered employment because they didn't get employed in the quarter after the exit because they were in college.

So you're going to have - I think that's, you know, I don't think that's - I think that's the exception, not the rule. But I mean you do have something like that. But as (Ron D'Amico) has provided in a lot of his training, it's about, you know, when to exit people and managing your program on, you know, timing your exit.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay. Are there other comments?

(Dr. Stapp): Angie this is (Dr. Stapp) in Dallas.

Angie Campbell: Yes.

(Dr.Stapp):   You know, we had been working on this for ages and it's gone back and forth. And as far as it being, you know, a goal versus the way we originally presented it as a measure - I mean I agree that I think the last time the effective workgroup and the council met about it, we decided we didn't want an additional measure if we didn't get it the way we wanted before and having the option on the original three common measures.

So the goal thing, you know, I think is probably okay. It's not anything that we're so much having to be held to but if we could use it as a tool to improve our programs or help track some things and I think that would be good.

Angie Campbell: Absolutely. Thank you Dr. (Stapp). And also too what we were thinking as a team here at the national office is that we could use the goal to, you know, to make improvement to the program specifically in training and also, you know, achieve an objective we've been working on for four years. But it doesn't prevent the counsel as a whole - one would be able to get at least a base line of information. But the counsel at some point - once we determine that the 166 community for example will utilize this goal - that we can come back to the department for example and even potentially advocate to have it to be a full measure - maybe not right now but in the future.

So there's a lot of benefits for, you know, the proposal that Duane's putting forward.

Elk Richardson: Do the - this is Elk Richardson again. Do the state program - they have a credentialing measure don't they?

Duane Hall: Yes, they do. And there's isn't a measure either I don't think. The youth program does but they've put out guidance to the states on increasing

credentials. This is kind of a, you know, this is really - I mean the council thought of this before the administration and the congress thought of it. But there's a lot of talk of this with the, you know, within the administration and congress about this. Employment training programs, you know, they've got to get people credentials.

Elk Richardson: What is the - how is our proposed methodology for tracking or measuring - accounting this goal - the same or different from the state's because all in all an educational credential measure or goal is going to be looked at as being the same thing across a national program, be it the ending program or migrant seasonal farm worker and the state programs.

And if the internal mechanics of that measure are different, no one will ever see that. They'll just look at the lower outcome and say wow, these programs are failing miserably at this. Why? Well they may or may not ask why but they'll just look at it on service and say they're failing miserably. That concerns me that we would have that appearance.

Duane Hall: Yes and I think that's another very good point Elk. They do - they calculated very similar to us except all they're looking at is just the people in training that got a credential.

Elk Richardson: Why would we do it different?

Duane Hall: Well that's a good question and here's why. Because we want to actually make a difference and not give the appearance of making a difference. I think the - I mean if we really want to make a difference, the state should have done it this way as well. And so this is a better way of doing it but we have the option of calculating it just like the states. We have the data available.

So let me give you an example and this is a perfect example and I envision this would work the exact same way. As you all remember - some of us that's been in the program for a long time. We never had these self service participants up to - up until maybe - I don't know when it was - five years ago, six years ago. We only counted people who came in and we put them on the program and gave them a service. There was none of this hey, come in and get on the computer and look for a job and count that as a self service.

Well the states did. I mean these states - you go into the Texas Workforce Center and you, you know, you get on their computer and you look for a job, you know, that's a self service. We never did that. We held ourselves to a higher standard. The problem was is that that increased - our average cost for participant was much higher because we didn't count people who got, you know, what we considered a course service.

So the question was well the states are much more efficient. No, they're getting credit for things that they're providing little or no service to an individual and they're getting g--they're counting them. So what we did was we added to Bear Tracks self service participants.

That shot up the number of people served in our program. We were always around 15,000 or something and I think last year it was like 38,000 because we count those people who are self service. Our cost for participant using that is I believe less than the state's now.

However - as you all know - when we look at average cost for participants for us, we use a different number. And we just, you know, we want to have a $4500 - I think is what it was -$4500 average cost for participant. And those are only - and that cost for participant is just based on people who were in the program and got a, you know, a tangible service, not core service people.

So in any budget, anytime somebody wants to compare us to the state when it comes to average cost for participant, we show them the exact same thing. We do it the exact same way the states do. We provide - we include our core services. However we know that what we really want is we want to people on the program and provide, you know, work experience. We want to pay for tuition and books. And so when we do it - when we hold ourselves accountable just internally and we say hey, we want to try to keep that at $4500 average cost for participant or below.

But when you count the core service individuals out front, we're at $1600 which is at what the state has or below. We would do - so how would that work with this? We would do the exact same thing. If anybody wants to compare our program with the states, all we'll do is say okay, yes. Calculating it that way - here's our numbers.

And I haven't done the calculation the way the state's done it - well let me take that back. If you calculate the state's the way we're calculating the state adult formula program, you know, the states have several different programs but the adult formula program for the state is the most similar to us. There's would be calculated at 13%. Of course they don't use it. They only count people in training. So they have 57%. But you can calculate theirs the way we're doing it and they're at 13%.

There is no question that we can get at 13% and go above that. We did a test with Winona. Winona was good enough to go back and look at her records. And just by going through and making sure she counted all the people's credentials, you know, she increased her rate by 40 something percent. So we can calculate...

