

Workforce Information Advisory Council

Summary of Meeting

June 21–22, 2017

Washington, D.C.

The Workforce Information Advisory Council was convened at 8:30 A.M. on June 21, 2017 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) of the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) and Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the Council, convened the meeting, which was chaired by Ms. Cynthia Forland of Washington and was open to the public in its entirety. The two-day meeting of the Council concluded at 4:00 P.M on June 22, 2017.

In Attendance:

Members of the Workforce Information Advisory Council

Bruce Madson, Ohio Department of Job and Family Services

Cynthia Forland, Washington State Employment Security Department (chair)

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 Professional Engineering Employees in Aerospace, IFPTE Local 2001

Bruce Ferguson, CareerSource of Northeast Florida

Andrew Reamer, George Washington Institute of Public Policy

Members Not in Attendance

Aaron Fichtner, New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development

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
Lauren Fairley, ETA
Pam Frugoli, ETA

Lester Coffey, Coffey Consulting, LLC
Roger Therrien, Coffey Consulting, LLC
Dani Abdullah, Coffey Consulting, LLC
JJ Ketchum, Coffey Consulting LLC
Mason Erwin, Coffey Consulting, LLC
Drennan Lindsay, Coffey Consulting, LLC

Invited Speakers

Amanda Ahlstrand, Office of Workforce Investment, ETA
Mike Horrigan, Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics,
Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS)
Rebecca Rust, Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics, BLS
Hilery Simpson, Office of Compensation and Working Conditions, BLS

Members of the Public Offering Comments or Called Upon to Address the Council

John Marotta, Center for Regional Economic Competitiveness (CREC)
Lindsey Johnson, Center for Regional Economic Competitiveness (CREC)

Others Attending for All or a Portion of the Meeting

Mark Troppe, Council for Community and Economic Research (C2ER)
Christina Pena, Workforce Data Quality Campaign (WDQC)
Yvette Chocolaad, National Association of State Workforce Agencies (NASWA)
Kevin Naud, National Association of State Workforce Agencies (NASWA)
Mark Valentini, Commercial Vehicle Training Association (CVTA)
Joylin Kirk, Goodwill Industries International

Subcommittees Reporting During this Meeting

Subcommittee One

WIAC Members

Mark McKeen (chair)
Angela Pate
Ellen Golombek

Subject Matter Experts Consulted

Rebecca Rust, BLS
David Talon, BLS

Subcommittee Two

WIAC Members

Mathew Barewicz (chair)
Aaron Fichtner
Chelsea Orvella

Subject Matter Experts Consulted

Pam Frugoli, ETA

Subcommittee Three

WIAC Members

Brenda Lisbon (chair)
Pamela Bucy
Jennifer Zeller

Subject Matter Experts Consulted

Pam Frugoli, ETA
Jacqueline Keener, North Carolina
Department of Commerce
Tom Gallagher, Wyoming
Department of Workforce Services

Subcommittee Four

WIAC Members

Andrew Reamer (chair)
Bruce Ferguson
Cynthia Forland
Bruce Madson

Subject Matter Experts Consulted

Ken Poole, LMI Institute

New Subcommittees Formed During this Meeting

Subcommittee One

Mathew Barewicz (chair)
Mark McKeen
Bruce Ferguson
Angela Pate
Pamela Bucy*

Subcommittee Two

Jennifer Zeller (chair)
Brenda Lisbon
Bruce Madson
Chelsea Orvella
Ellen Golombek*

Subcommittee Three

Andrew Reamer (chair)
Cynthia Forland
Aaron Fichtner*

** Members not present at the meeting selected their new committees by correspondence with the subcommittee chairs following the meeting.*

Day One Proceedings

Welcome and Updates

8:30 A.M to 9:45 AM

MS. FORLAND opened the meeting by thanking the members for their work on the subcommittees since the last meeting and expressing her appreciation and enthusiasm for her new role as chair. She reiterated that the goal of the WIAC is to produce actionable recommendations for submission to the Secretary of Labor by the end of the year, and that the purpose of this meeting was to continue our work toward that end. She introduced **MR. RIETZKE**, who formally congratulated **MS. FORLAND** on her new role as chair and echoed her sentiments on the members' efforts to date. He stated that **MR. SLATER**, the former chair, had resigned his position on the Council as of January 1; he also informed the members that **MR. FICHTNER**, **MS. GOLOMBEK**, and **MS. BUCY** were not in attendance but that a conference line would be available in case they were able to call. He then briefly reviewed the meeting agenda and introduced **MS. AHLSTRAND** to offer welcoming remarks and updates on ETA activities.

MS. AHLSTRAND thanked the members for their efforts and **MS. FORLAND** for her service as chair. She noted that **MR. ALEXANDER ACOSTA** had been confirmed as Secretary of Labor since the Council's last meeting, with **MR. BYRON ZUIDEMA** serving as acting Assistant Secretary for ETA and **MS. GAY GILBERT** and **MR. BILL THOMPSON** as acting Deputy Assistant Secretaries for ETA. She also noted that **MR. ONDRAY HARRIS** had joined the leadership team as a Senior Advisor. She then updated the Council on recent ETA activities concerning the implementation of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), apprenticeship, and related items.

MS. AHLSTRAND stated that ETA had recently held three National Convenings to provide training on the new regulations and share best practices and strategies related to the implementation of WIOA. State and local workforce agency representatives attended, along with representatives from the U.S. Department of Education (ED) and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). She reported that ETA was still in the process of analyzing findings from the convenings, but that some key issues identified included: one-stop operator competitions and infrastructure cost sharing agreements; the performance accountability system; and governance of the workforce system, especially the role of state and local Workforce Development Boards (WDBs) in a system that now includes education and economic development entities. She also noted general interest among the attendees in developing greater capacity for utilizing WLMI as a tool to promote greater career awareness.

MS. AHLSTRAND then spoke about the new Administration's budget proposal for FY18, noting that it emphasized accountability and investing in things that work, and the recently issued Presidential Executive Order (EO) Expanding Apprenticeships in America. She observed that the EO emphasized middle-skills, third-party development of industry-recognized apprenticeships, and promoting apprenticeships for youth and veterans, among others. She

stated that ETA would begin looking at the role of the Task Force on Apprenticeship Expansion and its relationship, if any, to the Advisory Committee on Apprenticeship (ACA). She further noted that the EO emphasized evaluating the effectiveness of other job training programs beyond apprenticeship, and that ETA would incorporate this into its annual review of its program evaluation resourcing and priorities.

