



**SkillUp Washington
Investor's Council Meeting Minutes
June 15th, 2009
The Seattle Foundation**

In attendance:

Investors: Steve Johnson (Office of Economic Development/City of Seattle), Michael Brown (The Seattle Foundation), David Okimoto (United Way), Jackie MacLean (King County Department of Community and Human Services), Theresa Fujiwara (The White Center CDA), Stephen Riley on behalf of Carol Gregory (BuRSST), Bob Watrus (The White Center CDA), David Wertheimer (Gates Foundation), Tina Bloomer (State Board for Community and Technical Colleges), and MaryJean Ryan (City of Seattle).

Partners and guests: Dan Fey (WDC), Susan Crane (Port Jobs), Jane Reisman (ORS), Anne Gienapp (ORS), Brian Bosworth (FutureWorks), Laura Rowley (SJI), Juliet Scarpa (SJI), Helena Haas (Office of Economic Development/City of Seattle), George Dignan (King County Worker Training Program), Matt Houghton (Office of Economic Development/City of Seattle), Stephanie Thomas (Office of Economic Development/City of Seattle), Krista Kipp (SJI), Anne Keeney (SJI), Marléna Sessions (WDC of Seattle-King County), Dan Fey (WDC of Seattle-King County), and Bill Block (Committee to End Homelessness)

Primary Objective:

Approval of Attainment Fund recommendations and review and discussion of Evaluation Framework recommendations

Introductions and Director's Report

I. Welcome and Introductions

Michael Brown welcomed the investors and asked the attendees to introduce themselves. All attendees gave their name and place of work. Next, Mr. Brown outlined the agenda for the meeting and introduced Steve Johnson. Mr. Johnson gave a brief Director's report.

II. Director's Report

Mr. Johnson thanked the Communications Committee for their recent work and accomplishments. He noted that based on feedback from investor, the Collaborative has official changed its name to SkillUp Washington. In two weeks there will be a new SkillUp Washington website, which will provide an overview of our initiatives and accomplishments. Also included on the site will be press releases and Op Eds. Our first Op Ed will be based on the content and the discussions at the forum that took place on June 5th, 2009. This forum included about 150 people. Mr. Johnson extended a thank you to Susan Crane, from Port Jobs, for the excellent work that Port Jobs did in planning and facilitating this event. He also noted that David Harrison was the moderator of the panel discussion and thanked him for his participation.

Mr. Johnson mentioned that individual check-ins with investors were taking place to review draft roles and responsibilities of the Collaborative and to touch base on the core initiatives and operations of the group. He explained that the next important step for the Collaborative is formalizing MOUs and the understanding of our rights and responsibilities as a Collaborative.

Regarding today's agenda, Mr. Johnson stated he is optimistic about capitalizing the Attainment Fund.

III. Approve Agenda and May Investors Council minutes

The agenda and May Investors Council minutes were approved.

IV. Attainment Fund

Steve Johnson provided some context and background information prior to the review of draft recommendations. He stated that the investors formally asked Seattle Jobs Initiative to put together an agenda to see how an Attainment Fund could be “operationalized”. Over the course of the past four months Seattle Jobs Initiative has hosted several meetings with colleges to review how an attainment fund would be accessed and what the best model would be for delivery. Most recently, SkillUp Washington was given a start up investment of \$150,000 to begin building this initiative. The discussion at this meeting, Mr. Johnson stated, will center around three core case management model systems. Do we create model 3, which involves a centralized fund/support manager? Or do we allow colleges to have a more central role, as model 2 would allow.

Anne Keeney, Executive Director at Seattle Jobs Initiative (SJI), introduced the models and reminded the group of our previous discussion in May. At this point, SJI has not determined how many students would be served and what the specific costs are. The administrative budget will be determined based on the case management model that the investors like best. Ms. Keeney stated that the investors, particularly the Executive Committee, have leaned toward model 3 at the meetings. The colleges were leaning towards model 2 because in their view it is more timely and allows for more control of funds. There are benefits and challenges to either model.

Juliet Scarpa and Krista Kipp reviewed pros and cons of each case management model. These are listed in the attachments that were emailed to the investors in June. Ms. Scarpa reiterated that the fund is a fund of last resort and based on feedback from the advisory group, the funds need to be flexible and timely. Furthermore, Ms. Scarpa stated that: 1) Access to the funds is strongly linked to case management, 2) There should be a single point of contact between the fund and those who need it most, 3) It should be a fluid experience, and 4) Regardless of the model used the Fund Manager will be available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Based on these principles, model 3 has some strong advantages. These included:

- more centralized model
- flexibility
- most effective of leveraging all other sources of funds before using this one
- scalability is easier

Funds could be used for such items as laptops and transportation, based on the needs that are to be assessed and based on the likelihood of college completion. The individual cap would be set at \$2000 per person per year. This value is based on petition not provision. The capitalization, to set foundation, involves a recommended \$300,000 initial investments. The start-up costs for case management model #3 are \$220,000. Ideally, the Fund Manager is appointed by July 15th so that policies and procedures can be completed, training with college support specialists be completed, and coordination of implementation is underway well before the fall quarter begins.

Case management model #3 did not get unanimous support from investors. One primary concern is that it is unclear how colleges will pay for the support specialist. The point of conversation was that student financial aid may impact overall package of student.

