



**WORKFORCE**DEVELOPMENT  
COUNCIL

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES & ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Thursday, February 23, 2017**

**9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**

Princess Ruth Keelikolani Building, Conference Room 314  
830 Punchbowl Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

**HAWAII COUNTY**

Office of Housing and Community Development  
51 Wailuku Drive, Conference Room A  
(808) 961-8379

**MINUTES**

**Member Attendees:**

Carl Hinson, Performance Measures & Accountability Committee Chair, and Director of Workforce Development, Hawaii Pacific Health  
Marian Tsuji, President & CEO, Lanakila Pacific  
David DeLuz, Jr., Chair, Hawaii County Workforce Development Board (by phone from Hawaii County)  
Connie Mitchell, Executive Director, Institute for Human Services  
Leonard Hoshijo, (Designee for Linda Chu Takayama, Director, State Department of Labor and Industrial Relations)  
Yang-Seon Kim, (Designee for Luis Salaveria, Director, State Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism)

**Members Absent:**

Winona Whitman, Employment & Training Director, Alu Like, Inc.

**Guest:**

Doris Dvonch, WDC Deputy Attorney General

**Staff:**

Allicyn Tasaka, Executive Director  
Jeanne Ohta, Assistant to the Director  
Linda Sakamoto, Program Specialist

- I. **Call to Order** ..... Chair, Carl Hinson

Meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m. A quorum of members was present.

**Roll Call:** Individuals present in the room and on the phone identified themselves.

**II. New Business . . . . . All**

**A. Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) Local Plan Review Process**

Presentation . . . . . WDC Executive Director, Allicyn Tasaka

1. The process and timeframe for review of the WIOA Local Plans were outlined:
  - a. Instructions for the form and content of the Local Plans were issued through WIOA Bulletin 09-16 on June 17, 2016.
  - b. WDC asked twelve people knowledgeable with WIOA, including core and mandatory partners, to independently review drafted local plans to determine whether the questions in WIOA Bulletin 09-16 which formed the basis of the local plan had been answered completely. The twelve reviewers independently submitted their comments about the drafted plans to WDC staff to assist with local plan approvals.
  - c. The Wagner-Peyser Core Partner, which is administered by the Workforce Development Division (WDD) recused themselves as reviewers because of their intention to compete for WIOA Title I One-Stop Operator and service provider contracts.
  - d. Hawaii and Kauai counties submitted their plans on time, in October 2016. Oahu and Maui counties were delayed in submitting their plans until January 2017 for various reasons. To expedite their efforts, they hired Jeff Fantine, the consultant who helped to compose Hawaii's Unified State Plan.
  - e. Reviewer critiques were due by December 21, 2016 for Hawaii and Kauai. Two and a half to three weeks later these counties received consolidated requests for revisions. Because deadlines were short and a lot was going on, eventually all counties asked for extensions on submitting corrections. Extended deadlines have since passed and to date modified plans have not been received.
2. Because timelines have been tight, it was highly recommended that conditional approvals be given to all four counties subject to completion of requested revisions.

Discussion . . . . . All

1. Leonard Hoshijo asked whether this affects the RFP.
2. Jeanne Ohta responded that approved Local Plans are not required for the RFP but they must align with it and bring local areas into compliance with WIOA law.
3. Allicyn Tasaka explained that the plan approval process necessitates reviewers' input, then requests for revisions and submittal of amended plans. This process is usually repeated a few times until the plan is approved.
4. Committee members were given some time to read the consolidated comments and requests for revisions from the independent reviewers.
5. Jeanne Ohta continued, if a question cannot not be answered in a reasonable amount of time, an action plan to explain how the task will be accomplished, with a timeline and responsible parties named should be inserted. She noted that the big miss at both the State and local levels was to explain *how* tasks would be accomplished. As more guidance is issued, State and local plans should be amended. Jeanne observed that the

Federal government is imposing greater demands on states and locals under WIOA than its predecessor program, the Workforce Investment Act.

