

TO: Executive Committee

DATE: 08/04/08

FROM: WIB Staff

For Action

For Information

For Discussion

SUBJECT: Integrated Service Delivery

PROPOSED MOTION(S): For Information Only

DISCUSSION: On July 10, 2008, the Workforce Investment Board requested additional information regarding Integrated Service Delivery. Specifically requested was information linked to the California Workforce System, State/Local Partnership State Framework/-Draft Policy for Implementing Integrated Service Delivery and Learning Labs.

Background: Over the last several months an Integrated Service Delivery Planning Team comprised of representatives from Employment Development Dept's (EDD) Workforce Services Branch, California Workforce Investment Board (CalWIB), California Workforce Association (CWA), Labor and Workforce Development Agency and Local Workforce Areas have been exploring opportunities for moving toward an integrated service delivery model that effectively:

- responds to 21st Century industry demand and our contemporary workforce crisis;
- assures that our services and training are in alignment with current local and regional labor market requirements;
- shifts service priority to an emphasis on worker skills, assisting workers to gain the skills leading to self-sufficiency and responding to employer demand;
- copes with limited and declining funding through a more efficient use of resources and a reduction of program duplication and requirements;
- increases service levels and quality; and
- redefines and improves performance.

California's integrated service delivery planning is structured to move forward by identifying policies, strategies and models in three key areas: *integrated customer pool, integrated customer flow and integrated staffing*. Workgroups involving state and local partners will develop recommended policies, strategies and operating models. These will be tested through Local Areas volunteering to serve as "learning labs" for proposed models. The target date for learning lab implementation was July 2008.

Consensus on a Framework: The following represents consensus of the Integrated Service Planning Team at its July 12, 2007 meeting, and serves to establish a framework for implementing an integrated service design and for defining key responsibilities.

Integration includes:

- A common pool of customers, composed of WIA Title I Adults and Dislocated Workers; Wagner-Peyser, Veterans, Long-Term Unemployed, Migrant Seasonal Farmworker and Trade Adjustment Act.
- A common set of services available to all customers in the pool through a common customer flow.
- Integrated Staffing: Shared WIA, WPA and TAA staffing of the common service and customer flow.

The Learning Labs will:

- Test a wide variety of approaches to achieve integrated service delivery (as outlined in their local integrated service delivery plan).
- The learning from these approaches will inform the development of the draft, state integrated service delivery policy.
- Among the learning to be captured from these Labs are:
 - Impact on service quality
 - ease of data collection
 - increased efficiencies and effectiveness
 - impact on performance outcomes
 - the time required to implement integrated service delivery
 - sufficiency and identification of resources to meet the responsibility
 - increase in number of customers receiving skills and other training
 - impact on cost per customer served
 - impact on skills improvement from entry to exit
 - impact on customer service outcomes
 - impact on duration of unemployment

Pilot Program Workgroups are Addressing:

Integrated Customer Pool – focuses on the impacts and benefits of co-enrollment, or rather, a common case-file; what does this kind of integration mean to performance; what does it mean to eligibility and to documentation requirements; what policy or system changes need to be made to achieve co-enrollment.

Workforce Intelligence Group – Much of the workforce intelligence that people seek exists within local workforce organizations and the traditional labor market information (LMI) system, but additional, and better organized, information is needed to enable clients and workforce professionals to optimize their workforce decisions. This group focuses on identifying (1) the types of workforce information needed and reasons why each is needed for each functional area and user type; (2) currently available information sources to address the needs, (3) gaps in the current information system, (4) methods and resources to produce and deliver information, and (5) approaches for teaching about the availability and use of workforce intelligence.

Integrated Customer Flow – The key question is how best to organize local operations to move toward and manage the common customer pool as defined under an integrated structure. The group is examining other states' policy and procedure manuals, developing a menu of services and operational flowcharts. More specifically, the group is working to define parameters and minimums for local integrated services to be used by all Learning Labs in developing and customizing their local integrated services delivery plan.

Integrated Staffing Employer Services – The initial question here is how to manage integrated teams, focusing on functions not funding. The group has completed its initial work on functional supervision, recommending adoption of an "On-Site Work Coordinator Policy," similar to that in use in New York, implemented through Local Memoranda of Operations, and structured both to attain functional supervision yet alleviate staff, supervisor and union concerns. The recommendations on functional supervision must be presented to various public employee unions for vetting and any items of concern by the unions need to come back to this group in order to propose solutions that address the issues identified. Finally, this workgroup will also focus on Employer and Business Services products and models that can be considered for inclusion within the various Learning Labs as part of their service menu.

Other State Feedback:

Oklahoma:

While there are now a number of fully integrated, skills-based Workforce Centers, many Centers remain challenged, finding it difficult to move forward with integration. In addition, some Centers are unclear about whether the Greg Newton sessions established State policy, whether LWIBs are responsible for local integration policy, whether their LWIB has established any local policy, or whether they are just lost.