

Workforce Information Advisory Council

Summary of Meeting

November 16–17, 2017

Washington, D.C.

The Workforce Information Advisory Council (WIAC) met for its second meeting of 2016 at 9:00 A.M. on November 16, 2016 at the Janet Norwood Conference and Training Center, Postal Square Building, Washington D.C. The Council was convened pursuant to Section 308 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2014 (WIOA) (Pub. L. 113-128), which amends section 15 of the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 (29 U.S.C. § 491–2) and in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.) and its implementing regulation at 41 CFR 102-3.

Mr. Steven Rietzke, Chief, Division of National Programs, Tools, and Technical Assistance (DNPTTA), Employment and Training Administration (ETA), and Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the Council, convened the meeting, which was chaired by Mr. Graham Slater of Oregon and was open to the public. The two-day meeting of the Council concluded at 4:30 P.M on November 17, 2016.

In Attendance:

Members of the Workforce Information Advisory Council

Aaron Fichtner, New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development

Bruce Madson, Ohio Department of Job and Family Services

Pamela Bucy, Montana Department of Labor and Industry

Graham Slater, Oregon Employment Department (Chair)

Cynthia Forland, Washington State Employment Security Department

Brenda Lisbon, South Carolina Department of Employment and Workforce

Mathew Barewicz, Vermont Department of Labor

Angela Pate, University of Florida Startup Quest, OwnForce, Inc.

Jennifer Zeller, Georgia Power

Mark McKeen, General Motors

Chelsea Orvella, Society of Prof. Engineering Employees in Aerospace, IFPTE Local 2001

Bruce Ferguson, CareerSource of Northeast Florida

Andrew Reamer, George Washington Institute of Public Policy

Members of the Council Not in Attendance

Ellen Golombek, Colorado Department of Labor and Employment

Pamela Bucy, Montana Department of Labor and Industry

Staff

Steve Rietzke, Chief, DNPTTA, ETA (DFO)
Don Haughton, ETA
Mike DeMale, ETA
Alex Nallin, ETA
Lauren Fairley, ETA
Mike Horrigan, BLS
Rebecca Rust, BLS

Lester Coffey, Coffey Consulting, LLC
Roger Therrien, Coffey Consulting, LLC
Dani Abdullah, Coffey Consulting, LLC
JJ Ketchum, Coffey Consulting LLC
Abby Miller, Coffey Consulting, LLC
Mason Erwin, Coffey Consulting, LLC

Attendees Offering Comments or Called Upon to Address the Council

Mike Horrigan, Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics, BLS
Bill Anderson, Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation
Jonathan Finamore, National Science Foundation
Javier Miranda, U.S. Census Bureau, Commerce
Melinda Kaufman, U.S. Rehabilitation Services Administration, ED
Mauricaio Ortiz, U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, Commerce
Rebecca Rust, Occupational Employment Statistics and Projections, BLS
Gay Gilbert, Administrator for the Office of Unemployment Insurance, ETA
Jake Claylaw, The Madison Group, on behalf of the Association for Enterprise Opportunity
Douglas J. Holmes, UWC – Strategic Services on Unemployment & Workers' Compensation
Aneesh Chopra, former Chief Technology Officer of the United States

Others Attending for All or a Portion of the Meeting

Andrew Rogers, Center for Regional Economic Competitiveness (CREC)
Haden Springer, Center for Regional Economic Competitiveness (CREC)
Joe Jaroscak, Center for Regional Economic Competitiveness (CREC)
Kim Vitelli, Office of Workforce Development, ETA, DOL
Christina Pena, Workforce Data Quality Campaign (WDQC)

Day One Proceedings

Members' Briefing and Update on Work Group Activities

MR. RIETZKE convened the meeting, welcomed the members, and offered opening remarks on the agenda for the first day. He then introduced the Council chair, **MR. SLATER**. The Council members, ETA and BLS staff and members of the public in attendance then introduced themselves, and **MR. SLATER** noted that Council members **ELLEN GOLOMBEK** and **PAMELA BUCY** would not be in attendance. The Council approved the minutes of the previous meeting without comment.

MR. RIETZKE then briefed the Council on the process for the development of the Secretary's two-year workforce and labor market information system plan and issues relating to the transition of administrations. The members were provided with a matrix of the

requirements for the Secretary’s two-year plan developed by the staff for reference. **MR. RIETZKE** informed the Council that the current Department of Labor leadership team would remain in place until January 20, 2017 or such time that a new Secretary was confirmed, and that a transition team was being assembled to brief the incoming leadership. That briefing would include information about the Council. Regarding the two-year plan, **MR. RIETZKE** indicated that, as the Designated Federal Official (DFO) for the WIAC, the Council’s recommendations would be submitted to him, and he would then submit them to the Secretary along with a memo from his office with its recommendations regarding the Council’s product. The goal would be to incorporate the Council’s recommendations into the two-year plan in late 2017.