6. David DeLuz, Jr. agreed, particularly with regard to the need for greater clarity and accountability.
7. Marian Tsuji and Connie Mitchell asked who should be contacted since we are not getting what we need. Connie wondered if there was a way to see where they're at and let them know early on if adjustments are necessary.
8. Allicyn Tasaka answered that we are working through the Chairs and Executive Directors to obtain responses.
9. Carl Hinson added that by-in-large most questions were addressed and were specific and localized but there were areas that either needed to be brought into alignment (with the State Plan) or required better answers to show the alignment. He then clarified that the purpose of the independent reviewers was to continually review these plans until they are completely compliant. However, this committee should recommend conditional approval to the full board to validate the work being done and provide needed momentum to complete this task.
10. David DeLuz, Jr. reasoned that the change in administration (at the Office of Housing and Community Development) delayed the process for Hawaii County and noted that most reviewer comments requested clarification of answers or supporting documents.
11. Connie Mitchell said that this was an opportunity to be innovative and apply localized context and asked whether they (the counties) needed technical assistance on specifics like performance accountability.
12. Allicyn Tasaka responded that the WDC flew in Executive Directors, Local Board Chairs and a board or staff member to review the requirements for the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and infrastructure funding agreement compiled in a workbook that Jeanne Ohta spent weeks developing. They also discussed how costs should be negotiated, something the counties are not comfortable with. Meetings were held with Oahu and Kauai last week and will continue with Hawaii County today and Maui tomorrow. Review of the MOU and infrastructure funding requirements was also eye-opening for the core and mandatory partners who are meeting monthly.
13. David DeLuz interjected that national webinars were also helpful.

Conditional Approval of Local Plans . . . . . All

Connie Mitchell motioned to have WDC grant the County Workforce Development Boards conditional approval of their local plans pending submittal of sufficient requested revisions, upon the recommendation of the committee to the Board. The motion was seconded by Leonard Hoshijo and adopted with six aye votes, no abstentions, and no one voting no (six voting members were present).

Marian Tsuji asked if there should be a deadline. David DeLuz, Jr. thought it was prudent to add one. Allicyn Tasaka concluded that the local plans should be approved by June 30, 2017 because the American Job Centers should be operational as of July 1, 2017. Connie Mitchell amended the motion to include this deadline. It was seconded by Marian Tsuji and passed unanimously.

**B. Establishing an Instrument and Process for Evaluating the WDC Executive Director**

Discussion . . . . . All

1. Carl Hinson described the establishment of a tool and process for evaluating the Executive Director as a straightforward proceeding. Three hundred sixty degree feedback typically involves gathering assessments from subordinates, peers and superiors for comparison with the job description. If the State doesn't have an instrument, Carl offered to adapt one.

2. Allicyn Tasaka inquired as to the evaluation process for the two non-profit executives in attendance.
3. Marian Tsuji, President and Chief Executive Officer of Lanikila Pacific confirmed that the process for her review is as Carl described.
4. Connie Mitchell, Executive Director of The Institute for Human Services ascribed to a similar process but with the addition of annual goals. She commented that the position description (for the WDC Executive Director) is broad and suggested that specific goals be added such as “attracting business resources” and recommended standards for outcomes.
5. David DeLuz, Jr. said that the Office of Community Services has a means to measure goals and outcomes.
6. Carl Hinson said that he could add goal attainment to the tool.
7. Connie Mitchell elaborated, saying that the Executive committee is supposed to sit with Allicyn to set annual goals.
8. For this year, Carl thought that Leslie (Wilkins, Chair of the WDC) had done this with Allicyn. He summarized that this committee recommends the tool and process but the Executive committee does the actual evaluation. He then offered to email Allicyn the draft instrument for circulation to committee members.
9. Legal counsel, Doris Dvonch expressed concern about whether Carl could send the draft instrument to the committee members under the Sunshine Law but thought it may be permissible if Allicyn includes it as part of the material sent to prepare for the next committee meeting.
10. David DeLuz, Jr. suggested that the next meeting be held at 8:30 am before the WDC meeting on March 9, 2017.
11. Connie Mitchell asked if we can do web meetings, “go to meetings” as this is the way business is being conducted.
12. To address the confusion, Marian Tsuji clarified that this allows members to call in from their individual offices. This permits both visual and/or audio participation.
13. Doris Dvonch is not aware of prohibitions against virtual meetings but recommended a call to the Office of Information Practice to see whether this is allowed.
14. Connie Mitchell also inquired about what will be used to measure outcomes for local-level success.
15. David DeLuz, Jr. said there are specific performance criteria listed in the State Plan.
16. Connie Mitchell suggested looking for existing measures as many industries and sectors have them. For example, in the homeless continuum of care, HUD requires that her agency increase the number of clients who are employed.
17. Allicyn Tasaka will place performance criteria for the Executive Director on the next meeting’s agenda as well as updates on the Local Plans, if any.

**III. Adjournment . . . . . Chair, Carl Hinson**

Committee adjourned at 10:06 a.m.