Winona Whitman: Excuse me. Excuse me.

Duane Hall: Yes.

Winona Whitman: Excuse me. I think our percentage was only - I mean I just wanted to be clear for the record. Our credential rate went from 0% to 29%. But I did still have the question about including all of the exiters because I was still looking at the bigger picture. Although it was an improvement from 0 to 29%, I was still looking at well what about the other 71%. I mean how would someone in, you know, performance, you know, if that was adept in performance measures - also look at that.

Duane Hall: Yes. Again, I think folks understand that. But again, if they want to look at it that way, we're more than glad to give it to folks that way. But if we did that and implement it, basically what we would be saying to ourselves is that we care more about the number than how it affects the community. And I think what we want to do is how this affects the community because we, you know, if you go back and look at the PY2011 performance - I'm sorry Winona. I was thinking of somebody else. I don't know where I got the 40%. But I think you're right. It was 29%. Is that right - it went from 0 to 29?

Winona Whitman: Yes it is.

Duane Hall: Yes, okay.

So but we can - we have people in the - when we went back and looked at the performance, we have people that put one person in training. And that person - that grantee may have gotten the same amount of money as another grantee. Let's say they got 100,000 and they put one person in. They get one person a credential that they're at 100%.

Another grantee may get $100,000 and they put ten people in. Well if they only get one credential, they're at 10%. So now you're - there's - you could almost say there's an incentive or you can start kind of working with your numbers and say who do you want to put in training or who not - who you don't. And, you know, we don't want to do that. The same reason we don't want to do that with like the average cost for participant because now you're just - now you're basically pumping up numbers.

But if they want to see it that way - if somebody's going to compare programs and want to look at it - we do that. We provide the department with the same calculations as how the states calculate things. And our numbers look very good when it comes to cost for participant. And I'm very confident are numbers are going to look as good as the states - if not better - when we calculate it the way the states do.

Darrell Waldron: Excuse me. This is Councilman Waldron.

Lorenda Sanchez: Councilman Waldron.

Darrell Waldron: There's just so much discussion about the state. At least in my area, the state creams constantly and clients that apply to them that don't meet their creaming standards are forgotten about and they roll on. We - as Indian grantees - everyone that comes to our door that is eligible, gets services. So, you know, we've been dealing with it in Rhode Island. If they come in under 7th grade, the state's not even interested in them and along turns them away.

So I just want to - it's not apples to apples with their clients. We service all of our people because they are our people. And so I wish I had half the budget

that the states have on just the ones that they turn away and we'd be rich. I just wanted to make that statement about the state.

Lorenda Sanchez: Thank you Councilman Waldron.

Duane Hall: If I could add to Darrell's comment and that is so true. I mean we can manipulate numbers. We can get this thing up to 90% probably if we wanted to if it's about a number. I'll just give you an example. True story. We checked it out here in the region.

A local board in Arkansas - this local board gets $800,000. They had a 92% entered employment rate. But as you know - we all know that only people who receive intensive services are counted in entered employment. So what happens is they say hey, we served 4000 people and we have a 92% entered employment rate. That looks real impressive. But most of those 4000 people at this local board - they were all core services.

They weren't - they weren't counted because you only count people who are in training. So when you went back and looked at this board, they had 12 people for $800,000. 12 people and I think ten or eleven got employed. So whatever the calculator was is 92%.

So my point is that, you know, can you imagine one of our programs getting $800,000 and only 12 people actually get put into work experience or actually put into training and get books or tuition. So, you know, you can - we can play with the numbers but the way it's calculated now, you get the best of both worlds. We're not - nobody - it doesn't help anybody to crane the numbers.

And so I think this will have an impact on the grantee community. And then at the same time, we have the calculations to calculate it by trainees who take

out the people who weren't in training and calculate the same way as the states and I think we'll, you know, our numbers - I'm very confident our numbers will be just as good if not better.

Lorenda Sanchez: Other comments?

Duane I have a few comments to make and I would be remissed not to share with the counsel and with you.

First of all we regret that we spent 3 1/2 years working on an education measure and providing what I felt was a very reasonable and workable position to the department. And I respect the assistant secretary's decision to move with a somewhat credential measure as an option. And I believe that we had a couple of discussions about how that might look.

And then in all honesty I feel blindsided that we are hit with what is a credential goal. And not only the fact that it is placed on the 9084 which I think people do view as a document that measures our performance and our outcomes. But I also looked at the instructions for completing the CS program quarterly performance report and the credential rate. And I understand the bottom of the document that it was generated from Pro Tech and revised in 2005.

So I'm assuming that it's a state document that has been revised for the Indian programs.

Duane Hall: No, that's not correct.

Lorenda Sanchez: Oh, so that's just - okay. So the bottom information is just...

Duane Hall: The ETA Pro Tech does forms for the states and for our programs. The Pro Tech oversees all - they have - they're responsible for implementing forms and instructions for all ETA programs. The instructions were this is a modification to - if you go back and look at our existing instructions, this is just a slight modification of that.

Lorenda Sanchez: The other concerns that I have is in reviewing the document that showed utilizing all the exiters - and I think we've had a little bit of discussion about that in the past about 40 minutes here - we will be looked at in comparison with other groups. And although we want to say we won't, we will. And if we do report only on our training against all of our extras, we're going to have a low percentage. There's just no way around that. And not because we don't want to - we don't have a need to serve that population.

