Public Notice of virtual Meeting of the Pima County Workforce Investment Board (*WIB*) Executive Committee

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the Pima County Executive Committee and to the general public that the Executive Committee will hold a virtual meeting open to the public on

**Thursday, August 26th**, 8:00am to 10:00am MST

Join on your computer or mobile app [Click here to join the meeting](#)  
Or call in (audio only) +1 213-279-1657,,504176645#  United States, Los Angeles  
Phone Conference ID: 504 176 645#

### Minutes

#### Members Present
- Dr. Mark Vitale
- Danielle Duarte
- Brad McCormick
- Michael Guymon
- Frank Grijalva
- Aric Meares

#### Guests
- Jim Mize
- Sean Lopez
- Michael Guymon
- Dan Sullivan
- Andrew Flagg
- Dr. Vaughn Croft
- Gabe Loyola
- Anna Cunes
- Cassie Lundin

### Agenda

**I. Call to Order:** Dr. Mark Vitale, Chair, 8:05am  
Mark asked if there was opposition to rearranging the order of the agenda to accommodate members who will arrive later in the meeting. There was no opposition. Mark rearranged the order of the agenda.  
(Agenda items remain the same and order of discussion/action is noted)

Per Mark, after his review of the by-laws and asked to add agenda items pursuant to Robert’s Rules of Order. Motion to add/introduced an action item: To officially review and accept the position description of Division Manager which is the official description that the county has offered for the WIB Director position. Motioned by Aric. Second by Brad. Discussion: Frank asked question regarding interpretation of by-laws and asked if we were in violation of public law by adding an agenda item as members of the public would not be able to comment or participate in discussion. Mark cited by-laws and Robert’s rules of order. Frank added that would we be in violation of public open meeting laws even if an agenda item is added. Mark deferred the answer to Andy Flagg. Andy Flagg stated that not as the WIB’s lawyer, but public Arizona Meeting laws do apply and adding an agenda item isn’t appropriate. Aric then asked if during the call to the public would an action item be able to be placed. Mark stated that it isn’t the job description itself, but the specific county classification. Mark then stated that the committee table the issue out of an abundance of caution in order to align with AZ Open Meeting Laws and decided not to add the second one as it would be within the same category of adding an item. Aric then asked if a special session would be necessary to address the description and recruitment effort of the WIB Director. Mark discussed that there will be calling a special session in a week or two and to get it to the board.

**II. (5) Action Item:** Approve minutes from July & Special Meeting minutes from August 9th, Motion: Frank, Second: Brad, Discussion: none, Vote: 5-0, Approved.
III. **(6) Action Item:** Review One-Stop Operator performance metrics as proposed and recommended by the Performance & Accountability committee.

Context: Mark shared the context of the performance metrics that arose during the state recertification process and the upcoming discussion of the One Stop Operator contract and regarding the contract extensions that occur with the initial contract. The initial contract was originally approved for three year extensions which has been extended through December 2021. The state communicated that the performance metrics within the OSO contract did not meet their standard but that we could be approved for recertification as contingent on establishing a performance metrics in future contracts. Mark agreed that the Performance & Accountability committee will review and share the performance measures with the Executive Committee and then will go to the full WIB as it adheres to the by-laws and SGA.

Discussion: Brad shared that the draft and items for consideration that will go to the full WIB that these would be performance measures that are in the contract for the OSO. Mark agreed. Aric shared concerns that depending on additional scope or performance would the vendor need to re-negotiation pricing for services and/or compensation. Brad clarified that these performance metrics do not apply to the current contract but will apply to the new contract and RFP process that was sent out. Frank asked that due to the committee review, recommendation of award, will the performance metrics lead to a new RFP. Dan asked Mark if an overview of the process on the county side be helpful. Mark stated he didn’t want to muddy the waters as procurement is different than the contract and recommended that the committee deal with the issue piece by piece. Michael asked about motion needed for item III to move to item number IV. Mark stated that there was not a quorum during the Performance & Accountability Committee but was shared with the committee. Mark also stated that there had been additional revisions after the committee met.

Presentation and discussion: Brad stated that the edits made are, “may not perform” statements (1.8). Brad shared with the committee that language and scope was pulled from other areas that have been previously approved by the state. Brad made it clear that the document of the performance metrics aligns with what the WIB expects from OSO and does not affect current contracts. Dan asked which areas the information was pulled from as other areas use the OSO for different providers. Brad answered he pulled information from: Cochise, Santa Cruz, Yuma, Maricopa and Pima. Brad also stated that there are counties where the OSO services are massive with a three-person staff as opposed to what we have for Pima. Dan also shared that OSO in Pinal county does everything and perhaps a conversation needs to be had regarding what the baseline of the OSO should be in Pima. Brad also shared that the document acts as a guide for the WIB to determine what we want from the OSO. Aric voiced concerns of language in the metrics: ensuring has a sense of authority that will need to be revised based on what the OSO cannot do. Dan suggested that the role of the OSO as coordinator and facilitator. Brad asked if OSO has managerial responsibilities. Dan clarified that the OSO does not have management roles or required to meet with individuals seeking services. Mark asked if the OSO is ensuring that the standard is achieved with the convening of stakeholders and making sure that it does happen. Aric asked that ensuring be removed and revised to facilitating and coordination. Brad also asked about monitoring and reporting that are the main roles of the OSO.
Committee members continued discussion and revised language as follows:
Language revised to “facilitate, monitor and report” 1.1.2.1 and 1.1.2.2.
Language revised to “support the implementing of” 1.1.2.3.
Language revised to “facilitate and support the developing of processes…” 1.1.2.6 and 1.1.2.7
Language revised to “Follow federal and state regulations pertaining to handling of Equal Employment Opportunity” 1.1.2.16.
And language revised throughout the document to align with facilitate, monitor and report to be consistent.

Per Dan ensure that the performance metrics doesn’t call for any duties that above and beyond what has been called for within the RFP. Mark clarified that there cannot be a contract issued from OSO that a contract cannot be issued as the board hasn’t approved it and that the board has to do their due diligence which is what they are doing with this document to ensure that the contract meets the state standard per technical assistance call and what was in the recertification checklist. Dan verified that the monetary amount for services has not changed and Mark confirmed.

**Action Item:** To review the One Stop Operator Performance Metrics as presented to the Performance & Accountability committee with additional modifications from the Executive Committee and Pima County staff to present to the entire board on September 10\textsuperscript{th}. Moved Aric, Second Michael. Vote: 7-0. Approved.

IV. (7) **Action Item:** Review SER Jobs for Progress, Inc. One-Stop Operator RFP as recommended by the RFP Committee and recommend to present to full WIB at September 10\textsuperscript{th} meeting as an action item to accept for period beginning next contract term (January 1, 2022), 7/22/2021 RFP committee approved the RFP. Moved: Vaughn. Second: Danielle. Vote 7-0. Approved.

V. (1) **Discussion:** Chair update on WIB Recertification, Mark reviewed the history of recertification process that started in January 2021. Executive Committee reviewed the SGA. Mark reported to the committee that at the WAC Executive Committee accepted the recommendation that the WIB be recertified at the next WAC meeting. AZ DES conducted the review of documentation and the recommendation to recertify the WIB was accepted by the WAC Executive Committee.

VI. (2) **Discussion:** Recruiting strategies for current and anticipated WIB vacancies. Mark shared the current WIB Roster as submitted to the state for recertification. There is one official vacancy listed on the business category and will need to be filled. Mark then reviewed the other individuals not seeking reappointment, members not eligible as they have missed more than the three meetings as stated in the by-laws. Vacancies not listed as the term expires September 30\textsuperscript{th}. Mark asked the Executive Committee members to start strategic recruitment discussion. Danielle stated there is a total of 5 in the business category and one in the other category. Per the Board Development committee that an email or recruitment notification will be shared with WIB & Guest email listing. Danielle stated that Cassie developed a google doc to share within the email to members in the public who may be interested in becoming a WIB member. Danielle also stated that Dominica with Business Services team will share out with their business contacts. Danielle also stated that the Board Development committee members are reaching out to their contacts with several large, medium and small businesses contacts. Mark stated that with 5 members...
needed in the business category the makeup would remain at 51%. Aric asked about sectors that members need to represent and if there are specific ratios. Mark stated that yes they have to represent the sectors however we do not have to have a specific ratio of sector representatives. Aric then asked if there is a sector that we do not have representation on the WIB. Daniele stated then listed the target sectors: Aerospace & Defense, Emerging Technologies, Logistics, Health & Bioscience, Natural & Renewable resources, and Infrastructure. Aric asked if there are any signatory contractors who may be interested. Frank suggested several organizations that may be interested. Frank stated that the difficulty is getting someone within the organization with decision-making and hiring authority. Danielle shared that the recommendation was made to have a social media post and call to action from members to their networks with the contact form and email. Aric also suggested getting on CEO forums to get on the agenda and present what the WIB is and get some engagement with those individuals. Frank asked about getting the list of who the current members are and the category they represent. Mark stated that it is in the attachment for the meeting packet that Cassie had sent. Frank stated that he would also reach out to United Way member who may be a good candidate on the WIB. Mark also stated that there is an opportunity to develop a relationship with the two tribal nations that are within Pima County. Mark stated that in his exit interview with Dr Higgins that she forwarded her contacts with the nation to recruit potential members and Mark will share the contact information with Danielle. Mark stated that if the google doc was ready to share out so the entire WIB can get involved with recruitment. Danielle also stated that the new member orientation is September 23rd which is the same day as the Executive Committee. Brad asked about the timeframe for vacancies to be filled. Mark stated that it is 120 days. Aric also stated that the number of WIB members can be adjusted to maintain a 51% ratio, per Mark that yes that is an option but actions and forms will have to be submitted in order to change the number of members. Mark reminded the committee that there is only one current vacancy listed on the roster due to shifts in member category due to state recertification process. The current vacancy listed has only been listed for two weeks. Brad stated that it is good that we are aware of the upcoming vacancies and that we have five months to recruit.

VII. (3) Discussion: Update on State DES LWDB audits, upcoming events, and associated dates from August 17th ARIZONA@WORK monthly meeting/call. Mark shared details from the DES state call.

Board Audit: originally planned in July, but has been delayed by the state. No new date has been shared regarding board audits. Per Mark the audit will follow the same parameters as the recertification checklist and will keep members up to date as information becomes available.

Plan Modifications: Goes to the Planning Committee, presented to the Executive Committee and then to the full WIB. Next modification will be due July 2022.

Performance Negotiations: Next round will be in August 2022 and will cover WIOA Title IB Adult, Dislocated Worker and Youth programming. The state will use the Statistical Adjustment Model (SAM) again in the negotiations. Mark updated the committee that recent performance data shows that all measures have been exceeded as of last week. Mark congratulated the stakeholders again and thanked them for all of their hard work in reaching those measures. Committee members identified the possibility of the measures increasing as all measures were exceeded.

Board Recertification will happen again in 2023.

MOU and IFA will also be up for revision in 2022.
Aric suggested a “lesson learned” document to share with members regarding the processes behind all of the certification and recertification steps. Mark agreed that having a mechanism in addition to meeting minutes and agenda is a good idea and will take some coordination in order for members to be able to participate in that as many members were involved throughout the process.

VIII. Discussion: Draft WIOA Procurement Policy, Dan Sullivan, CWD Director (unable to discuss due to time and will review at next meeting)

IX. (4) Discussion: Annual Meeting Task Force – membership, Mark shared that in the last meeting there was discussion about setting up a task force to lead the planning efforts for the annual meeting. Brad stated that the meeting is December 10th and the modality as virtual. Mark stated that the modality hadn’t been settled as of yet. Aric asked about county guidance regarding in person meetings. Dan stated that there hasn’t been county specific guidance, however the trend including the state meetings will remain virtual at this time. Aric voiced concerns about the planning of an event space, menu and catering that takes planning and coordination with the county for payment. Danielle stated that in the hospitality industry that they are seeing cancellations daily and would recommend a virtual event. Brad asked about the development of the task force. Mark stated that with the establishment of a task force that they would recommend the next steps for the annual meeting. Aric would like to see high level speakers and a theme. Mark asked if committee would like to see all industries on the committee.

The committee identified potential members for the task force (5): Susan Dumond, Peter Loya, Dr David Dore, Laurie Kierstead-Joseph, Karen Molina, Jenifer Preston, Rose Grijalva and Dan Sullivan (county representation or CWD staff)

Next steps: Email from Executive Committee (from Cassie) to solicit participation on the task force. Mark will reach out to Rose and Dr Dore as potential leader of the annual meeting task force.

X. Discussion: September 10th Board Meeting

XI. Call to Public

XII. Next Meeting, September 23rd, virtual meeting, or special meeting that will be announced at a later date

XIII. Adjourn Motion: Vaughn. Second: Frank, Meeting adjourned