With regard to other ETA activities of interest to the WIAC, she reported that ETA had recently awarded a round of Workforce Data Quality Initiative (WDQI) grants, as well as funding for research on occupational licensing, and that the administration would continue its work with its partners from ED and HHS on vocational education, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and other programs.

In conclusion, **MS. AHLSTRAND** observed the workforce system has two primary customers, businesses and workers, and that we continue to need to emphasize business as a driving customer within this dual-customer system. She indicated that ETA would continue to emphasize competency-based learning, apprenticeships, and other work-based learning strategies, as well as defining the skills gap, with a focus on middle skills, and funding what works based on program effectiveness evaluations. She closed by stating that she looked forward to getting new ideas and input from the Council.

MR. RIETZKE thanked **MS. AHLSTRAND** for her remarks and turned to updates on Council business. He reported that several nominations had been received for candidates to fill **MR. SLATER'S** vacant seat and were under review by the Secretary's office, as was the Council's Informational Report. He thanked the members, the support staff, and **MS. ZELLER** for their contributions to the report.

He announced that the terms of members with two-year appointments would end in March 2018 and that the staff would place a solicitation for nominations for those openings in the Federal Register soon, which would run for 60 days. He added that restrictions on how long nominations remain active limited the Council's ability to maintain a list of pre-approved nominees, but that the staff would endeavor to expedite filling of new vacancies to the extent possible.

He then updated the Council on what he anticipated would be the procedure for submitting its recommendations to the Secretary and other staff activities. He reiterated that the ETA staff consider the Council's recommendations to be critical to the development of the Secretary's two-year plan, as required under WIOA, but added that the Council's work need not be limited strictly to producing the recommendations. He also reported that the Council staff were working to identify and connect with subject matter experts (SMEs) throughout DOL whose expertise might benefit the subcommittees, and he encouraged the members to seek out opportunities to engage SMEs from the broader community, noting that engaging with experts throughout the community would also help increase the visibility of the Council's work.

DR. REAMER asked **MS. AHLSTRAND** for guidance from ETA on the information needs of federal agencies, partners, and grantees related to identifying in-demand jobs as required under WIOA and evaluating the effectiveness of programs as emphasized in the Presidential EO on expanding apprenticeship and about how the Task Force on Apprenticeship Expansion would be aligned with ACA. **MS. AHLSTRAND** indicated that her office would consider his requests about informational needs and that ETA was beginning to review issues regarding the ACA and the Task Force on Expanding Apprenticeship. **MS. LISBON** inquired about potential state-level impacts of the reduction in WIOA funding in the President's Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 budget proposal. **MS. AHLSTRAND** was unable to discuss specifics, however **MS. FORLAND** noted that the National Association of State Workforce Agencies (NASWA) had released information about the potential effects of the budget proposal. **MR. MADSON** observed that state and local governments often respond to proposed budget cuts by pre-emptively reducing spending, which presents an immediate issue for the WLMI system regardless of whether the proposed budget is eventually adopted.

MR. RIETZKE opened the floor new business and a roundtable discussion. **MR. BAREWICZ** asked for input on the possibility that penalty and interest money from the unemployment insurance (UI) trust fund would no longer be allowed to pay for UI administration. **MR. MADSON** observed that the President's FY18 budget proposal directed that those funds must be deposited in a subaccount of the trust fund. He added that they could still be used to pay for UI administration; however, state flexibility would be limited.

MS. PATE reported that the evaluation of her organization's training program had found a 12 percent increase in employment rates for recipients of entrepreneurship training, along with increases in wages and decreases in associated unemployment insurance costs. Based on her experience, she suggested that the Council investigate ways to promote the dissemination of local program evaluation reports. **MS. FORLAND** noted that the WIOA National Convenings had included sessions about program evaluations and that the Council could help get the word out about the use of WLMI in program evaluations and the use of WLMI-based evaluations in making decisions about programs.

DR. REAMER noted a number of efforts for the Council to factor into its considerations and provided links and/or documents for distribution to the members by Council staff: the Congressional Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking's final report due in September 2017 which will address the feasibility of a federal data clearinghouse to facilitate program evaluation, among other topics; a National Academy of Science recent report on middle skills including use of data; CredentialEngine, an effort to create a nationwide database of credential programs; and a U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation project to create a central repository for job descriptions from private firms.

MR. BAREWICZ reported that the Vermont Department of Labor had been asked to present its work with a local philanthropic organization to create a brochure and marketing campaign around pathways to promising careers at a gathering in Washington, D.C. in the fall.

MS. LISBON reported that South Carolina was recently recognized for its apprenticeship program. She also reported South Carolina also recently passed a state law directing the formation of an interagency longitudinal database as the culmination of its work on data sharing as one of the five states participating in an ETA-funded technical assistance (TA) project conducted by the Center for Regional Economic Competitiveness (CREC). She described how her state had used an ETA-funded WDQI grant to establish an infrastructure for data sharing, but customary practices disputes over which state agency would hold the data had continued to impede actual sharing. With the state's new law on the formation of a longitudinal database in place, she anticipated that these barriers would be overcome, but that further work would be needed to put a final data sharing framework in place.

Subcommittee Report Presentations

10:00 A.M. to 11:30 A.M.

MS. FORLAND called upon the subcommittee chairs to report the suggested improvements identified by their subcommittees. (Copies of the reports submitted by the subcommittees are available at <https://www.doleta.gov/wioa/wiac/>. Page 3 of this document provides a listing of the four subcommittees, their members, and the SMEs they consulted.)

Subcommittee One

MR. MCKEEN, chair of Subcommittee One, thanked the members and SMEs for their work. He then called on **MS. PATE** who reported on the subcommittee's first suggested improvement to "Create a common or standardized data structure" that would facilitate widespread data accessibility through innovations such as distributed knowledge management and independent application development to tie the elements of the current system together. **MS. PATE** emphasized the importance of incorporating and leveraging existing WLMI systems and databases into any new structure and of creating standards and protocols that would allow systems to communicate and facilitate automated curation of reported data, placing professionals in a system design role. She noted that such a system could include both confidential and publicly available information, as demonstrated by the healthcare and financial records systems; that there would need to be a transitional period during which crosswalks would need to be used to allow communication between legacy systems using different occupational classifications; and that building such a system would be a long-term effort requiring significant investment, but that such a system would result in cost savings in the long run. **DR. REAMER** observed that efforts like CredentialEngine and the National Labor Exchange (state job banks) could be incorporated into such a structure and offered to introduce the subcommittee to representatives of these efforts. **MR. BAREWICZ** noted that introducing greater

standardization to the system could work against responsiveness to dynamic changes in the labor market. **MS. PATE** observed that learning computer systems, such as IBM's Watson, can allow for both standardization and dynamism.