I want to show you I had the daunting task of looking at who the small grantees were for the national conference planning meeting. And, you know, we have so many small grantees. Over 50% of our grantees - probably almost 60% are what I would consider small grantees. They don't have that amount of funding to really invest in training.

And if they do - if they have a $28,000 budget or if they have a $50,000 budget and they choose to work with a client and maybe one gets a job and maybe one went into training and that person, you know, did get a GED or did get a certificate. Why wouldn't we want to have a feather in their cap for utilizing - getting 100% by taking one person and putting them into training because that was their goal?

And someone may argue that, you know, why do we have these small grantees? But that argument is not one really that we can have because we do have small grantees and we have to recognize that. And we have to allow

them to serve what the needs are for their community. But in the big picture you had mentioned that you were able to capture some data that you have and I'm assuming it's probably some of the SPIR information that you're getting with Bear Tracks.

And Winona has 29%. And Winona does an exceptional job I feel because I've read her return on investment reports that she does annually. You know, is 29% a goal that we all can strive for? And probably not because of the conditions and the funding that we have available to do this activity.

And I also take exception to your comment about how, you know, this would affect our communities, you know, we can play with the numbers. It's never been about numbers in this community and I know you know that. We look at our people. Even when I look at the reports that we submit and we look at our total participants served and the core services. The core services in Indian country are nothing compared to the core services in the non Indian programs, you know.

It goes beyond a similar level of service. And that's just by the nature of who we are and who the people are that are coming through our doors. I want to see our program succeed and I want to see us do an exceptional job. And if the calculation can be done by, you know, with the information that we have now but do we have to put it on the 9084 as a rate?

And then the other concern I have has to do with the enhancements that will need to be done to Bear Tracks to collect the credential goal information. And the concern I have there is I think we have numerous other fixes and enhancements that have been recommended to Bear Tracks that also need to be considered. And, you know, those don't get the attention that they need but

now we're going to do this data collection for this credential goal and we're going to work on the enhancement for Bear Tracks.

But I will, you know, leave it up to the committee of the council. And, you know, we also have to keep in mind the education process. We only have one conference between now and July 1st. And will we be able to sufficiently educate and train our community should we move forward with this? And those are my questions and comments. Thank you.

Winona Whitman: Lorenda this is Winona. I'd like to make a comment here. I concur with Lorenda's comments on the educational goal and all the discussion about it. And what I don't want to see happen - I mean because we have to be very, very concerned about how this has an effect on these smaller funded grantees.

Our - I would not want a raise rate of 29% to be a measure for the rest of the grantees because obviously and humbly I say, you know, we are very fortunate that we have the funding and resources to be able to accomplish some of these goals. So I, you know, if we use CK as a guideline, I mean, you know, like we're comparing apples and oranges because you have to take into consideration funding and resources available in the community.

Duane Hall: Yes. No, I agree. I think that's an important point. And, you know, if we have a small grantee and say if they're a small grantee, they may only have - I don't know - they may only have seven or ten exiters. Well putting one person in training, you know, that might be acceptable because they only had, you know, seven or ten people that exited anyway. So one, you know, that's certainly reasonable.

But there are instances where, you know, you might have a grantee who has 100 exiters and only one person put in training. I guess that's what I'm talking

about - the, you know, this is based on funding, you know. Obviously it takes into consideration the amount of money you get, the lower number of exiters you're going to have. And therefore, you know, the lower number you have in training.

It's, you know, the situation where you have a lot of exiters and you just choose not to put people in training. And I think that was the whole intent here was to try to encourage people to, you know, look at training and put people in training. So I think that's, you know, I think that's factored in.

You know, as far as the percentage, I used - in this document - 10% as an example. And, you know, because that's, you know, I'm not saying that's what it should be. But when I did put in an example what I thought would might be a good goal is 10%. So, you know, I wasn't thinking, you know, 29%. You know, I think 10% would be a significant achievement and I think we could easily exceed that.

On the training we, you know, we only have the national conference. And even if we had a full year, you're still only going to have three and that's assuming you have two multi-region conferences. So we fully intend to do webinars on this so grantees can learn how it's calculated and what they can do to strive to increase the credential.

Angie Campbell: Chairman?

Lorenda Sanchez: Yes.

Angie Campbell: Okay. Real quick - this is Angie. Thank you. Are there anymore questions because in the interest of time - 3:24 - I wanted to be able to move on and

allow the committee to have some discussions. Are there anymore questions regarding the education attainment goal?

And where we sit as a council is that the council - on October 18th - provided advisement to the secretary and to the Department of Labor. And at this juncture, what is being proposed is what's acceptable to the assistant secretary and the secretary's office. And as a council we have to determine whether or not we're going to go forward with what the department agrees with is being presented today or choose not to go forward and just maintain the three common measures that are in place.

Roselyn Shirley: I would like to provide some discussion. This is Roselyn Shirley from the Navajo Nation.

Since the interest of this goal is mainly to track those that have attained a credential, I would look at it maybe even under the section B on the reporting form where it has total exiters - include a line there just to track that information. However - since we're talking performance outcomes - also allow a time period for this to be a pilot project and I believe there is time. There is time that is needed to train grantees and I would imagine time is needed to fully enhance the Bear Tracks reporting systems that we use.