The Council then discussed the specific requirements for the Secretary’s two-year plan and the Council’s recommendations. **MR. SLATER** emphasized his intent that the Council should strive to develop relationships with key stakeholders and play an active and productive role in the continual development of the nationwide workforce and labor market information (WLMI) system, rather than focus exclusively on the development of recommendations for the Secretary’s two-year plan. **DR. REAMER** noted that the Council’s Charter included directives to consult with the Secretary as well as provide written recommendations and **MS. FORLAND** observed that the Council’s formation had already positively affected the level of collaboration between BLS and ETA. **MS. ZELLER** suggested the possibility of creating an electronic method for the Council to gather input from stakeholders, which the staff agreed to investigate further. **MR. MADSON** suggested that the Council collaborate with other bodies such as NASWA to ensure alignment of the Council’s recommendations with other parallel efforts, and staff pointed out that the Council’s work groups would be an appropriate place for such collaborations.

Informational Presentations

After the morning break, **MR. THERRIEN** of Coffey Consulting, LLC, the contractor providing support to the Council, presented a review of the nationwide WLMI system and additional background documents prepared by the staff, including a lightly modified version of the WLMI infrastructure graphic from the 2012 report “LMI Customers and their Needs,” prepared by the LMI Institute for WIAC’s predecessor, the Workforce Information Council (WIC). The infrastructure chart prompted discussion of the relationships between the primary federal and state statistical agencies, the various support and partner organizations and the customers of WLMI. **MS. FORLAND** noted that chart illustrated the great complexity of the system and that she saw the Council as something of an umbrella organization for the entire system. **MR. SLATER** added that some of the organizations depicted had originally been initiated by state LMI offices and more recently had established associations with other stakeholders to add more formal structure to the system and that this diagram had been evolving steadily for several years. Other members suggested clarification of the monetary relationships among the organizations and others

ways to improve the chart. Representatives of CREC and the LMI Institute attending the meeting added some clarifications and welcomed the members' input on the chart, adding that a companion chart of WLMI customers was planned.

The review included summaries of three WIC reports: "Enhancing UI Wage Records" (2014), "LMI Customers and Their Needs" (2012), and a report on the WIC Skills Initiative (2015), as well as briefs on the U.S. Department of Education's (ED) Privacy Technical Assistance Council and the Evidence-based Policy Making Commission established by the U.S. Congress, all requested by the Council during the previous meeting. **MR. THERRIEN** also shared a detailed look at the matrix of WLMI customers and their needs from the 2012 WIC report along with a list of questions that LMI can answer developed by staff from a review of state WLMI agency websites and a detailed catalog of WLMI related resources, also requested by the Council previously. The members discussed each item, providing comments and feedback. **MR. FICHTNER** suggested the WIAC use a different term than "Real-time LMI" to refer to data scraped from online job postings, which several members supported. **MS. PATE** asked whether a list of providers of data from online job postings could be included, but some members were concerned about the giving the appearance of the Council's endorsement to a private product and also about maintaining such a list. **MR. FICHTNER** and **DR. REAMER** suggested that the list of WLMI customers was a good start, and could tie into the list of priority groups discussed at the last meeting.

During the discussion of the WIC report on enhancing unemployment insurance (UI) wage records, **MR. BAREWICZ** noted that the BLOC also had a current project on enhanced UI wage records, and **MR. SLATER** emphasized the need for the Council to coordinate with the BLOC and other stakeholders on that issue.

After the lunch break, the Council heard from the co-chairs of the BLOC, **Mike Horrigan**, Associate Commissioner for Employment and Unemployment at BLS and **Bill Anderson**, Chief Economist at the Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation, who briefed the Council on the history and current work of the BLOC. **MR. HARRIGAN** and **MR. ANDERSON** described how, with the passage of WIOA, the role of governance over the federal-state partnership WLMI programs had been passed from the WIC to the BLOC, whereas the WIAC had assumed the broader, system-wide focus from the WIC. They reported that the policy councils will continue to handle technical issues for each federal-state program and coordinate with the BLOC any key decisions, action items or issues for which they need BLOC input. In addition, the BLOC will focus on areas such as resource management, coordination of the flow of information between partners in the system, data gaps, new opportunities, and maintaining and improving WLMI data quality. They also explained that the BLOC had provided a forum for the states' Projections Managing Partnership, but that since it is funded by ETA the WIAC could exercise jurisdiction over it, if desired. **Mr. Horrigan** also listed current projects of the BLOC, including converting the QCEW refiling survey to a stratified quarterly sample with quick

response capability; converting the wages produced from the Occupational Employment Statics (OES) program to a time series; reviewing benchmarking methods in the CES to make state and national estimates consistent; providing better documentation for the local estimates from LAUS; changing the production cycle for projections from biennial to annual; modeling JOLTS to include state estimates; and potentially, creating a work group to look at the variability in the state unemployment statistics program.

DR. REAMER asked about how BLS plans to meet the legislative requirement to provide mass layoff statistics, and **MR. HARRIGAN** suggested that enhanced UI wage records might support data to address the need.

MR. HARRIGAN and **MR. RIETZKE** discussed the potential for WIAC to refer highly technical issues to the BLOC, and for the BLOC and WIAC to cooperate on future work, especially through their respective subcommittees or work groups.

MR. SLATER then asked the several representatives of other federal agencies in the gallery to introduce themselves provide brief statements about their agencies' activities of interest to the Council.