MR. MCKEEN then described the subcommittee's second suggested improvement, "Upgrade the WLMI system infrastructure to 21st century levels" which proposed upgrading both hardware and software to enable the WLMI system to take advantage of innovative technologies such as machine learning, artificial intelligence, and natural language processing. The subcommittee further suggested that public-private partnerships and cooperation with research universities could help ameliorate cost concerns. **MS. FORLAND** expressed appreciation for the boldness of these two suggested improvements.

MR. MCKEEN indicated that his subcommittee would defer on the third and fourth suggested improvements, "Enhance UI wage records," and "Produce labor turnover information at the state and county level" to other subcommittees that had also proposed similar improvements. With respect to job turnover data, **MS. PATE** noted the value of the BLS Job Openings and Labor Turnover Survey (JOLTS) program, and **DR. REAMER** added that the U.S. Census Bureau (Census) Local Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) program also provides certain local workforce turnover data by industry and demographic characteristics, but not by occupation.

MS. PATE reported on the subcommittee's fifth suggested improvement, "Identify the changing structure of work in the U.S. economy," in recognition of the widespread consensus that the labor market and workforce are changing and that measuring and understanding its characteristics would continue to be of increasing importance. **MS. PATE** added that the BLS Contingent Worker Supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS) could be a key resource on this topic if it were conducted routinely, noting that **U.S. SENATOR MARK R. WARNER** had recently submitted a bill on transportable benefits for non-traditional workers. She also noted forthcoming reports on related topics from the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) and the Annie E. Casey Foundation.

MS. FORLAND suggested that, with the increasing importance of the CPS in the WLMI system, the Council consider recommending funding for more robust state-level sampling within the CPS. **DR. REAMER** added that BLS had requested funding to conduct the Contingent Worker Supplement every other year, but that it had not been funded. The members observed that survey has been conducted in 1995, 1997, 2001, and 2005, with another wave planned for the near future, and it was suggested that increased funding for the Contingent Worker Supplement and more robust state-level sampling in the CPS merited consideration as suggested improvements.

MR. MCKEEN called upon **MS. RUST** to speak about the subcommittee's sixth suggestion, "Increase the availability of information on labor supply and demand." She reported that while state WLMI agencies receive funding to produce job projections and to support identification of in-demand jobs, there is no requirement or funding for measures of labor supply. She noted that

a few state WLMI agencies produce labor supply data by measuring training enrollees, training completers, and levels of job seekers at their career centers. **MS. FORLAND** noted that the number of states producing supply data is increasing and that Washington State, for example, uses UI claimants and on-line job postings to help measure labor supply, but that states have to find funding streams to support generating labor supply data. She also expressed interest in establishing a common methodology for producing supply data among the states.

Subcommittee Two

As chair of Subcommittee Two, **MR. BAREWICZ** opened his presentation by thanking the members and SMEs, highlighting the importance of prioritizing the suggested improvements in an environment of resource scarcity. He reported that his subcommittee conducted five informational interviews with individuals from stakeholder groups to inform its work. identified by subcommittee. The subcommittee's first suggested improvement was reported as "Update O*NET more frequently and expand information available on occupations" with a focus on ensuring that funding be available to provide up-to-date career information to job seekers, workers, and students. The subcommittee also suggested additional information to supplement O*NET, including layoff and retention data, rates of part-time work, and incidence of self-employment.

MR. BAREWICZ then reported the subcommittee's second suggested improvement, "Create a comprehensive resource on credentials," emphasizing the importance of a resource that is up-to-date, validated for quality, includes credentials that relate directly to skills with value in the labor market, and demonstrates career pathways that do not require a four-year college degree. **MR. BAREWICZ** observed that, in Vermont, partnerships between community colleges and private firms had proven successful and that such efforts could help overcome the societal focus on four-year degrees. **DR. REAMER** added that the CredentialEngine project is cataloging credentials and plans to collect information about the labor market outcomes for credential earners, and that the LEHD program has two related contracts, one with the University of Texas and the other with the Colorado Higher Education System, to gather credential earner outcomes across state lines. **MS. RUST** noted that some private education providers receive public funding, which could be leveraged to spur reporting on participant outcomes.

MR. BAREWICZ reported that the subcommittee viewed its third suggested improvement, "Obtain better data on training/education program outcomes," as a big reach with two parts: utilizing state WLMI agencies as centralized entities to support program evaluations for all WIOA partners; and enhancing UI wage records to include additional information. He highlighted the potential for the state WLMI agencies to serve as central repositories of all workforce data needed and to perform workforce outcome-related analyses, and suggested that such an approach would allow for greater efficiency, elimination of redundant efforts, and enhancement of privacy protections. **DR. REAMER** observed that this suggestion tied in to section 10 of the recent Presidential EO on expanding apprenticeship, which spoke to

effectiveness evaluations across all workforce programs. **MS. PATE** and **MR. BAREWICZ** noted the opportunity to use user-generated queries to automate the process by which partners could request aggregated reports from the WLMI agency as the central data holder.

For the subcommittee's fourth suggested improvement, "Improve information on job quality," **MR. BAREWICZ** observed that the suggestion was related their first suggested improvement and to the work of Subcommittee One. **MS. ORVELLA** added that, from the worker perspective, wages and openings are the most readily available information, which offers a one-dimensional perspective on career pathways and that it would be helpful if job seekers, workers and students had a single portal that could provide information about other aspects of work. She suggested that the Employer Provided Training survey, conducted by BLS for ETA, could provide related insight, if it were funded. **MS. RUST** added that the survey was had been conducted in 1993 and 1995, but that BLS had not received funding for subsequent waves. **MS. ZELLER** added that including local and regional information would be important.

The fifth suggested improvement from the subcommittee was to "Create a common, integrated set of WLMI resources available nationwide" to support all end users. **MR. BAREWICZ** explained that the subcommittee envisioned addressing local workforce needs through adoption of standardized formats allowing users to access the same resources in the same format for different localities. The subcommittee identified obtaining sufficient sample sizes to provide localized information, despite budgetary constraints, as the primary obstacle to implementing this improvement.

MR. BAREWICZ continued by addressing the inter-related sixth and seventh suggested improvements from the subcommittee, "Improve data access and user experience through advanced technologies and tools" and "Customize WLMI delivery to better meet user needs." He stated that improvement six referred to the platform used to access WLMI, while improvement seven addressed the content available through the platform with the common theme being to leverage new technologies to make WLMI easier to access and use. He emphasized the need to consult experts in designing interfaces tailored to the needs of different end-user sub-populations. **MS. ORVELLA** noted New Zealand's Occupation Outlook mobile application as an example. **MR. BAREWICZ** also included a reference to an effort in Vermont to develop and disseminate customized, age-appropriate materials to support career awareness and planning at K-12 schools.