So that is going to also take time to tweak some of the fixes that are needed and also to do complete updates to fully implement new reporting requirements.

Angie Campbell: Thank you Mrs. Shirley. And again, that's why the department and Duane and SPRA and our team is proposing a goal for that very reason that you're stating now. Also too we'll take a look and Duane we'll make note of moving the goal maybe to section B. But we can talk about that.

Thank you Mrs. Shirley.

Roselyn Shirley: Okay. Another observation that - observation that I have is people are talking about this as a credential rate and then somebody else said educational rate. So, you know, it has to be maybe probably a credential rate.

Angie Campbell: Credential rate - I stand to be corrected.

Duane Hall: Yes. I think credential captures it because there's things that, you know, you can get a credential and it really has very little, you know, it doesn't mean you went to a two year college or four year college. Getting a CDL - we might count that as a credential. And so, you know, I think credential is more encompassing of what we want.

Darrell Waldron: This is Councilman Waldron.

I'm just trying to get a little bit more clarity on Councilwoman Shirley. Are you suggesting a pilot program for a period of time to look at the results and see where they come out? Is that what you're recommending Roselyn?

Roselyn Shirley: This is Roselyn Shirley. I believe it's fair to all grantees to have this gathered during a time period such as a pilot project for a while and until everybody is used to reporting. And of course you also have to think about setting up your participant records.

Duane Hall: Just my comment on that is it's fine if it's a pilot. I think we're kind of still thinking in terms of measures. We don't want - we want, you know, we don't want to be measured by something until we get trained and everything. So in that sense, a pilot makes sense.

I would just say that, you know, since it's not a measure, you know, certainly we can call it a pilot or make it a pilot. But when you're talking about a goal, really all we'd be doing is providing training this year and we'd say look, you know, maybe we'd say we strive for 10%. Well, you know, if you - the program only does 8% which I don't foresee happening, you know, there's no repercussions for that.

So a pilot would make sense. You don't want to implement something and then fail it. But we're not passing or failing anything here. We're just tracking it and say hey, let's try to get more people in training and let's try to get more people potential.

Darrell Waldron: This is Councilman Waldron.

The Madam Chairman - she felt a little differently about that. Does the pilot ease any concern Lorenda?

Lorenda Sanchez: I think if we define what the pilot project was that we envision is one thing. But there are a couple of things. I don't want to just discard Assistant Secretary Oates' presentation of this credential goal. And Duane keeps saying that, you know, we determine this and we want this. And so I'm assuming that we is the department. And I don't want to be disrespectful to the department but I also feel I have a responsibility to the grantee community.

And if we can accomplish a look at the credential goal through a pilot process and allow time for work to begin on Bear Tracks and have some type of percentage recommended to us, I believe that would be, you know, something that we would look at because we did spend a lot of time and had a lot of conversations about the grantee community on the goal of this program.

Darrell Waldron: This is Councilman Waldron.

We have spent a tremendous amount of time on it and energy and dollars and, you know, Duane had mentioned earlier about training and it was more about our community and their education level and access to career oriented jobs and opportunity that other Americans get to.

When you take a look at the education levels in this country, it's fairly clear less education, less money and then more problems that follow. I'm a little curious as to if Dr. Gipp - and I hate to put you on the spot - had an opportunity to look at it and what his opinion was on it since he's running a college out there. I'd be just curious to hear his take on it if that's possible.

I totally understand if you decline to comment Dr. Gipp because I'm just kind of asking you this cold.

Dr. David Gipp: We really are just now examining it ourselves. And, you know, we are used to frankly using the credential program as you already know. I haven't really sat down and calculated the specifics on our own program however. And so from that perspective, I do have some concerns.

We're not a big program but we're not a very tiny program either as you know. And so I think that from a credential point of view, you know, I tend to favor it as an educator and as an operator of a college as well. But from the perspective that we have about our clients and how we - and who we serve out here - and share the view that has been expressed about concern about how this would really work. And so I kind of am in the middle on this thing in some respects but I also do have that same concern that smaller programs would have as well.

Darrell Waldron: Thank you. Again, this is Councilman Waldron.

In the sense of compromise moving towards something that could potentially be good or be bad, Chief of the Program Angie Campbell do you think that a pilot would be respectable to the assistant secretary's recommendations on the program and also meet some of the concerns of the counsel as to the end results and what we would just get as far as quality of training and try to get it moving and seeing what it does sort of like a hold harmless but a good attempt at something that could be beneficial. Or it could also be, you know, negative to us.

Do you feel that a pilot would be some type of a compromise? If so, I support Councilwoman Shirley.

Angie Campbell: Absolutely and that's where I think it was and I truly support the presentation that Duane has put forward. He's put a lot of time into this and really worked with SPRA in looking at the difference between implementing a measure opposed to the goal.

And when he presented it to me as well - it is really - he's looking at it from a pilot perspective where we're not currently being held to a measure - to a certain level of accomplishment. This will allow for us to one - you're right - train the community. Also it allows for us to get credit for where the country's moving and that is obtaining credentials.

And it's also thirdly it allows the community to receive - like Dr. (Stapp) had said earlier - we put a lot of time in this goal and to working toward to get to where we're at here. So yes, I do believe in working with Duane - and I don't

want to undo Duane all the work you put in today because he is the primary point of contact. He's done all the research.