Some major issues included the need for ongoing capitalization and work is hinging on a very short timeline. Furthermore, there were concerns that if case management model #2 was implemented, would student financial aid be impacted? It was believed that it would although Tina Bloomer stated that the students would still need to report any funds received on their student forms regardless of which case management model was used.

Tina Bloomer noted that some colleges were concerned about another administrative layer that students would go through if model #3 were implemented. She stated that we must give a goal and clear criteria or else they do not know the scope of their expectations.

Mr. Watrus was concerned that model 2 would not serve those who are on the onramps and bridges. In Model 2, something new and additional would have to be done to serve those not in college programs. Several investors agreed, but presented the possibility of a hybrid model to serve a bigger group of students outside of the College for Working Adults cohorts. Anne Keeney stated that SJI thought of the process of setting up an Attainment Fund as a phasing-in process and building toward reaching a wider audience but not at the onset. In previous meetings with colleges, Ms. Keeney stated the colleges said that they did not have the funding for these fund manager positions, hence we made a model. Mr. Fey wondered how easy it was to replicate each model and bring them to scale.

MaryJean Ryan noted that the relationship of the Fund Manager to the support specialist and student is analogous to the Retail/Wholesale model-Wholesaler: full and direct-service; Retailer-middle vendor/higher price.

Brian Bosworth noted that it is important to know who at each college is able to access or draw the funds down. They will need to be knowledgeable about all funding sources as well as be accessible to the students so they know who to turn to when they are in trouble. Ms. Another attendee mentioned that the case management view is really lacking. It is a capacity issue. It works when it works well, when it works in a holistic approach. "Form needs to follow function"

Ms. MacLean acknowledged that she is concerned about efficiency of accessing the fund. Questions she posed included: What does last resort really look like? There should be more clarity on defining what the fund manager does.

A big worry is that the student will wonder, "How many people do I need to form a relationship with?"

David Wertheimer stated that the goal for the attainment fund is that it must be easily and rapidly accessed by students. The desired outcome is that they attain their education and workforce goals. The model should address the needs of the students first. The infrastructure is almost secondary.

Mr. Johnson stated that based on feedback from investors a hybrid model is the best approach. Next steps are for Seattle Jobs Initiative to look at a hybrid case management model and to define the Attainment Fund manager role. In July, SJI will report back to the Collaborative with final recommendations and proposed timeline/phasing of how the Attainment Fund project will be implemented.

Review

V. Draft Evaluation Recommendations

Anne Gienapp and Jane Reisman presented information related to a large packet of information that was handed out to each investor. They began their presentation by asking people to partner up and answer the following question: "What have been the peak moments when you felt that the Collaborative/CWA was functioning extremely well? What were your challenges? This is called an "Appreciative Inquiry"- a way to keep the group focused.

After meeting attendees had a few minutes to pair up and provide their responses, Ms. Reisman called on a few investors to provide their thoughts. Here are some of them:

"Our meeting today! There was perfect conversation. We may not get it all right the first time around, but that's okay."

"The June 4th forum. This forum was facilitated by Brian Bosworth. The forum had a larger group of people. Everyone was talking about something that was greater than an individual program."

Ms. Reisman and Ms. Gienapp then introduced the "Summary of Evaluation Recommendations and Next Steps" document. This document highlighted the following outcomes:

-Changes among low-income/low-skilled working adults and attainment in postsecondary education

-Changes in multiple systems in how they interact

Ms. Reisman iterated that the framework builds upon systems and outcomes. A good starting point for evaluation would be to focus on the most developed initiative and build from there (i.e. The College for Working Adults). The presenters provided a template that could be used for this individual evaluation piece. They also encouraged discussions with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges regarding data collection and to collect data from them that would speak of outcomes and to formalize these discussions.

There was more discussion on whether to expand our evaluation to more than evaluating our system impact and the impact on students enrolled in the College for Working Adults. David Okimoto stated that when looking for donors, we need to demonstrate a high percentage of students completing credentials and certificates.

Steve Johnson continued that our timeline for evaluation is approximately 3 to 5 years. Agreement with a national fund (a timeline): 3 years, maybe up to 5 years.

The investors were strongly encouraged to review the ORS document emailed in the previous week. The goal for the July meeting is to adopt the evaluation framework and to commit to funding. It was noted that these two will likely not be approved in the same step.

Updates

VI. Communications Committee:

Helena Haas presented a timeline. The first phase of the website will be launched in 2 weeks. Community Colleges are focused on recruitment for Fall quarter. There will be an event highlighting the official beginning of the new CWA pilot projects sometime in September or October.

VII. DOL Stimulus Planning Meetings (Health Care and Green Jobs)

Dan Fey mentioned that the DOL is set to release \$750 million competitive grants to stimulate green jobs and healthcare.

Green Jobs: A grant will be sent out a couple weeks before it is made public. There are 5 main buckets that the money will be divided into. It is yet to be determined whether the money is going to the Governor's office and then being distributed or thrown out and competed for.

Health care: The Health Work Force Institute and the SEIU had two planning meetings-one with employers and the other with colleges and WDCs. Both were well attended. The next steps for us are to:

1. Continue firming up our partnerships with our employers
2. Firm up our concept paper
3. Work on long-term sustainability, and
4. Hire a grant writer.

Steve thanked all for attending and reminded everyone that the next Investor's Council meeting will be July 20th at the Seattle Foundation.

Official meeting adjourned at 2:10 pm