MR. BAREWICZ then reported on the eighth and ninth suggested improvements from his subcommittee, "Expand outreach and education efforts to inform end users about WLMI resources" and "Expand outreach and education efforts to inform WIOA partners." He emphasized the imperative for better outreach and education for job seekers, workers, and students and for WIOA partners on how to use free WLMI resources from state agencies for in lieu of costly private-sector alternatives.

The subcommittee's tenth suggested improvement was to "Develop methods for determining how well WLMI products are serving customer needs." **MR. BAREWICZ** noted the need for richer information on how well WLMI products meet end-user needs, as opposed to simple usage statistics. **MR. MCKEEN** added that there are commercial applications that can track which information is accessed, by whom, and for how long, as well as how often given users return. **MS. FORLAND** suggested that obtaining more information about users sometimes requires more detailed investigation through follow-up surveys.

The subcommittee noted that its eleventh suggested improvement, "Develop guidance for defining skill-shortages, in-demand jobs, and soft-skills," was related to the overall theme of greater standardization of methodological approaches and occupational classifications. **MR. BAREWICZ**, however, noted that such standardization might come at the cost of flexibility. **MS. ORVELLA** noted that when data on various types of shortages are disseminated, the nuances of methodology are often lost and reports simply refer to a shortage. The subcommittee then solicited input from the Council balancing flexibility and standardization. **MS. PATE** suggested there was a relationship between this improvement and Subcommittee Three's suggestion regarding defining success for training programs, concluding that the WLMI system needs to be smarter in developing guidance for identifying shortages and defining success. **DR. REAMER** drew the members' attention to the National Compensation Survey (NCS), conducted by BLS's Office of Compensation and Working Conditions, and the Council agreed to request input on the NCS from an appropriate SME.

MS. FORLAND concluded the session by suggesting that members be mindful of identifying overlaps between the subcommittees' suggestions and long- versus short-term improvements, and that they ensure that suggested improvements are specific and actionable, especially if they are ambitious in terms of scale and duration. She suggested that the Council target submitting five to ten recommendations to the Secretary, which would allow for one or two top priorities from each subcommittee. **MR. RIETZKE** echoed her comments and urged the members to consider their recommendations from the perspective of ETA's implementation process and make them as concrete and actionable as possible.

Subcommittee Report Presentations (continued)

1:00 P.M. to 2:30 P.M

MS. FORLAND began by asking **MS. LISBON** to present the report for Subcommittee Three.

Subcommittee Three

MS. LISBON thanked the members and SMEs and then began with the subcommittee's first suggested improvement, "Enhance UI wage records." She observed that this suggestion was similar to improvements identified by Subcommittees One and Two and that enhanced UI wage records could be valuable in evaluating workforce training programs by providing data on the workforce outcomes of trainees.

MS. LISBON turned next to the subcommittee's second and third suggested improvements, "Increase WDQI grants" and "Expand the capabilities of state WLMI agencies" which she noted were closely related. She reported the subcommittee's expectation that making the competitive WDQI grants available to all states on a regular, non-competitive basis would help states build and enhance the infrastructure and content of the longitudinal databases needed to support training program evaluations. She added that expanding the capabilities of state WLMI agencies would include the ability to hire and retain new IT and analytical staff. **MS. FORLAND** suggested attaching a proposed funding level to the suggested improvement. **DR. REAMER** added that, to the extent feasible, the Council's recommendations should address additional funding requirements, but should also give a sense of the fiscal benefits or savings anticipated from the investment, without needing to go so far as projecting dollar-for-dollar returns on investment.

The members briefly discussed the funding issues underlying the difficulty states have in hiring personnel with the skills required for building, maintaining, and utilizing longitudinal databases. State statutory limitations on hiring of personnel at high pay-grades were identified as a barrier, along with unavailability of adequate funding to contract out for that expertise. It was noted that overall funding for WLMI has been flat over the last decade (e.g., WDQI and Workforce Information Grants to states, and the BLS federal-state cooperative programs) while WIOA had brought increased demands on WLMI agencies. Partnering with research universities was suggested as a potential workaround. The members concluded that the success of WIOA and improvements in the functioning of the labor market would inevitably require investments in WLMI infrastructure.

MS. LISBON then moved to the subcommittee's fourth suggested improvement, "Update the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) more frequently." She explained that the SOC has not been keeping up with changes in the labor market and therefore does not serve end users effectively. **MS. ZELLER** added that the current process for updating the SOC entails posting proposed changes in the Federal Register, which most businesses do not monitor. She suggested direct outreach to employers and private vendors to obtain data that could supplement the SOC

update process. **MS. FORLAND** acknowledged the importance of timely updates and cautioned the members that constant, rapid changes in the SOC could result in a loss of ability to identify changes in occupations over time in SOC-dependent data series. She suggested moving from a job-title based classification system toward a system based on groups of skills bundled to represent occupations as a potential alternative.

The members then sought input from **MS. RUST** and **MS. FRUGOLI** as SMEs on the SOC. They discussed how the SOC includes some information on skills but that it is not the form of a separate skills classification and that, while ETA's Competency Models represent a business-driven approach to defining bundles of skills, those models are not standardized, do not constitute a classification system, and are not currently used as the basis for any data collections. It was reported that ETA had investigated the possibility of collapsing some SOC codes, such as those for teachers in different subjects, to reduce reporting burdens, but it had found that the current, detailed classifications were valued by specific end-users. Additionally, it was noted although the SOC is under the control of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and there is no funding dedicated to updating the classification.

MS. ZELLER reported on Subcommittee Three's fifth suggested improvement, "Educate labor market participants on skill transferability," noting that companies and job seekers often do not recognize that the skills for a given occupation are highly transferrable to other occupations; therefore a model connecting information about skills transferability with existing WLMI could enhance the functioning of the labor market. **DR. REAMER** offered to investigate efforts from the 1990s by the National Skill Standards Board to create skills-based occupational crosswalks, and suggested **DR. ANTHONY CARNEVALE** of Georgetown University as a relevant expert on the history of federal efforts at creating skills classifications. It was noted, however, that regional variations in occupational skills requirements had been a barrier to creating a national skills-based crosswalk. Torque and EMSI were mentioned as examples of private sector tools addressing skills transferability, whereas public sector tools such as MySkillsMyFuture and O*NET also address skills transferability, but were currently less well developed in that regard.