And Duane if you believe that we can still go forward - and I think we could do it as a pilot and even within the three years - that's the next time we have to go back in and update our reforms again. Also we can have a good presentation for even the new secretary or the new assistant secretary - whoever is here at the time. I think it's a good strategy and I do support it and I know that I could work with the Assistant Secretary Oates to have her agree.

Duane what are your thoughts?

Duane Hall: Yes. No, I think that's a good suggestion by Mrs. Shirley.

You know, there's some apprehension here and obviously so. We don't know what it's going to look like. And by calling it a pilot, you know, we're saying we're not ever saying officially hey, this is what the program did. This is our goal. We're testing it. We don't know. And, you know, let's look at it and see if it's providing the benefits we wanted or the outcomes. Is it negatively affecting us?

So no, I think that would be fine. My only point was is that really kind of a goal, you know, a pilot is very important when you have a measure because you don't want to implement that and then fail at where this is a goal, you know. It's not important.

But the more I think about it, I think it would delay a lot of concerns about saying, you know, making it very clear that this is just a pilot, so.

Angie Campbell: And allow us time to do more training and technical assistance, maybe even - and we can capture a lot of it. I'm pulling you into it Duane because our next stage would be to start drafting a teagle if the community - I mean if the council agrees to at least presenting pilot goal is that then we would begin to draft a TEGL.

And what we can do again is to set up another teleconference perhaps with the effective management workable - even with the full council again - to get it. So you will have beforehand an idea of what will be rolled out in training at the national conference. And also too we could look at putting out some webinars option. So I mean in terms of training and making it a pilot, I think that's a very good idea Mrs. Shirley. And thank you all for your comments.

Julia Davis-Wheeler: Madam Chairman?

Lorenda Sanchez: Yes.

Julia Davis-Wheeler: Yes, this is Julia Davis-Wheeler with region six. I'm sorry. I had to go off of the call. My battery went dead on me and I got back on. So I missed a little bit of the discussion.

I really appreciated your comments Madam Chairman regarding the programs and we don't want to overlook the programs and those that are small. I really liked that comment.

The only concern I have would be I guess on a tougher side looking at what we would need to do on proper tribal consultation regarding our programs, you know, meeting with them, getting this information out. And I'm sure there's a lot of them on the call now listening, wanting to say things, you

know, wanting to comment. And so I would hope that we see something in writing Madam Chairman.

And I like the proposal of the pilot by Darrell Waldron. I think that would be a good way to go. And I don't know what the motion was but I hope that we could work that out. But again, my concern is tribal consultation - whether we have to go back to the Department of Office Management and Budget for approval or whether we could just do it ourselves within house. That would be my concern. Thank you.

Lorenda Sanchez: Thank you. And I also believe we need to remember that there are some immediate fixes in Bear Tracks that would need to be done for the pilot - correct Duane?

Duane Hall: Yes. I mean we can still calculate it Lorenda you know. But we can call it a pilot. It depends on how, you know, whatever how the council would like to do this. But if you want to call it a pilot until Bear Tracks is fixed or you could say we're not going to make it a pilot until Bear Tracks is fixed. I think saying it's a pilot and it's a goal that, you know, we would - definitely what we could do is before we go off the pilot and say this is going to be a goal for the program - make sure Bear Tracks is fixed. That certainly seems reasonable.

Dr. David Gipp: This is Councilman Gipp.

I'm wondering if Councilman Waldron wants to put that into a motion that we would try that we would recommend that a pilot program along with the criteria that's been developed to date might be tested or might be tried as a pilot program for those that would wish to participate and then come back with the results of that and see what our final recommendations would be.

Darrell Waldron: Yes. This is Councilman Waldron. I would be prepared to put that into the form of a motion. I'd like to put a small caveat on it that if the pilot shows negativity towards the results in our communities that the full measure come back on the table for discussion with the powers that be back to what, you know, we were originally looking at that we felt was going to be a positive to our community. So, you know, we'd have the opportunity to test this and to see just how it does.

So yes, I would do that in a motion.

Dr. David Gipp: I would second. Councilman Gipp here.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay. There's a motion to test the credential goal in a pilot program and evaluate the results with consideration of the original full measure should the results not be in the best interest of the grantees.

Duane Hall: Sounds good.

Darrell Waldron: Yes, excellent. That's my motion. Yes.

Duane Hall: Councilman Waldron you are very, very articulate in your motions.

Darrell Waldron: Thank you.

Lorenda Sanchez: Is there discussion?

Angie Campbell: Lorenda Chair, I have a quick question. In terms of really just throwing out - how would you like the department to go forward because, you know, designing the pilot, what it would look like, how long it will exist, you know, the number of grantees that will participate and all of those other, you know,

fine details. How would you like for the department to go forward? I know we're going to put together a TEGL and write the TEGL and use - capture the verbiage that counsel's putting forward.

Do you recommend or should we come back and have another teleconference regarding the teagle that's put together or how would you like for us to manage that part before we make a full recommendation on the pilot study itself?

Duane Hall: I would like to make a recommendation on that as well - after Mrs. Sanchez or before?

Lorenda Sanchez: You can comment Duane.

Duane Hall: Yes. Lorenda on the pilot, one way we could do it is give the training through webinars - intensive training conferences - and have grantees, you know, make it clear that we want, you know, that this is a good thing and, you know, we'd like to strive to get more people in training - get people a credential.