MR. JONATHAN FINAMORE of the Center for Science and Engineering Statistics at the National Science Foundation spoke about the Center's two surveys on the science and engineering workforce: the National Survey of College Graduates and the Survey of Doctor Recipients. He described how both are longitudinal surveys that track participants from postsecondary education through age seventy-five. The surveys, he added, capture information about students who study science and engineering, regardless of whether they go on to work in related fields, and that their data has been used by the Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce. **MR. HARRIGAN** noted that BLS also has longitudinal data on two cohorts in its National Longitudinal Survey of Youth.

MR. JAVIER MIRANDA of the Center for Administrative Records Research and Applications of the U.S. Census Bureau described his bureau's expansive mandate to collect data for statistical purposes from both surveys and administrative records. He added that the Census Bureau had been directed, and provided with funding, to make its data available for program evaluation purposes. He also briefly described the Local Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) program, under which states provide the Census Bureau with UI wage records, through which it makes aggregate data available for public use. Dr. Reamer then asked Mr. Miranda about the Census Bureau's partnership with the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC), a private organization that collects information about the academic records of postsecondary education students. Mr. Miranda provide an overview of two pilot projects underway with the NSC, one looking at how well education records can be matched with earnings data from five different states and one looking a program outcomes in the state of Texas.

MS. MELINDA KAUFMAN from the ED's Rehabilitation Services Administration described the RSA's role in funding state rehabilitation and training programs for disabled persons, including apprenticeships and on-the-job training, as well as employment assistance.

MR. MAURICIO ORTIZ of the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) provided an overview of the BEA's regional compensation and employment estimates. These estimates, he informed the Council, begin with the BEA's national income and product accounts while the local estimates, down to the county and metro levels, are filled in with data from a variety of sources, including the QCEW, retirement contributions, and health insurance, Medicaid and Medicare records, among others. He reported that the BEA also has an agreement with the IRS to use tax filings for self-employed persons and sole proprietorships to add more detail to its estimates. He also touched briefly upon the BEA's Regional Price Parities program, which produces indices that can be used to adjust incomes from different states to arrive at real income estimates.

Following those statements, **MR. HORRIGAN** and **MS. REBECCA RUST**, Assistant Commissioner for Occupational Statistics and Employment Projections at the BLS, provided the Council with an overview of recent work at BLS to identify in-demand jobs.

MS. RUST began by describing some of the methods that BLS has learned are used by states to identify in-demand occupations, given that WIOA requires the states to identify occupations that are in demand but leaves the methodology for doing so up to each state's discretion. In many states, she reported, they look at the percent growth anticipated by the state and establish a threshold, such as the mean, above which occupations are determined to be in demand. She added that some states also impose a minimum average wage for occupations to be considered in-demand and some also look at the number of jobs created, to filter out occupations with a high anticipated growth rate but a small number of openings. Furthermore, **MS. RUST** noted that states have broad discretion to add other criteria, such as occupations in industries that the state seeks to encourage as a matter of policy.

MS. RUST also described several alternative methods of identifying in-demand occupations, including work done by the BLS toward converting the OES to a time series. If successful, this would allow analysts to compare OES statistics from year-to-year, which cannot currently be done because the program uses different samples every three years. She also noted that some states perform job vacancy or skills gap surveys but that funding for such efforts is not available in all states, and that some states are making use of analytics based on on-line job postings, which can be updated frequently but may have quality and reliability concerns. Finally, she added that some states use

requests for customized training from employers as a way to identify in-demand occupations.

In response, **MR. MCKEEN** suggested that sponsored job ads might provide a more reliable indicator of occupational demand. **MS. ZELLER** noted that mass layoffs can create local over-supplies of labor in specific occupations that may attract other employers. **MR. FERGUSON** described a project carried out in his workforce region to create a technical program at a local college where employees of a regional hospital group earned technical awards to qualify them for better paying positions that the hospitals had struggled to fill. **MS. PATE** expressed her concern over recruiting students and job-seekers into occupations seen by them as less desirable, even when training programs have been well-aligned with projected demand.

MR. MADSON stated that his agency begins by identifying key industries and then reviews job postings from major employers in those industries to identify in-demand occupations, consulting with the major employers to further validate demand and educational requirements. **MS. FORLAND** described how her agency allows local workforce boards to add or remove occupations from their list of in-demand jobs based their local intelligence. **MR. BAREWICZ** emphasized the importance of the raw number of anticipated job openings due the relatively small population in his state, and also noted a concern about the potential costs and benefits of converting the OES program to an annual time series. **MS. LISBON** reported that her state looks at projected growth with a wage threshold, but has recently begun making more use of analyses of on-line job postings. **MR. FICHTNER** described his state's success with assigning analysts to industry groups, enabling them to stay in close touch with occupational demand, and added his concern about the lack of information being collected about in-demand credentials.

MR. HARRIGAN then spoke in greater detail about a method for identifying well-paying, in-demand jobs that is still in development by BLS. The method entails grouping occupations by the typical level of educational attainment required to enter them and then filtering for occupations that had experienced growth above the 75% percentile and did not have small overall employment levels, as well as eliminating occupations that composed large shares of jobs in industries that had seen employment declines. **MR. HARRIGAN** concluded that this preliminary exploration of a method of identifying in-demand jobs has produced a list of occupations that made sense and had higher than average growth and mean wages in 2015. He added that converting the OES program to an annual time-series would allow for year-over-year comparisons using a similar methodology, and could also serve as a proof-of-concept for using a sampling and modeling approach to generate better estimates of employment down to the metropolitan statistical area geographic level.

In the following discussion, **MR. HERRIGAN** stated that this approach was new and still in early stages of development. **MR. SLATER** observed this could be an opportunity for the states to work with the federal agencies to develop a standard nationwide approach, but also noted that employment estimates in his state based on a sampling and modeling approach would be problematic due to the small populations in some rural areas. **MR. HERRIGAN** suggested that the new approach would allow for data-driven improvement of the estimates, which **MR. SLATER** acknowledged, cautioning the effort might meet some resistance based on historical precedent for similar changes. **MR. HERRIGAN** affirmed BLS's commitment to improvements in the OES data without lowering the quality of the data.

Following **MR. HERRIGAN's** presentation, the Council continued to discuss issues around the identification of in-demand jobs. **DR. REAMER** then inquired about ETA's efforts to facilitate the identification of in-demand jobs. **MS. KIM VITELLI**, deputy administrator for the ETA's Office of Workforce Investment, who was in attendance, replied that there was an opportunity for ETA to help disseminate information about approaches to identification of in-demand jobs to state agencies. She also suggested that NASWA and the BLOC could help facilitate sharing and conversation. **DR. REAMER** further noted that additional context beyond identification of in-demand would be needed to allow end users to utilize the information effectively.

MR. RIETZKE added that attendees at a recent joint meeting of two NASWA committees were looking to ETA to be a facilitator in that conversation. **MS. FORLAND** expressed excitement at the efforts of the federal agencies to help define in-demand jobs, given the lack of specificity found in WIOA.

MR. SLATER concluded the discussion by suggesting that the topic of identifying in-demand jobs fell within the purview of the Council, as per its Charter, and therefore it could be something the Council could take with a work group. **MR. BAREWICZ** advocated for a system of state-level solutions due to variations in labor markets and policy goals among the states, and **MR. SLATER** suggested that a balance could potentially be struck between nationwide and state-level approaches.

Discussion of Draft Informational Report

MR. SLATER next introduced the Council's discussion of the draft informational report prepared by the planning work group formed to compose the report at Council's previous meeting. **MR. SLATER** related that in its initial meeting, the planning work group had agreed that it would like to present a product to the incoming administration in February 2017 that would brief the DOL's new leadership on the nationwide WLM system and the role of the WIAC, as provided in WIOA. **MR. SLATER** then called for a discussion of the draft among the members. During the discussion, it was reported by

MR. RIETZKE that he anticipated the DOL would prepare briefs for the new leadership team on its ongoing programs and activities, that the brief from his office would include information about the WIAC, and that the WIAC's informational report would be conveyed to the incoming Secretary and leadership team with those materials.

There was general agreement among the members on the importance of using the document to make the case for the maintenance and continued strengthening of the nationwide WLMI system. It was also generally agreed that the product should clearly link key priorities to their intended benefits and end user groups who would benefit from them. Furthermore, it was suggested and generally agreed that a four-page brief focusing on priorities for the nationwide WLMI system, laid out in a visually attractive manner and published on glossy paper would be preferable longer report-style product. **MR. FICHTNER** underlined the importance of making a strong case for the importance of WLMI to the incoming administration, and Ms. Forland agreed, highlighting the need to garner strong support from a broad audience.

The Council discussed the overall organization of the product and provided feedback on the content that had been presented by the planning work group. **MR. MCKEEN** suggested the product should make clear that WLMI plays an important role in the sub-state allocation of resources. **MR. SLATER** suggested moving portions of the narrative that established the critical needs of a broad range of customers to the beginning of the product. **MS. FORLAND** and **MR. FICHTNER** stressed that this product would be an opportunity to make the case the priorities identified to a broad audience by emphasizing value of WLMI to a broad range of end users, while **DR. REAMER** suggested also appealing to the established constituencies for existing federal programs and audiences with a focus on programmatic costs and benefits. **MS. PATE** suggested emphasizing the business community as a key end user and the importance WLMI driven workforce development in meeting business needs. **MS. ZELLER** added that testimonials from business and other users that rely on quality WLMI could add help establish the value of the priorities identified.

MR. SLATER inquired about the audience for the informational report, in contrast to the audience for the Council's recommendations for the Secretary's two-year plan. **MR. RIETZKE** replied that as the Designated Federal Official for the WIAC he would deliver the Council's recommendations to the Secretary, along with an accompanying memo from his office. Furthermore, the Council's recommendations would be included in the Secretary's two-year plan, which would be delivered to the appropriate committees of the U.S. House and Senate. He also indicated that the informational report currently under discussion would be provided to the incoming Secretary as part of the transition process. **MR. FICHTNER** suggested that it would be desirable to have a product that could also start conversations among other stakeholders. **MS. FORLAND** suggested a shorter,

fold-out product, and emphasized the importance of delivering briefs for the incoming leadership.

MS. LISBON suggested that the product should focus on a few select questions that WLMI can answer rather than attempting to present a comprehensive list, and **MR. MCKEEN** agreed. **DR. REAMER** suggested presenting the questions that LMI can answer as a matrix, relating the questions to key customer groups. **MS. ORVELLA** noted the value of maintaining a balance between employers, workers, the community, and education, and suggested including an explicit reference to career and technical education. **MS. PATE** suggested including a reference to the changing structure of work, which **MR. SLATER** agreed would fit well as a data gap. Dr. Reamer offered support for placing a description of the critical need for WLMI and a discussion of its end users at the beginning of the product, identifying them as most vital portions of the narrative.

The Council continued to discuss the draft document prepared by the planning work group, turning to the included list of four broad categories of priorities drafted by **MR. FICHTNER** based on the discussion from the Council's previous meeting:

- 1) Informing Career Decisions of Students and Adults;
- 2) Aligning Workforce and Education Investments with Industry Needs;
- 3) Understanding the Characteristics of the Workforce; and
- 4) Determining the Effectiveness of Education and Workforce Programs.

There was general agreement about the categories included in the draft. **MS. PATE** suggested including a testimonial for the category on aligning with business needs, and **MR. FICHTNER** suggested that the members could probably find testimonials to go with all four categories. The Council discussed the merits of various terminologies to describe end users of WLMI on the labor supply side, as well as terminology for programs to develop human capital. **MS. PATE** emphasized that targeted training, as opposed to education more broadly, played a key role in preparing many individuals for work.

The Council also discussed including statements of values and principles, and there was general agreement that the draft versions presented were a low priority for the product under discussion.

Day Two Proceedings

Discussion of Draft Informational Report

The Council began the second day with brief statements from **DR. REAMER** and **MR. SLATER** on the history and role of the LMI Institute and from **DR. REAMER** on a Federal Register notice that had appeared the day before detailing the Census Bureau's request

to the Office of Management and Budget for approval to collect additional administrative records from the states, which was related to the pilot projects described to the Council by **MR. MIRANDA** during the first day's proceedings.

The Council then resumed its discussion of the draft informational report prepared by the planning work group. **MR. SLATER** moved the discussion to the task of identifying key priorities. **MR. FICHTNER** suggested leading with specific priorities, rather than the priority themes the Council had developed during its first meeting. **MS. FORLAND** agreed, and **MR. MADSON** suggested it would be important to link the priorities to the problems they were intended to solve. Dr. Reamer added that the priorities identified should be actionable and tied to decision making in the labor market. **MR. SLATER** summarized the vision for the product articulated to that point as starting with the fundamental importance of WLMI, then relating the end users of the system and their needs, and finally identifying the current gaps in the system and the Council's recommendations for addressing them. **MR. MCKEEN** expressed that developing new tools to make WLMI data more accessible to end users should be a key priority. **MR. FICHTNER** stated that the informational product should view funding as challenge for the system, but not problem to be solved by the system and supported **MR. MCKEEN'S** suggestion of development new tools for end users.

The discussion then turned to identifying key priorities associated with each of the four categories discussed on the first day. Under the heading of *Informing Career Decisions of Students and Adults*, **MR. BAREWICZ** suggested enhancing the use of WLMI data by end users as key priority. **MR. FICHTNER** suggested gaining a better understanding of alternative work arrangements. **DR. REAMER** added that better aligning the career resources produced by the DOL and its partners should be a priority, such as the occupational definitions from the OES, the Occupational Outlook Handbook (OOH), CareerOneStop, the Competency Model Clearinghouse (CMC), and O*NET, as should developing better data on occupational outcomes for educational programs. **MS. FORLAND** noted that responsibility for tracking educational outcomes fell to the states, in accordance with WIOA. **MR. BAREWICZ** added that MyNextMove and MySkillsMyFuture are also effective career resources, and that the Council could look for ways for states leverage federal efforts such as those. **Ms. Zeller** suggested identifying in-demand jobs, and raised the example of providing educational and career pathway apps to high school students.

MR. SLATER inquired as to whether facilitating consistency in WLMI user interfaces among the states should be a priority. **MR. FICHTNER** suggested putting more emphasis on ensuring that the state systems delivered all the information end users need to make good labor market decisions. **MS. PATE** offered an example of students needing access to systems that identify careers and pathways in making the case for a more capable user

interface for the WLMI system. **MR. MCKEEN** added that some commercially available products based on online job postings provide a user friendly interface. **DR. REAMER** noted a project to create an open database of credential programs and industry certifications with standardized terminology, whereas **Ms. PATE** advocated for an open data approach that would by-pass such a database.

MR. SLATER summarized the discussion as having emphasized the following priorities: improving career decision-making, identifying the changing structure of work in the economy, enhancing the use and accessibility of WLMI data, and producing data on the occupational outcomes of education and training programs.

The members then briefly discussed the role of the nationwide WLMI system in educating young workers about alternative work arrangements. **Ms. ZELLER** suggested a strategy of tying educational and career choice to concrete lifestyle consequences. **Ms. PATE** noted a local effort in her area to create programs for workers in alternative arrangements.

The Council then turned to discussion of the second category: *Aligning Workforce and Education Investments with Industry Needs*. **Ms. Forland** raised the importance of developing better data on the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA) needed by employers and communicating to students that many seemingly outmoded careers now require very technical skills. **Ms. PATE** added that other factors, such as seasonality, cyclicity, and quality of work were also important, and that employers continue to have difficulty filling positions in low-tech fields. **DR. REAMER** reiterated as a priority the potential of existing programs such as O*NET to help connect occupational data to demand for skills, if it could be updated more frequently. **MR. MCKEEN** noted that policy makers were another important end user group who had not been discussed, noting that gaps in WLMI data could lead to poor policy decisions. **Ms. FORLAND** added that gaps in WLMI data also affect private businesses, and that addressing those gaps would help prevent public and private money from being wasted.

Ms. LISBON emphasized the need to improve the sharing of data among data producers and improve communication with the nationwide WLMI system, especially with the education sector. **MR. FICHTNER** suggested that generating better data on skills gaps could help identify areas where real skills gaps existed. **Ms. ZELLER** noted that her employers use commercial data vendors to create heat maps of projected employment levels down the ZIP code level looking out five years. **MR. MCKEEN** added that his firm uses data from commercial vendors to identify skills gaps and build talent pipelines with educational institutions. **MR. HARRIGAN** suggested that resources such as O*NET might be more useful in identifying skills gaps from occupational projections if those resources were updated more frequently. **MR. RIETZKE** reported that O*NET and

CareerOneStop had recent begun using online job postings to identify in-demand skills and certifications, respectively.

In summary, **MR. SLATER** observed that several of the priorities identified had a relation to O*NET, such as understanding KSAs, and identifying in-demand skills and skills gaps.

Informational Presentation

Next, the Council heard briefly from **GAY GILBERT**, Director of Office of the Unemployment Insurance at DOL, and **Ms. RUST** on the topic of enhanced UI wage records. **Ms. GILBERT** noted that WIOA had put great demands on UI wage records, and that Mr. Horrigan was working on using them for longitudinal analyses and making those analyses available to the states. She also emphasized the need for many stakeholders to be brought to the table in any discussion of enhancing UI wage records. **Ms. Rust** added that the value of enhanced UI wage records is that they would enable analysts to see the occupational outcomes of participants in education, training, and other programs. The current systems, she noted, allows analysts to see the wage and industry of program participants, but not their occupation. She further noted the value of being able to identify real-world career pathways. However, she did acknowledge the need to gather more information about the costs of implementing enhanced UI wage records, and **Ms. GILBERT** noted that an in-depth work group would be need to study the issue.

MR. HARRIGAN added that there would be significant issues to address in terms of whether the quality would be high enough for it to replace the OES program and that BLS was engaged in a pilot project to examine issues around the sharing of administrative records among six states. He also noted that the BLOC was reconstituting a working group on the issue and would need to coordinate with the WIAC if it wanted to take action on this issue. Additionally, he reiterated the intent of the BLS to work with all the affected stakeholders, including employers who would bear some cost of enhancing the records.

Ms. FORLAND suggested that this would be a good issue for the WIAC as a permanent body capable of sustained work. **DR. REAMER** inquired about communications with the state UI administrators, and **Ms. GILBERT** indicated that her office meets with them periodically. **MR. MADSON** noted that this effort could be construed as excessive government regulation. **MR. FICHTNER** and **Ms. PATE** agreed that building consensus among the stakeholders, especially employers, would be important. **MR. HARRIGAN** cautioned that opening a conversation on the topic with the business community could affect many parties.

Public Comment Period

The Council then heard comments from members of the public.

MR. JAKE CLAYLAW, representing the Association for Enterprise Opportunity, commented on how starting a business could be counted as a successful outcome of employment services. He noted that the WIOA permits counting of self-employment as a successful outcome and suggested that business IDs, business licenses, tax filings, or certification documents could be used to track business starts.

MS. PATE noted that her office has seen better results for employment service participants who receive entrepreneurship training. **DR. REAMER** noted that adding indicators to WIOA workforce investment program data collection was not under the purview of the WIAC. **MR. SLATER** added that better counting self-employment outcomes would be of value in policy decision making.

DR. DOUGLAS HOLMES of UWC - Strategic Services on Unemployment & Workers' Compensation, reported to the Council on the testimony of **MICHELLE BEEBE**, Unemployment Insurance Director for Utah to the Human Resources subcommittee of the U.S. House Ways and Means Committee. According to **DR. HOLMES**, **MS. BEEBE** has described a survey conducted by her department and the Workforce Information Council that out of 1,600 responses from 22,000 establishments surveyed, 80 percent indicated that they did not have SOC codes in their human resources systems or that it did not apply to them and that 59 percent opposed wage record enhancement.

MR. SLATER recalled that during the Council's discussion of the topic, the members had acknowledged that a great deal of conversation would need to take place with many stakeholders before any changes were put into effect. **DR. REAMER** asked about the work of the BLS on auto-coding job titles to get SOC codes, thereby potentially relieving establishments of the burden of coding them. **DR. HOLMES** indicated that there were concerns about the quality of auto-coded data, since many employers use unique job titles, among other issues. **MR. HARRIGAN** added that the BLS uses a large database for auto-coding that identifies records where the probability of an accurate match is low and flags it for individual review. **DR. HOLMES** suggested looking first at a voluntary, rather than mandatory program. He further noted that the BLS has had quality issues with auto-coded data from a pilot project in Louisiana.

Finally, the Council heard from **ANEESH CHOPRA**, former Chief Technology Officer of the United States. **MR. CHOPRA** spoke on issues of making job postings open source to improve matching of applicants with openings. He described an employment initiative for veterans under which employers committed to hire veterans. To make job postings from those companies easier to find, the White House got the consensus to make job postings with the tag "veterans commit" in its metadata discoverable, free, and available for anyone to reuse.

The White House then aggregated the over half-million tagged postings and made them available to the public.

MR. CHOPRA then described a research project he headed in Virginia that sought to better match talent with opportunity. They examined the job postings tagged as “veterans commit” at a point in time and compared them to veterans’ unemployment insurance filings. A third party research firm, he reported, found that 25 percent of openings in high tech occupations were entry level and that every opening could have been filled by a tech-trainable veteran who had filed for unemployment in the same geographical area.

In conclusion, **MR. CHOPRA** explained that, currently, job postings are proprietary and therefore states such as Virginia must pay to access listings from services such as the National Labor Exchange (NLx), which limits their reuse. He encouraged the Council to think about job listings as an open data resource and potential avenues to enable making them an open resource, such as through Vietnam Era Veterans’ Readjustment Assistance Act (VEVRAA) regulations. He also suggested that the Council look for an opportunity to provide guidance to states on open source job postings to improve information about labor demand.

In response to questions from the Council, **MR. CHOPRA** indicated that making NLx postings open for sharing would help, but in the bigger picture there was no public action to make all job listings open for reuse. He also clarified that the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) brings organizations together to agree on standards and this has not yet been done for job postings.

Discussion of Informational Report (cont'd)

The Council next returned to its discussion of priorities, turning to the third priority: *Understanding the Characteristics of the Workforce*. **MR. FICHTNER** said that in his state measuring the attainment rate for credentials had been an issue. **DR. REAMER** reported that an interagency workforce between BLS, ED’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), NSF and Census called GEMEnA had started working to develop standards for the collection of data about credential attainment. He went on to say that BLS had fielded survey questions based on the standard developed by the group as part of the monthly CPS collection, and that NCES was in currently in the field with more detailed questions as part of its Household Education Survey. **MR. HARRIGAN** added that in the 2015 data CPS data with the credentials question, BLS had found that 3.1 percent of the population, 4.8 million people, had a certification but no credential, and 22.4 percent had a license.

MR. SLATER remarked that a workforce investment board in his state had requested an analysis of skills gaps in its area, which suggested to him that the issue was not limited only to credentials. **MS. FORLAND** added that the concept of a skills gap was overly narrow and that analysts should look at other factors like wages or quality of life, but that ETA had been emphasizing skills gaps recently. She added that professional licensing boards could

be a useful source of information. **DR. REAMER** expressed concern over maintaining funding for existing data collections that provide good information about the characteristics of the workforce, and **MS. ZELLER** noted that OnTheMap was a vital tool for businesses making relocation or expansion decisions. She added that it would be more helpful if it included occupational data. **MS. PATE** added that collecting data on the third of the workforce not in full-time jobs would be increasingly important in the future. **DR. REAMER** called the members' attention to a new data product of the Local Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) program called Job-to-Job flows that allows analysts to see where a cadre of workers ends up over time.

MR. SLATER summarized the discussion of that category as having three focal points: a group of issues around skills, credentials, and licenses; maintaining current foundational data programs; and including economic developers as a beneficiary of WLMI.

The Council moved on to a discussion of *Determining the Effectiveness of Education and Workforce Programs*, the fourth draft priority category. **MS. ORVELLA** expressed concern that the effects of factors other than wages and training or education may not be well measured or accounted for in the nationwide WLMI system. She also described a concern over not being able to effectively track the career paths and employment outcomes of students from specific educational programs. **DR. REAMER** noted that the Census's Bureau's efforts to match wage records from the states to student records from the National Student Clearinghouse could help to address that issue. **MS. FORLAND** remarked that her agency did a lot of routine reporting on this issue, including quasi-experimental statistical analyses, so that she did not consider this issue to be as uncharted as others discussed. **DR. REAMER** mentioned that the database proposed by the Credential Transparency Initiative could help with matching programs to occupations, and the State Longitudinal Data Systems grants from ED were also targeted at tracking career outcomes of students. **MR. FICHTNER** described how the Wage Record Interchange System helped some states get credit when training program completers found employment in another state. **DR. REAMER** noted that the WIAC could also play a key role coordinating the many different programs and agencies with interests in workforce development.

MR. SLATER then called for the members to identify any priorities that they were surprised had not been mentioned in the discussion of any of the categories. He then raised the issue of data quality and volatility in local employment estimates. **MR. SLATER** also mentioned the conversion of the OES to a time series, and **DR. REAMER** responded that it could be included with the discussion of identifying in-demand jobs. **Ms. Forland** expressed her thinking that enhancing UI records should be a higher priority than converting the OES to a time series, given the relative costs and benefits of each project. Also not on the list, **MR. SLATER** observed, was the item pertaining to accessibility of data, but **MR. FICHTNER** suggested that accessibility might better be considered a cross-cutting theme.

MR. SLATER then brought up the subject of online job postings, which had not previously been discussed as a priority item. **DR. REAMER** remarked that online job postings represented a wealth of data as yet untapped by WLMI agencies, and suggested that enabling the agencies to utilize those data could be of use. **MS. PATE** suggested thinking about information that the Council might recommend be added to the standards for job postings and of a mechanism to provide feedback to the sources of improperly completed postings. **MS. FORLAND** suggested that the issue could be classified under category two, Aligning Workforce and Education Investments with Industry Needs, as her agency uses online job postings as a supplement to keep up with changing trends in KSAs.

DR. REAMER asked about BLS or ETA guidance on how to use online job postings. **LAUREN FAIRLEY** of ETA, who was in the gallery, was recognized and responded that she had been a part of an ETA project that funded eight states to trial the use of online job postings as a supplement to traditional WLMI, with some technical assistance, and that the deliverables from that project were available online. **MS. RUST** added that while BLS does not advise state agencies whether or not to use data from job postings, BLS is studying data from online job postings to see how they can be used to improve the current system.

The Council also agreed that it would be important for the informational report to list aspects of the nationwide WLMI system that were going well and should be kept, for example the BLS federal-state cooperative programs (QCEW, OES, CES and LAUS), O*NET and ACS. Suggestions also included the employment projections, the ETA-supported workgroups (PMP, LEWIS, ARC and NCSC), OnTheMap, MyNextMove, MySkillsMyFuture, and CareerOneStop.

MR. SLATER then brought the member's attention to the question of framing the informational product. He noted that the Secretary would be the primary audience for the informational product, with the Assistant Secretary of ETA and the Commissioner of BLS key intermediary audiences. He suggested a tone that indicated that the Council has studied the nationwide WLMI system carefully and identified some opportunities, as opposed to presenting take-it-or-leave-it policy recommendations. This approach was also supported by **MR. RIETZKE**. **MS. ZELLER** also liked the idea of presenting opportunities. **MR. REAMER**, however, suggested that the term "opportunities" would make it difficult to address the foundational things that were going well, and suggested "findings" as a neutral variation. **MS. FORLAND** suggested "strengths" for the foundational elements of the system.

The members then turned to discussion of the next steps in creating the informational product. **MR. SLATER** suggested that the staff could create a draft to be reviewed and wordsmithed by either by the planning work group or the entire Council, to then be sent for final editing and layout. **Ms. Pate** suggested that it would be good to target the product to an audience beyond the incoming leadership team, something people want on their walls. **Mr. Rietzke** supported that as a goal. He also cautioned that a full deliberation by the

Council, even over email, would be subject to FACA guidelines. **Mr. Slater** requested volunteers for a work group to edit the draft.

The members then set January 11, 2017 at 2:00 P.M. EST as the date and time for the next full meeting of the Council, by conference call, for the Council to review and provide feedback on the edited informational product. The Council also identified February 8, 2017 at 2:00 P.M. EST for a second call during which the members would review the final informational product prior to publication. It was also agreed by the members to include possible discussion of work groups as a second agenda item for both meetings.

The members then briefly discussed the anticipated role of the work groups. **Mr. Slater** suggested that their primary role would be to develop and complete the three to five recommendations for the Secretary's two-year plan. **Dr. Reamer** suggested they could also play a role as conveners of participants in the nationwide WLMI system.

The Council tentatively selected May 2-3, 2017 for the WIAC's next in-person meeting.

Informational Presentation

Next, the Council heard a brief presentation from **DR. REAMER** about two separate Federal Register notices. The first notice announced the intent of the Census Bureau to request OMB approval to begin collection of state administrative data records. It indicates the type of records to be requested, but there is not a great deal of specificity regarding what they plan do with the data. **DR. REAMER** suggested that the Council request a briefing from Census and also offered to request more information via email.

The other notice, **Dr. Reamer** reported, was a proposed addendum to an OMB statistical policy directive. Federal agencies are required to produce a performance plan and an annual performance report consistent with requirements. Currently, BLS has a performance report that is built in to the DOL performance report. Furthermore, statistical agencies are only required to report principle federal economic indicators. This notice requires statistical agencies to identify its key statistical products, and then report on how well it did with regard to that product. In this notice, he explained, OMB is asking for comment, and although may not be within WIAC's purview to comment, it might be in WIAC's role to comment on the selection of key indicators.

MR. SLATER noted that these performance reports would fill in most blank areas in the matrix presented on the meetings first day by **MR. RIETZKE** showing the components that the Secretary's two-year plan was required to address. **MR. RIETZKE** suggested that members keep in mind that a key area in which ETA has envisioned WIAC's role is in the evaluation of the performance of the system, which would include a discussion of the gaps identified by WIAC. **MS. PATE** suggested that the Council might want to ensure that their work groups mapped onto the requirements in the matrix, to ensure that the Council's recommendations did as well. **MR. HARRIGAN** suggested that the metrics used in the

performance report might not be very applicable to the Council's goals. **MS. FORLAND** stated that the Council should drive its own agenda, rather than following the lead of the items identified in the matrix.

With regard to the performance measures used by BLS, **Mr. Horrigan** informed the Council that their metrics are generally statistics, such as standard errors or coverage ratios. The metrics are usually just the statistics, not a qualitative evaluation, and the performance reports produced by the statistical agencies may have little or no relevance to the WIAC.

The meeting was concluded by Mr. Slater and Mr. Rietzke.