MS. LISBON noted that the subcommittee's sixth suggested improvement, "Improve data on skills associated with occupations," was sufficiently similar to the previous suggested improvement that additional discussion was not needed, except to emphasize the need for timely and accurate information.

MS. ZELLER then addressed the seventh improvement suggested by the subcommittee, "Review the definition of program success," when evaluating the effectiveness of training programs. She reported the committee's sense that a training recipient's outcome should be considered successful if he or she finds employment that utilizes the skills in which he or she was trained. She mentioned an effort by Wyoming to obtain more robust training follow-up data, which has required extensive collaboration with colleges and universities as well as supplemental funding. **MS. FORLAND** noted that success is currently defined by post-training wages and employment,

but that it would also be useful to know whether training leads to a job related to the training received. **MS. PATE** encouraged the Council to resist associating the value of including occupations on the UI wage record with efforts to define training program success in terms of job-training match, emphasizing that training can lead to positive outcomes in a variety of ways and that general skills development in areas such as teamwork, communications, and other soft skills are often undervalued because they are difficult to measure. **MR. FERGUSON** noted that in Northeast Florida, specific occupational skills and job training has been declining as employers demand more customized employer training on topics such as Lean Six Sigma. **MS. ORVELLA** observed that other post-training data are important as well, such as wage retention and increased wages over time, and that training costs could also be considered in effectiveness evaluations. **DR. REAMER** noted that Census is working on a project to machine-read occupations from 1040 tax forms.

Subcommittee Four

DR. REAMER thanked the members and SMEs and then proceeded to present the subcommittee report for Subcommittee Four. He indicated that the subcommittee had determined that its role would focus on enhancing the ability of the WLMI system and its institutions to respond to data-user needs, particularly as defined by the other subcommittees of the Council. He divided the subcommittee's goals into two large categories: 1) enhancing Council members' awareness of the array of WLMI resources and ongoing work in the WLMI arena, and 2) laying groundwork with subject matter experts to support the work of the other subcommittees.

He then identified activities that the subcommittee proposed to address, including: developing a guide of WLMI programs and resources at the federal and state levels with points of contact for each; conducting reconnaissance on topic areas such as potential enhancements to administrative records, legal, and other barriers to data sharing; applications for new information technologies like auto-coding and non-governmental sources of WLMI; and crafting recommendations on the supply-side of the WLMI system to support the demand-side priorities identified by the other subcommittees. He added that funding related to specific suggested improvements should be addressed as part of the relevant subcommittee's work. **MR. FERGUSON** emphasized the importance the subcommittee placed on addressing the underlying laws that impede effective data sharing. **MS. FORLAND** suggested that increasing the specificity around data sharing requirements in federal laws, such as adding state WLMI agencies as designated data recipients in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), would be a simple approach to the issue. **MS. ZELLER** suggested that increased efficiency and reduced duplication could be potential systemwide benefits of better data sharing.

At **DR. REAMER'S** request, **MS. LINDSEY JOHNSON** of CREC reported that lessons learned from CREC's recent state data sharing initiative included: recognition that resistance to data sharing is often culturally ingrained within agencies even when statutes provide for sharing and that agencies can struggle to assign data sharing activities among agency staff, especially when staff

are funded by federal grants to perform other tasks. She indicated that a representative of CREC would be able to provide a more detailed update on the project on the following day. **MS. LISBON**, whose state had participated in the project, stated that helping agencies see the benefits of sharing their data helped to break down resistance to sharing data. Members also noted that WIOA envisions data sharing and that state agencies often may have the ability to apply more flexible interpretations to relevant state laws than they currently do if key stakeholders are motivated by mutual benefits rather than arbitrary requests.

Overlaps/Re-Organizing Discussion

MS. FORLAND thanked the members for their reports and then led a discussion of overlaps between the suggested improvements identified by the subcommittees, referencing a document prepared by Council staff that categorized the improvements by topic. **MS. FORLAND** and **MR. RIETZKE** began by clarifying the scope for the Council's recommendations as follows:

- Recommendations should cover what needs to be done and how to get it done.
- The nature of how to get them done will vary based on the recommendation, however inclusion of some sense of the costs, potential savings, and key implementation actions would be helpful. For example, if legislation or pilot investigations would be needed.
- Recommendations should comport with the WIAC charter and focus on the Council's role to submit recommendations to the Secretary of Labor, recognizing that further action would be at the Secretary's discretion.

MR. RIETZKE indicated that staff would further examine the FACA guidelines with regard to limitations on including suggested legislative language in the recommendations.

MS. ORVELLA proposed a new subcommittee structure and re-organization of the suggested improvements based upon the topics presented in the Improvements by Topic reference document. **MS. PATE** suggested an alternative approach to re-grouping of the items. **MS. FORLAND** asked the members to develop alternative committee structures, and the members broke into two subgroups to develop two alternative structures.

DR. REAMER presented the approach for one of the groups, which would create three subcommittees to address topics from the Improvements by Topic document as follow:

1. Data Content – Focused on what data are collected, addressing the enhancing data topic, except for the labor supply and demand item.
2. Data Collection – Focused on how data are collected, addressing use of administrative records, data sharing, auto-coding, and other new tools and technologies.
3. Data Analysis and Access – Focused on delivering the information all end users need to make decisions, addressing supply and demand analysis, program evaluation, and tools to support business and career planning.

MS. ORVELLA presented the approach from the other group which would also create three new subcommittees to address the following topics:

1. Improving Technology and Tools and Educating End Users – Focused on utilizing advancing tools and technology in all phases of WLMI collection, analysis, dissemination, and feedback loops.
2. Enhancing Data and Program Evaluation – Focused on the items covered under both of these topic areas except for increasing the WDQI grants and expanding the capabilities of state WLMI agencies, which would be assigned to Subcommittee 3.
3. Facilitating Collaboration and Funding – Focused on supporting the work of the other subcommittees given its crosscutting scope.

The members then engaged in a back and forth discussion of the two approaches after which **MS. FORLAND** called for a vote. The Council selected the proposal from the second group, with the amendment that the item “Create a common or standardized data structure” from the Improvements by Topic document be moved to the purview of the new Subcommittee 2. The members then assigned themselves to the new subcommittees as follows:

1. Improving Technology and Tools, and Educating End Users: Barewicz, Ferguson, McKeen
2. Enhancing Data and Program Evaluation: Orvella, Pate, Madson, Lisbon, Zeller
3. Facilitating Collaboration and Funding: Forland, Reamer

Unassigned: Bucy, Fichtner, Golombek

BREAK-OUT SESSIONS

2:45 P.M. to 4:00 P.M.