And then, you know, at a certain timeframe - maybe at the end of next year - see how folks did. And some people may not be good and we find out why and they say well, we just chose not to do it and that's fine. We get an idea. So in other words, you wouldn't have, you know, people volunteering for the pilot. We would just, you know, we'd be doing it just like we normally would. We would give the training and we'd get those results back in because the data's embedded in Bear Tracks. So we're going to get it on all the grantees anyway.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay. I would request that the - that Duane do a review of the grantee community at this point with the data that you have so that we can have like a ballpark percentage of where we are from PY11 the city would look at.

Duane Hall: Sure.

Lorenda Sanchez: And if we're looking at rolling it out as a pilot for next program year, I believe we need to get it outlined. And if it's going to go through the TEGL process, I would have the department prepare that. But because of the number of comments that were made and also because there were a number of people that I believe are on this call that the council does have an opportunity to review the TEGL again before it is actually issued Angie. And we also would have, you know, maybe the information from Duane on what we look like at this point.

Angie Campbell: That's agreeable.

Duane Hall: That's fine.

Darrell Waldron: Madam Chair?

Lorenda Sanchez: Councilman Waldron?

Darrell Waldron: All of that discussion is not part of my motion but my original motion that I made - maybe we could get it voted on and then go into that language.

Lorenda Sanchez: Of course.

Duane Hall: That would be my suggestion Madam Chair - vote on his motion and then take up the second matter in either a second motion and or discussion.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay. All right, the motion's been on the floor for us to move forward and test the program - the pilot program - and evaluate the results to see if we need to go back to the original full measure on behalf of the grantees. Is there a question?

Julia Davis-Wheeler: Madam Chairman, the only concern I would have - this is Julia Davis-Wheeler with region six - the timeline. Could we - Councilman Waldron and Mr. Dr. (Gipp) - did you have a timeline that you were looking at?

Darrell Waldron: I did not have a timeline. I think that that could be discussed immediately after the vote for this motion. Then we could make a second motion and put those details in place. This is just on the pilot and the results of the pilot. So I am hoping for that.

Julia Davis-Wheeler: Okay. Thank you.

Lorenda Sanchez: Questions? Questions been called. We will go through roll call vote again for this motion.

Region one?

Darrell Waldron: Darrell Waldron - in favor.

Dr. (Stapp): I got a question. This is Dr. (Stapp) down in Dallas. What exactly is the motion again because it's been tweaked around so many times? So what's the motion that we're voting on?

Lorenda Sanchez: The motion is that we would test the credential goal as a pilot program, evaluate the results and if they were not favorable then we would go back to the full measure that was previously on the table for the grantees.

Dr. (Stapp): The full measure being it's the fourth option as a measure?

Lorenda Sanchez: Are we talking about the education measure Councilman Waldron?

Darrell Waldron: Yes. Sorry, I had you on mute. I was answering yes.

Dr. (Stapp): So we're saying if we - after we pilot it and this is piloting it for everyone and if we don't like it then we'll go back to what's on the table from labor being it's a fourth optional measure versus a goal?

Darrell Waldron: Yes but they haven't - the details on who and how many is not part of my motion. That would come up after this motion passes in more detail with possibly a second motion.

Lorenda Sanchez: I think Dr. (Stapp) is looking for which measure are we going to put back on the table if the results are not favorable for us. Is it the motion that was put together - the measure that was approved for the credentials or is it the education measure?

Darrell Waldron: It's the original education measure.

Duane Hall: I'm not sure if the department can comment during this process but at some point I would like to speak on that issue.

Lorenda Sanchez: It's the education measure Dr. (Stapp).

Dr. (Stapp):   Okay but the education measure as an optional fourth measure?

Darrell Waldron: Yes, I believe that's how it was presented.

Dr. (Stapp):   Okay. Okay well I was kind of under the impression that we as a council didn't want to accept the way that labor had tweaked it and changed it to being the mandatory first three and then educational credential measure being an optional fourth. I thought we collectively did not want that. So I didn't know if the motion would need to go back to that. If we didn't like the pilot then we just didn't like the pilot.

Darrell Waldron: Well the objective of the motion was not to lose the time and energies and effort put forth in bringing the education measure this far. There was some concern about the results of the credential or goal and that it may undue stress on smaller grantees. And so we've been at this for a long time. The original measure that we had put forth was somewhat of a measure - a menu of measures - selecting the education credentials for those who wanted to and those who did not would stick with the other three measures.

So it's just that we keep running into time discussions and great deals of energy on this and it was just okay, let's try the pilot. And if it doesn't work - if it is very negative, let's go back to originally what we were discussing to benefit our community.

Duane Hall: I don't want to step out of line here or break protocol but I think there's, you know, something we need to consider on that and that is, you know, going back to the original decision by the assistant secretary - it's going to - the outcomes would be the same.

So, you know, if you say well we don't like the credential goal. We're going to go back to an education measure and make it optional. The way the education measure is defined and the way the credential goal is defined are the same thing. So if you don't like the credential goal, you're certainly not going to like it when it's a measure because it's calculated the same way.

And then if you don't like it, you're probably not going to choose it and then we might have a situation where you really don't have an education measure because nobody selected it or only a handful of people selected it. Maybe to help with that, the motion is to say look how it's defined. If you don't like it - if you don't like the pilot or the goal, maybe look at how it's defined or how we do it.

We're going back to what was proposed by the assistant secretary. It's the definition stays the same. It's just becoming an optional measure. So if you didn't like the goal, you're not going to like it as a measure either.

Darrell Waldron: I thought that we liked what we had put forth and then it was changed.

Dr. (Stapp):   Correct Darrell. We did like what we put forth but then it was redone.

Darrell Waldron: Right. So, you know, I'm just trying to get back to it if this doesn't work. And, you know, I mean we could change it open to discussion for reevaluation but I'm just trying to stop the merry-go-round and get to it.

Dr. (Stapp):   Sure.

Duane Hall: And Darrell I don't want to add to the merry-go-round but I think the key point is, is that, you know, the reason we proposed this is because the initial decision by the assistant secretary - she didn't really have any other options or

there wasn't any other options on that decision paper. So if she didn't choose the kind of menu approach, this was the only other option.

And I think it's important for the council to consider if they don't like that measure, they're not going to pick it and basically you don't have a measure if nobody picks it or very few people pick it. It's hard to make a goal - I mean it's hard to make a measure optional. You know, it's kind of like if, you know, my goal for the next year is to be able to run a 5K and then say but it's optional. Well are you going to do this or not going to do it?

I don't know if an option when it comes to this - I'm not sure if that makes sense. I mean...

Angie Campbell: Okay, this is - excuse me. I'm sorry. This is Angie. And in interest of time we have three minutes and we will either have to put a motion on the table regarding Darrell's motion on the floor for the council's consideration or...

Darrell Waldron: Yes. There's a motion on the floor that has been made and seconded and we were calling the vote. You know, my motion will stand as it was and I would like to continue with the vote. I was voting and I vote in favor.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay. And I think for clarification for Dr. (Stapp) that the credential that was approved was a stipulation to be an optional measure in addition to the three existing common measures with what the counsel had put forward in their October meeting. And I think that's what Darrell is looking at. Correct Darrell?

Darrell Waldron: Yes, absolutely.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay.

Region two? Region Three?

Elk Richardson: Elk Richardson votes in favor of the motion.

Lorenda Sanchez: Region four?

Kim Carroll: Not present.

Dr. (Stapp): Yes, so my vote is for it, okay. If I'm understanding it correctly Darrell we go back and consider it again, right, if we don't like the goal.

Darrell Waldron: Yes, right.

Dr. (Stapp): Okay. Yes, I vote yes.

Lorenda Sanchez: Region five.

(Molle): Councilwoman (Molle). I vote yes for the motion.

Lorenda Sanchez: Councilwoman James?

Region six?

Julia Davis-Wheeler: This is Julia Davis-Wheeler.

Jessica James: Sorry.

Julia Davis-Wheeler: Oh, go ahead.

Jessica James: I was on mute. This is Councilwoman Jessica James and I am in favor of the motion.

Lorenda Sanchez: Thank you.

Region six?

Julia Davis-Wheeler: Yes, thank you Madam Chairman. This is Councilwoman Julia Davis-Wheeler region six and I am in favor.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay.

Winona Whitman: This is Winona Whitman from Hawaii and I vote in favor.

Lorenda Sanchez: Oklahoma?

CarlaBowlan: Carla Bowlan. I vote - it's a vote in favor.

Lorenda Sanchez: Other disciplines?

(Jacob Bernal): (Bernal) in favor.

Roselyn Shirley: This is Roselyn Shirley Navajo Nation - vote yes.

Dr. David Gipp: Councilman Gipp special interest to colleges - title colleges. Yes.

Ryman LeBeau: This is Ryman LeBeau. I vote yes.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay. Lorenda Sanchez region six - yes.

Okay. The motion passes.

Darrell Waldron: Madam Chair?

Lorenda Sanchez: Councilman Waldron.

Darrell Waldron: I would just like to give credit to Councilwoman Roselyn Shirley. It was actually her idea that was presented out on the pilot and I appreciate those thoughts and I was glad that it was carried forward. Thank you everybody.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay. Angie is there a timeline that will work for the department?

Angie Campbell: Duane as the primary point of contact, I don't want to put a timeline on it for you. So what is a good timeline for you Duane?

Duane Hall: Yes. Sure Angie. Just to clarify whether the timeline's on how long the pilot will ask when we go back and look at this or to get the teagle out - just to clarify.

Angie Campbell: Well there was a couple. One was an analysis of the 166 PY11 data. That was one request.

Duane Hall: Sure. We have that. That can go out - I would say - within, you know, I got some things on my plate but, you know, within a month or so and just send that out to the council members.

Angie Campbell: Okay. And then also too we had planned to have the TEGL drafted by February 19th so we could maintain the February 19th date and then still work with our contractor to develop a schedule to rollout some webinars and then

also still plan to do a presentation at the national conference. And so we would have the PY data within 30 days you had said Duane.

Duane Hall: Have what in 30 days?

Angie Campbell: The PY11 data.

Duane Hall: Yes. No, we can get that out to the council. I don't want to hold myself to a month but possibly no later than, you know, 45 days to two months. I should be able to get it to the council within the next 30 days.

Angie Campbell: Okay, so within 30 days. And then also too we had agreed that we're going to at least have a good working draft of the TEGL by February 19th. And so that was the second deliverable. And then also too, once the TEGL is generated and we could probably all do a meeting in the interim with the effective management workgroup or some members (unintelligible) have a good - present that draft before we come back to the council again.