The Council moved into break-out sessions for the new subcommittees to review and clarify the specific improvement items associated with their overall topic and begin identifying priorities. After the break-out session, each subcommittee reported out the items from the Improvements by Topic reference document that would fall within its scope, and the members verified that all items had been assigned to a subcommittee under the new structure.

The members also agreed to distribute certain cross-cutting items as follows:

- “Creating a comprehensive resource on credentials” would be split between Subcommittee One, which would look at the end-user education aspect of credentials, and Subcommittee Two, which would focus on the collection of related data.
- “Creating a guide to the WLMIS” would be divided between Subcommittee Three, which would inventory information about WLMIS resources, programs, and points of contact, and Subcommittee One, which would address dissemination of that information.
- Funding considerations for individual improvements would be addressed by the subcommittee suggesting that improvement, while Subcommittee Three would work on system-wide funding issues.

The Council adjourned for the day.

DAY TWO PROCEEDINGS

INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS

8:30 A.M. to 10:15 A.M.

MS. FORLAND convened the Council for the second day. Without objection, the schedule for the day was modified to move the break for lunch up by half an hour and adjournment to 4:00 P.M. The council then welcomed informational presentations by three speakers from BLS, **MR. MIKE HARRIGAN**, Associate Commissioner for Employment and Unemployment, **MR. HILERY SIMPSON**, Assistant Commissioner for Compensation Levels and Trends, and **MS. REBECCA RUST**, Assistant Commissioner for Occupational Statistics and Employment Projections.

MR. HARRIGAN updated the members on recent developments at BLS and the BLS Labor Market Information Oversight Committee (BLOC). Highlights included the establishment of a new vision policy by the BLOC and the effects of the FY17 BLS budget. **MR. HARRIGAN** reported that a FY17 budget of \$641 million had been proposed for BLS, which would maintain current programs and fund three new projects: an Employer Training Survey, a Contingent Worker Supplement to the CPS every other year, and creation of new measures for poverty. However, the final approved budget was \$609 million, resulting in cancellation of numerous program-related conferences as a cost-saving measure. He further reported that a BLS budget of \$607 million had been proposed for FY18, which would cover the maintenance of core data series, and that BLS planned to request several non-permanent, temporary reductions in funding to several programs, including reducing the budgets for the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) by \$2.4 million, the Local Area Unemployment Statistics (LAUS) program by \$500,000, and the Current Employment Statistics (CES) program by \$400,000, as well as a 6.5% reduction in the sample size for the Occupational Employment

Statistics (OES) survey. He added that ETA was working with the Office of Compensation and Working Conditions (OCWC), which conducts the NCS, to share modeling techniques and information about the physical requirements of occupations and that improving the availability of local data was a top priority for BLS.

MR. HERRIGAN reported that, in response to flat funding, the BLOC had established a vision that focused on taking proactive steps to close major data gaps related to: temporary worker placements; the mix of labor used to produce goods and services; measuring globalization at the enterprise level, rather than the establishment level; international supply chains; identifying in-demand jobs; and expanding local detail. In addition, he reported, the BLOC vision would focus on bringing new products in development to fruition, such as modeling JOLTS at the state level, converting the OES to an annual time-series, leveraging big data to enhance current survey programs, incorporating greater data visualization into the reporting of data, using auto-coding to reduce reporting burdens, facilitating sharing of wage record data between states, matching QCEW records to data from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), accessing customs data and data from the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) on foreign direct investment, and reinstating the Survey of Occupational Injuries and Illness (OII). He noted that enhancing UI wage records to include occupational information would advance these efforts on multiple fronts, including state-level modeling of JOLTS and provision of data on mass layoffs.

MR. HERRIGAN also updated the Council on current BLOC projects, including a project on enhancing UI wage records and a pilot study to facilitate sharing of state LMI budgetary information to shed light on the adequacy of funding for federal-state partnership programs. He reported that the BLOC had structured its living vision around groups of goals and had identified budgetary restrictions as a significant barrier to accomplishing its goals. He added that, if the BLOC determined that the federal-state partner programs were underfunded, BLS would consider moving resources from other programs to fill the gaps, but that BLS did not anticipate any new funding to be made available. He noted that BLOC welcomed cooperation with WIAC on cross-cutting issues, such as enhancing UI wage records.

DR. REAMER asked for clarification on the BLOC's strategic planning process and how it might relate to the Secretary of Labor's two-year plan. **MR. HERRIGAN** confirmed that if the system, through the BLOC, agreed that OES was underfunded and neither additional funding or cost savings could achieve a sufficient funding level, then BLS would transfer funding from other programs to OES and that BLOC would be a willing partner with WIAC in developing the Council's recommendations, although the BLOC's scope would be narrower than that of ETA. **MR. RIETZKE** asked about alignment between BLOC and WIAC activities such as investigating enhanced UI wage records, and **MR. HERRIGAN** indicated that the BLOC's focus would be on data inputs, whereas WIAC's focus would be on the outputs of the system, which could create opportunities for supportive efforts. **MS. FORLAND** asked for additional information about BLOC's activities related to enhanced UI wage records, and **MR. HERRIGAN** reported that BLOC's effort was between phases, and that the BLOC planned to discuss the charter for the

next phase of its project at its next meeting. He affirmed that once its efforts were underway, the BLOC would be open to collaborating with the WIAC committee addressing that topic. **DR. REAMER** inquired about opportunities for cooperation between the Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics and the Office of Compensation and Working Conditions within BLS, in response to which **MR. HARRIGAN** indicated that they were collaborating on topics such as general skill requirements, education requirements, and physical requirements of occupations. **DR. REAMER** then inquired about the questions to be included on the Quarterly Refiling Survey under development by BLS, and **MR. HARRIGAN** replied that he would be interested in topics such as employer-provided training and the use of contract employment and temporary workers, but that finalizing the topics would take place after the pilot process planned for later in the year. **MS. LISBON** asked how BLS prioritized expanding local detail in the national survey programs, and **MR. HARRIGAN** responded to say that while states present local data well, the federal programs could do a better job of presenting the data it already collects and that efforts were underway to model data from national programs at local levels. He specifically indicated there had been preliminary discussions about finding ways to improve the accuracy of local estimates from OES and JOLTS. **MR. BAREWICZ** asked how BLS weighed the value of short-term cuts to the OES sample size against the potential long-term benefits of investing in converting OES to an annual time-series. **MR. HARRIGAN** stated that he had endeavored to balance the impact of budgetary constraints among BLS projects without causing lasting damage to any of them and that he would continue to evaluate all available options to minimize the effects of the budget reductions.