So in terms of getting the data - drafting a TEGL because it would come out in a TEGL - and then our training strategy would be - February, March, April, May, June, June - five months.

And at that time the TEGL for example will lay out specifically what the pilot would consist of - well I'm looking at the whole community but we'll talk - we'll back brief the council and then the effective management workgroup also to that it would be for one year - maybe from one program year to the next program year. Or perhaps, you know, then that way we would have the new planning cycle. So it would be one program year and consistent with a new SGA that would come out at the end of - beginning of next year.

So I would think one year but we could put together the TEGL and have more guidance. So I know that this teleconference is - I think the more we do it, the better we'll get at it. But it is a way for us to get together. We don't have to wait until April to discuss this. We can set up a meeting - a full council meeting - or an effective management workgroup meeting soon after the TEGL is generated in March, for example, if the council desires.

And then we could, you know, share the data that's developed, share the good working TEGL. We'll get it out well in advance so the council members can look at it and study it and then have a good idea of what's being proposed and if it in fact captures what's being requested by the council.

The problem we'll have to do - what we still have to do is we have to update the 9084, 9085 forms. And in the interest of time, they expire in May. So we would still be able to present that maybe at a March meeting. So I would say within five months we would be able to at least get the teagle out and then do the study within the year.

Duane Hall: So it's my understanding we take this off the - I mean as a recommendation - take this off the form. And during the pilot phase, does the council feel it would be better for grantees to see how they're doing on the form - have this as a pilot - or because it's a pilot, you may not want to put it on the form and we provide some other method of sharing the data with the grantees?

Dr. (Stapp):   What other method?

Angie Campbell: Well we can't collect it unless it's on the form. And that's why we were trying to because we only need to get OMB clearance every three years and these forms expire on May 17th - 13th - of 2013. And we cannot - meaning the department collecting information - unless it's on the form.

Duane Hall: Angie it's embedded in the - I mean we get the data right now. It's not on the form but, you know, we did calculations for PY2010 and 2011. So we can do the calculation - even if it's not on the form - and send it to folks.

Angie Campbell: Right.

Man: Madam Chair, this is...

Angie Campbell: But in terms of the interest of time, we're talking about doing a year study and the forms don't expire for another three years, you know. It is probably beyond the scope of this conversation. We can talk offline. But Madam Chair, you had asked, you know, for the dates. And so the outline would be that we would have the program year 2011 data within 30 days. We'll have a draft TEGL - it's delivered - it's supposed to be within the Department of Labor by the 19th of February.

And then I would also recommend that we could either come back and present what we have to the effective management workgroup or the full council and we again could do it via teleconference - maybe improve the acoustics and how we do process the teleconference. But that would be our recommendations.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay. I see it's easier for us to do it as an effective management workgroup meeting sooner. And if effective management workgroup feels that we need to vote a council, you would have at least a couple of weeks to schedule a full council meeting.

Angie Campbell: That sounds good. And with the, you know, working on the other white paper with Mr. (Bernal) I think that that's a good strategy for the office.

Dr. David Gipp: Madam Chair, this is Councilman Gipp. Unfortunately I have to leave the line. I have another appointment coming up here at this time.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay. I also just want to make sure that some of you may have had access to your emails today. I did have Teresa send out the carriage report on our council activity for the last four years to you all. It's a draft report. I would appreciate your comments and feedback. I'm hoping to have it ready to go to the printer at the end of next week.

So I hope you get a chance to view it and share your comments. And if you did not get it, you know, let me or Teresa know please.

Angie Campbell: Lorenda we have about a minute before the entire conference will be disconnected. I'm going to assign on myself will work directly with Teresa for the department - any input we have on the report. And like so for example, I wasn't for certain if the council wanted to include the PY12 strategy or those areas we've identified as priority for 2012 in this report.

Lorenda Sanchez: They were - they are in the report.

Woman: It is there.

Angie Campbell: Good, good. Okay, good.

Lorenda Sanchez: They're in there but as I was not at the meeting, I've only listed them. If we want to expand them, I would have to have some additional information. It is the PY12 priorities are included in the report.

Angie Campbell: Yes. I see it in the bar graph that's here. Okay.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay.

Okay, I want to also just note that we are planning on having a full face to face council meeting at the national conference. Correct Angie?

Angie Campbell: Yes.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay. Now it's May 2nd and 3rd. So please save the date.

Thank you Duane for your work, Angie for overseeing the department and I thank all the council members for your input and your continued support of the work on behalf of the grantees.

Duane Hall: Thank you.

Group: Thank you.

Man: Thank you very much.

Man: Thank you everybody.

Woman: Thank you. Aloha.

Woman: Did we do a motion to close the meeting?

Woman: Motion to adjourn.

Man: Motion made.

Roselyn Shirley: I move to adjourn. This is Roselyn Shirley.

Lorenda Sanchez: Mrs. Shirley makes a motion to adjourn.

Darrell Waldron: I'll second it - Waldron.

Lorenda Sanchez: Seconded Waldron.

Man: I'll say goodbye.

Lorenda Sanchez: Is there discussion, questions? Questions been called for. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

Group: Aye.

Lorenda Sanchez: Okay. Thank you all very much.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thanks guys.

Woman: Bye.

END