The Council then welcomed **MR. HILERY SIMPSON**, who provided an overview of the NCS, which he described as a voluntary survey of establishments collected by the bureau's regional economists using sampling profiles determined in the national office. The survey, he continued, breaks jobs down by full-time/part-time status, unionization, and time versus incentive compensation structures. Furthermore, he added that it classifies jobs into levels corresponding to the federal General Schedule (GS) system using a point-factor approach developed by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and based on four factors: knowledge, controls, contacts, and physical environment. Within this system, he described how leveling guides are used to assign points to each factor and how these are combined to assign an overall level to the job. Once the private sector jobs have been leveled, the corresponding compensation data are used to set compensation levels for federal workers at each level in the GS system. He added that BLS produces several data products from the NCS, including: the Employment Cost Index (ECI), a principal economic indicator used to escalate wages for future work; Employer Costs for Employee Compensation (ECEC), an estimate of the hourly cost of employee benefits; and the Employee Benefits Survey, which measures the incidence of various types of employment benefits with in-depth information on the health plans, defined contribution, and defined benefit components of compensation. He added that BLS had recently published a new product, Modeled Wage Estimates (MWE), which models NCS job characteristics and OES data to produce estimates of wages by occupation, level, and location.

MR. SIMPSON then spoke about the Occupational Requirements Survey (ORS) that BLS developed to meet the needs of the Social Security Administration (SSA) for information to assist in making disability determinations, for which the SSA required greater detail than was available from O*NET. He added that the ORS consists of a nationally representative sample of employer establishments and is administered by BLS regional field economists, and that it includes data on: physical and cognitive demands, environmental conditions, and vocational preparation. He reported that the cognitive demands aspect of the survey, which includes questions about interpersonal interactions and the pace of work in the position, had presented difficulties and would be redesigned for the next wave of the survey. He also drew the members' attention to the vocational preparation component of the survey, which examines the minimum educational attainment needed to enter the position, the minimum on-the-job training requirements, and the minimum related job experience, credentialing, and licensing required by employers. He reported that estimates from the first collection cycle of the ORS had been released in 2016 and new estimates would continue to be released by wave, with plans to establish a five-year collection and reporting cycle, which would allow for coverage of 80 to 90 percent of SOC occupations at the eight-digit level.

MR. BAREWICZ asked whether benefit costs in the ECEC exclude employees who do not receive benefits. **MR. SIMPSON** indicated that employees who do not receive benefits are not excluded from the standard reporting, but could be excluded by special request. In response to questions from **MS. FORLAND** and **DR. REAMER**, **MR. SIMPSON** noted that the ECI and ECEC provide estimates for the Census areas and the 15 largest metro areas, but that the sample design of those programs does not allow for state-level estimates and that the MWE were currently available for major metro areas for a limited number of occupations. It was also noted that the ORS data could be helpful in placing veterans and jobs seekers with disabilities.

MS. RUST updated the Council on her work examining how states identify in-demand jobs. She explained that state LMI agencies are required to identify in-demand jobs under WIOA in order to better align job training and education investments with labor demand. She described some methods currently used by state agencies to identify in-demand jobs, including using recent changes in employment levels, recent employment growth rates, and projections for employment levels. She noted that these methods are often implemented in conjunction with thresholds for the number of openings or prevailing wages to select for occupations with quality jobs, especially in middle-skill occupations, and that states sometimes select in-demand jobs in sectors targeted for economic development or based on other factors. **MS. RUST** also mentioned alternative methods used by state agencies including: reviewing postings in job banks or online job sites, conducting vacancy surveys, performing supply and demand analyses, and monitoring requests for customized training.

MS. RUST then presented a recently completed survey of all fifty states and the District of Columbia conducted by her office that explored methods used to identify in-demand jobs. She reported that three-quarters of states indicated that they use projected job openings, the most

common method. Seventy percent of states reported using projected growth rates, and just over half of states reported reviewing online job postings. Targeted sectors and supply and demand analyses were reported to be used by about a quarter of states, and about a fifth of states reported using job vacancy surveys. Seventy percent of states reported using wage thresholds as well, and about half reported that they categorize in-demand jobs by minimum educational requirement for entry. She also noted that one state reported using the three-year OES estimates, since OES estimates could not currently be compared year-over-year.

MR. HARRIGAN added that BLS had been exploring the possibility of identifying in-demand jobs at the national level, and that the results of this state survey would be helpful in that respect, especially in better understanding how state agencies utilize online job postings, which he noted can be biased toward jobs that require higher educational attainment levels.

MR. BAREWICZ remarked on the variety of methods used among the states, and **MR. MADSON** observed that his agency appreciated the flexibility afforded by current system to respond to the needs of businesses and other agencies in his state. **MS. PATE** added that current methodologies may have difficulty capturing demand for low-skill and entry-level workers.

BREAK-OUT SESSIONS 10:30A.M. to 11:30A.M.

MS. FORLAND directed the subcommittees to resume their subcommittee work from the prior day, keeping in mind the goal for each subcommittee to produce three actionable recommendations by the tentatively scheduled Council meeting in September. **MR. RIETZKE** reiterated that WIOA requires ETA to explain the extent to which the two-year plan for the improvement of the WLMI system incorporates recommendations from the WIAC, which ETA envisions as including an articulation of the WIAC's recommendations. He also added that making the recommendations actionable, including details such as potential funding requirements, and identifying short- and long-term goals would be helpful in that process. **MR. RIETZKE** also advised the subcommittees to select new chairs during the break-out session. **DR. REAMER** drew the members' attention to several resources that might be useful during the break-out sessions: an article on the proposed College Transparency Act of 2017; an article on the National Skills Standards Board; a primer from a 1995 report on skills standards from the Secretaries of Commerce and DOL; and a meeting summary from the most recent meeting of the Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology highlighting overlaps with topics of potential interest to WIAC. The Council then proceeded to break-out sessions for the newly formed subcommittees.

Public Comment Period 1:00 P.M.

At 1:00 P.M., **MS. FORLAND** opened the floor for the scheduled public comment period. No members of the public rose to address the Council.

Break-out Session Report-Outs

1:00 P.M. to 2:00 P.M.

MS. FORLAND called for the chairs of each of the new subcommittees to report on their work from the morning break-out sessions.

MR. BAREWICZ spoke for Subcommittee One. He reported that the subcommittee members had focused on regrouping their assigned suggested improvements into three broad areas and assigning a point person to each as follows:

- Infrastructure and Advanced Tools – Mr. McKeen would spearhead the effort in this area, which would include systems upgrades and improved accessibility.
- Common, Integrated, and Customized Resources – Mr. Ferguson would work on this group of items, which would include addressing the Key Resources guide developed by Council staff.
- Education and Outreach – Mr. Barewicz would lead the effort in this third area, which would include educating end users and WIOA partners.

MR. BAREWICZ confirmed that the subcommittee had not identified priorities within or across these groupings, that the group needed to further examine each area to do so, and that he had been selected to act as subcommittee chair.

As chair, **MS. ZELLER** reported out for Subcommittee Two. She indicated that her subcommittee had also begun by regrouping its assigned improvement items, identifying common themes, and working through an exercise to identify the “what,” “why,” and “how” aspects of each suggested improvement. Although more discussion among the group would be needed, they had identified three potential priority items: enhancing UI wage records; expansion of skills information; and addressing credentials.

DR. REAMER, chair of Subcommittee Three, reported that he and Ms. Forland had identified three priorities:

- An inventory of resources, programs, and points of contact, which **DR. REAMER** suggested could lead to a recommendation for a mechanism for interagency communication.
- An inventory of the legal barriers to data sharing, which **MS. FORLAND** would begin to collect.
- A recommendation on system-wide funding, which the subcommittee would develop.

MR. RIETZKE suggested that the Council consider the following analytical and conceptual framework for research and analysis into the improvement items and moving toward identifying and communicating their priority recommendations.

- The What – a strategic level statement of the improvement.
- The How – high-level suggestions for how to implement the improvement addressing barriers and challenges.
- The Why – an explanation of why the improvement is needed, which could include benefits such as cost savings.

MS. FORLAND suggested including cost estimates for each of the “hows,” where appropriate. It was also suggested that the Council briefly discuss and identify a clear vision to guide and align the continuing efforts of the subcommittees and ensure that the final recommendations collectively constitute a cohesive strategy for achieving the vision. After reviewing the Council’s Informational Report and working documents from prior meetings, the Council conducted a brief discussion about identifying a vision. The second paragraph of the first section of the handout version of the Informational Report, amended as follows, was put forth as a candidate for their vision statement:

The nation’s labor markets cannot function efficiently and effectively without quality information to support the investment decisions of the workforce development system — including Federal and State policymakers; State and local Workforce Development Boards; Federal, State, and local government agencies; and frontline staff — and the investment decisions of business managers, workers, students, jobseekers and educators.

The Council accepted this language as its working vision statement without objection.

MS. FORLAND asked **MR. JOHN MAROTTA** of CREC, who was in attendance, to briefly update the members on that organization’s state data sharing initiative mentioned earlier in the meeting. **MR. MAROTTA** informed the Council that the data sharing technical assistance project, funded by the Laura and John Arnold Foundation, ends October 31, 2017. The project included a national scan of state statutes that affect sharing of UI records and corporate tax filings, technical assistance to five states (Wisconsin, Minnesota, Utah, South Carolina, and Iowa) to support development of state action plans to improve their data sharing environments. The project also included a survey of cultural attitudes on data sharing in Wisconsin, which found that many barriers were based on practices, perceptions, and personalities rather than statutory requirements. He added that the project was currently in its final phase, with forthcoming products to include a final report on findings and model non-disclosure laws, regulations, and data sharing agreements, all of which would be posted to the project’s website, statedatasharing.org, along with various additional resources. He indicated that CREC would continue working with the five participating states to advance their action plans on data sharing and produce best-practice case studies and that CREC was exploring the possibility of

undertaking a second round with a new group of states. He reported that the project had not included any analysis of federal data sharing impediments.

MR. MADSON mentioned that there might be products available from previous efforts to examine impediments to data sharing, and **MS. FORLAND** added that NASWA also had an ongoing project with CREC to examine state agencies' access to driver's license records, used to connect K-12 records with higher education and workforce records. **MS. FORLAND** suggested that coordinating and publicizing such efforts could be a key function of WIAC.

MS. FORLAND and **MR. RIETZKE** then reviewed the timeline for the production of the Council's recommendations. They suggested that subcommittees plan to have their three recommendations close a final form by late August, for consideration by the Council at its next meeting, planned for September, in order for the Council to submit its final recommendations by the end of the year. She reiterated that the recommendations should be concrete, actionable, and should each address the questions of what, how, why. It was discussed and agreed among the members that recommendations should address public costs only; that level of specificity would depend on the recommendation; and that the subcommittees should seek out and engage SMEs to assist with estimating costs. It was also noted that the Council should be mindful of the potential for cost estimates or projections to be a focal point for criticism when developing them. Identifying and aligning with key stakeholders and implementing agencies was identified as a strategy to improve the process of developing the recommendations and countering potential resistance. The Council then broke out for another session of subcommittee meetings.

BREAK-OUT SESSIONS

2:00 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.

The Council broke out into subcommittee groups to continue their work on developing and prioritizing their suggested improvements.

Concluding Remarks and Adjournment

3:30 P.M. to 4:00 P.M.

MR. HOUGHTON notified the Council that the terms for members on two-year appointments would end in March 2018. He stated that Council staff planned to publish a Federal Register notice soliciting nominations for new members in July or August of 2017 and that current members would be permitted to self-nominate for additional terms once the notice had been published. **MS. FORLAND** informed the members of a July 2017 joint NASWA-LMI-UI meeting in Baltimore, MD where topics of interest to WIAC would likely be discussed. **MS. RUST** announced that she and **MR. HARRIGAN** would be speaking at the upcoming National UI Issues Conference, a conference of state UI directors, state workforce agency administrators, and employers during the week of June 26.

MR. RIETZKE recalled the remarks of **MS. PORTIA WU** at the Council’s first meeting encouraging the members to offer a mix of both highly actionable short-term recommendations and outside of the box long-term recommendations. **MR. HARRIGAN** suggested that the members consider recommendations touching on the changing nature of work and labor force participation trends, especially those pertaining to low-skill occupations, the role of apprenticeship for non-college bound workers, and how technology advances such as robotics affect the changing demand for labor. He also suggested that members seek out opportunities to leverage public-private partnerships to take advantage of new and emerging technologies. **MS. FORLAND** emphasized that her direction to make recommendations actionable should not be construed to imply short-term, low-cost, or unambitious. **DR. REAMER** called upon the Council staff to invite representatives of the new Administration to Council meetings to introduce the political leadership to the value of WIAC as a resource for the Secretary of Labor.

The Council identified September 25-26 as tentative dates for its next meeting. **MS. FORLAND** and **MR. RIETZKE** thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting.