

1 THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2020

2 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Let's get started. This  
3 day is called to order. Call the roll, please.

4 UNKNOWN: CHAIRMAN BRYAN DANIEL.

5 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Here.

6 UNKNOWN: MARIO Lozoya.

7 MARIO LOZOYA: Present.

8 UNKNOWN: Scott Norman.

9 SCOTT NORMAN: Here.

10 UNKNOWN: Steve Lecholop.

11 STEVE LECHOLOP: Here.

12 UNKNOWN: Conley.

13 WILL CONLEY: Here.

14 UNKNOWN: Jerel Booker.

15 JEREL BOOKER: Here.

16 UNKNOWN: Thank you. Chairman, there is a  
17 quorum. I would like to remind everyone this is a public  
18 meeting and the meeting is being recorded and would like to give  
19 a brief administrative update. And as an administrative tool  
20 with support from OGC to properly put the commission in the best  
21 place to make final decisions, we are providing sample language  
22 to use for the motions made today. And that language, which at  
23 the time I will have up on the screen, is "I move that we  
24 recommend the FY21 program parameter to the commission for  
25

1 consideration as follows." So, I will bring that back up, but  
2 just to give that brief update.

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right. Thank you.  
4 Well, thank you everybody for making time for this. I know  
5 schedules are quite, so we'll try to be as efficient as possible  
6 today. And what a great group we've assembled and always look  
7 forward to working with this group. Some folks on here I've for  
8 a while, some of you we just met a little while ago, but this is  
9 one I thoroughly enjoy working with. I'm so proud to see that  
10 my fellow commissioners have joined us today. Commissioner  
11 Alvarez, would you care to make any comments? Might get you to  
12 unmute.

13 JULIAN ALVAREZ III: Man, I'm glad you said  
14 that, Chairman. I was saying some bad stuff.

15 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I can read your lips.

16 JULIAN ALVAREZ III: It's all in Spanish.

17 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I can read lips in  
18 Spanish too, so I could tell.

19 JULIAN ALVAREZ III: I just wanted to  
20 welcome everyone and I'm looking forward to the conversation.  
21 It's nice to see everyone from TEA, higher ed and, of course,  
22 our appointed advisory committee members online. So, thank you  
23 for volunteering your ideas and your time for this, what we  
24 think will be a great initiative with the JET Advisory. You  
25 guys along with Emily and her team have elevated this to the

1 next level and we're so excited to be a part of it. So, looking  
2 forward to the conversation.

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Thank you, sir.

4 JULIAN ALVAREZ III: Thank you, Bryan.

5 AARON DEMERSON: Did you say Commissioner  
6 Demerson?

7 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Yes, I did.

8 AARON DEMERSON: Okay. I didn't hear it,  
9 so.

10 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: That's all right.

11 AARON DEMERSON: Good seeing you guys. And  
12 basically I'm going to get--Chairman, I'm going to get off  
13 afterwards, but always enjoy working with Chairman Daniel and  
14 Commissioner Alvarez and the team. The JET team that's here  
15 I've been there from the very beginning and Emily's just so  
16 proud of what you guys are doing. I've been sufficiently  
17 briefed this week and you guys are taking care of business. And  
18 so, Mario, Scott, Steve, all you guys. Jerel, you're new on the  
19 board, so I didn't know you at that point but your predecessor  
20 really put us in a position that really took care of a lot of  
21 business from that standpoint. But thank you guys for  
22 everything that you guys are doing. Scott, you're representing  
23 TWC. We appreciate what you guys are doing. And if I can do  
24 anything as my role as Commissioner Representative of Employers,  
25 you guys let me know at any time, but thank you for your

1 efforts. And Chairman, thank you for what you're doing as well.  
2 Now I'm circling out.

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Thank you, sir.  
4 Appreciate it very much. All right. Let's stick to our agenda  
5 here tightly if we can. Agenda Item Two would be public  
6 comment. Mr. Trobman, has anyone signed up for public comment?

7 TROBMAN: Good afternoon. No, we have no  
8 public comments today.

9 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Thank you very much, sir.  
10 Let's do Agenda Item Three, discussion, consideration and  
11 possible action on historical numbers and trend analysis  
12 regarding fiscal year 16-20, Jet grant applications. Emily,  
13 take it away.

14 EMILY CLODFELTER: Thank you, Chairman  
15 Daniel. As my colleague (inaudible) on our team will be pulling  
16 up the presentation. I would like to start with thanking the  
17 team. Everyone knows that there is a big team behind this  
18 program with Kristina Ramos and our contracts team. Carol Hunt-  
19 Moses with the RFA grants team, Mike Guzman with LMCI, Matt on  
20 the OEIC. Several folks have worked so hard to make the program  
21 what it is. We'd just like to thank them for all their hard  
22 work in putting this presentation together today. Also wanted  
23 to take the opportunity to introduce our new, still new, I think  
24 she's been here for a couple months, but the new Director of the  
25 Office of Employer Initiatives, Mary York, who's joining us

1 today. Just wanted to thank Mary for her leadership and welcome  
2 her to her first Jet Advisory Board meeting.

3 MARY YORK: Thank you, Emily. It's great  
4 to be here and it's a great program, and as the commissioners  
5 have already shared, supported by an amazing staff who are very  
6 passionate about what they do and about helping Texans. So,  
7 thanks for having me here today.

8 EMILY CLODFELTER: Thanks, Mary. So, we'll  
9 get started. Just as a quick reminder, I know it's been about  
10 seven months since we've gotten together. JET Grant Program  
11 providing those grants to eligible entities to purchase and  
12 install equipment necessary for the development of those CTE  
13 courses or programs leading to that license certificate or post-  
14 secondary degree in a high-demand occupation. So, what we will  
15 be covering today. We're going to start with a brief overview  
16 of the application scoring, go into some occupation data and  
17 then discuss disqualifications. I know this has been a question  
18 in the past of wondering why folks are being disqualified.  
19 Next, we'll go into a brief geographic breakdown of awardees  
20 over the past five years and then a deep dive into non-awarded  
21 applicants. We know that has been a question in the past of,  
22 you know, why are folks applying, especially multiple times, and  
23 not receiving an award. So, we have done a deep dive into that  
24 scoring. And then, a brief overview of marketing and outreach.  
25 So, with that we will go ahead and get started with the scoring

1 overview. So, with the JET request for applications, 50% of the  
2 scoring for each proposal is based off of a program evaluation.  
3 The remaining 50% is based off of an economic impact evaluation,  
4 which for the colleges is based off of a wage impact score and a  
5 community type score. For the ISCs, they as well have a wage  
6 impact score and community type score. They also then have a  
7 property loss score, which is dated from TEA. And then, a few  
8 years ago the advisory board put into place possible bonus  
9 points for those institutions of higher education that are  
10 partnered with an ISD. Per statute, ISDs must be in partnership  
11 with an IHE, with their community technical or state college,  
12 but these bonus points incentivize the IHEs to have that ISD  
13 partners. So, there are those possible bonus points for the  
14 colleges. Next is going into the program evaluation breakdown,  
15 which is worth a hundred points, and you'll see the breakdown of  
16 those scores on the slide. So, first starting with the number  
17 of unduplicated students, meaning the number of students that  
18 will be utilizing the equipment during that year, during that  
19 life of the grant, looking at the number of past JET-funded  
20 grants that they have received. And then, for the colleges,  
21 looking at the co-board's certified enrollment numbers. And  
22 then, for the ISDs, looking at the physical location of their  
23 IHE partner. Next, looking at letters of support. So, this is  
24 worth up to 25% points, five letters up to five points awarded  
25 for each letter, letters of support from local industry, you

1 know, letting them know, signing off and saying, yes this  
2 occupation is needed. We need folks trained with these  
3 certifications for this program or this course. Next, being  
4 unemployment rate. And then lastly, poverty rate. So, for the  
5 IHEs we look at the county rate, but then for the ISDs we look  
6 at TEA's Economically Disadvantaged Status Report, which breaks  
7 it down by ISD. Next, going into, so this is language that's  
8 used when an applicant that did not receive an award contacted  
9 the RFA grants team, you know, wanting to get some feedback on  
10 their application. And this is language that is sent out to  
11 them letting them know that, yes, there are several aspects of  
12 this application that are based off of, you know, economic data,  
13 past grants, you know, student enrollment numbers, that they may  
14 not have complete control over, but letting them know there are  
15 a few sections of the application scoring that they do have  
16 control over. One being their choice of occupation, which  
17 directly effects the entry level wage that is used for that.  
18 Next, being letters of unduplicated students. As I mentioned,  
19 these are letters of support from local industry saying how much  
20 that program or course is needed in the community. Sorry,  
21 letters of support then going back to number of unduplicated  
22 students, the number of students that will be served, utilizing  
23 the equipment during that life of the grant. So, then next  
24 we're going to get into major occupations awarded by type. I  
25 will say at any point if anyone has questions, you know, feel

1 free to interrupt me, but we'll keep going. And I know for the  
2 sake of time we've got a lot to cover today and I want to be  
3 respectful of everyone's time. Next, being major occupations  
4 awarded. So, we broke this out into IHEs and ISDs. As you can  
5 see, that navy blue color is going to be your healthcare  
6 programs, your RNs, your LVNs, your CNAs. And then, that kind  
7 of reddish orange is your production occupations. Those are  
8 going to be your welding programs that we've seen. And then,  
9 you see also installation and maintenance and repair  
10 occupations. You see quite a few other types of occupations  
11 that have been awarded across the state during the past five  
12 years. And then, this next slide shows this information in just  
13 a little bit of a different perspective, showing kind of in  
14 order of the number grants that are received per occupation per  
15 individual (inaudible) codes. So as you can see, 20 RN programs  
16 have been awarded for IHEs over the past five years. And for  
17 the ISDs, we've seen 35 welding programs that have been awarded.  
18 So, this next slide is going to go to just some background  
19 information. And we made this slide a little bit more simple  
20 just to make it easy to read, but total applications per year.  
21 So, over these five years looking at these numbers of that  
22 orange being the ISDs and then that blue being the IHE numbers  
23 of applications received. So, this next area we're getting into  
24 is disqualification. I know this has been a question in the  
25 past, and so we wrote down some of the top reasons that folks



1 have been disqualified. And I'd like to highlight this first  
2 one, high-demand board confirmation for other entity. So, part  
3 of the application that applicants must turn in is a high-demand  
4 board confirmation form, basically a form that the applicant  
5 takes to their local workforce development board for them to  
6 sign off and say, yes, this occupation is high-demand in this  
7 region. So, during that first year in the RFA we defined board  
8 as local workforce development board and, you know, spelled out  
9 exactly what that meant. And then, throughout the RFA, you  
10 know, referred to them as the board. Well, this is the very  
11 first year that the ISDs were eligible for this. And when they  
12 saw the word board, several of them assumed ISD board. So, we  
13 received a few of these confirmation forms signed not by their  
14 local workforce development board but by their ISD board. So,  
15 we took that as a lesson learned to make sure, okay, make sure  
16 that anywhere, you know, the word board is we spell out the  
17 local workforce development board to make sure that we can  
18 eliminate that confusion. And so, this next slide is going to  
19 show that first year we had 22 disqualifications, which you  
20 know, is higher number than last year being just two. So, you  
21 know, every year it is very important to us at the staff level  
22 to make sure that the feedback we get through the Q&A and doing  
23 a lessons learned at the staff level of making sure that  
24 everything is as clear as it could possibly be, every year how  
25 can we make this better? How can we make it easier to

1 understand? So, we've seen a trend of the number of  
2 disqualifications per year decrease over the years. So, the  
3 next slides are going to be the distribution of the grants  
4 across the state. And each amount is going to be biennium of  
5 the program. So, the first biennium that we had the program,  
6 '16 and '17, 51 grants were awarded. Also mentioned these two  
7 years we had the \$10 million available. We had about \$45  
8 million's worth of requests. So, this definitely highlighted  
9 the fact that this is a very competitive program and the need  
10 for this program is so great across the state. So then, the  
11 next slide is going to show the next biennium and the  
12 distribution across the state. As you can see, it's a heat map.  
13 So, the darker the blue, the more grant that went to that  
14 workforce board. And so, 50 grants were awarded during that  
15 biennium. And so, then this next map is going to be from last  
16 year, FY-20, which the first four years, 16-19, those are the  
17 years that we had \$5 million allocated every year and we saw  
18 about on average about 25 grants per year. Well, last year  
19 being the first year we had the additional funds, the \$8 million  
20 instead of five, we were able to award 41 grants that year, so  
21 16 grants more than that average over the past four years, so 16  
22 more institutions, 16 more communities that benefit from these  
23 grants. So, just wanted to thank our commissioners and the  
24 legislature for appropriating additional funds to the program.  
25 It's exciting to see how many more individuals and communities

1 are getting to benefit from these grants because of that action  
2 and that decision. So, we're so grateful for that. And so,  
3 then this next map is going to kind of fly through, and that's  
4 going to show it kind of layers on top the grants that have been  
5 awarded. And so, this is 16-20, these are just five years. And  
6 you know, I can take a moment and say for these five years  
7 that's 142 grants that have been awarded, 142 programs and  
8 courses and communities that have been effected by these grants.  
9 So, it's just so exciting to see. And we're so grateful to the  
10 leadership, the advisory board and our commissioners have really  
11 been the reason this program has been so successful over those  
12 five years. So, I think it's also worth noting and celebrating,  
13 you know, the grants that have been awarded in these five years.

14 UNKNOWN: Can I ask a question?

15 EMILY CLODFELTER: Yes, sir.

16 UNKNOWN: How are you, by the way?

17 EMILY CLODFELTER: Doing well. Doing well,  
18 thank you.

19 UNKNOWN: Is it just coincidental that  
20 Central Texas has not asked for any?

21 EMILY CLODFELTER: So, interesting you say  
22 that because these next two slides are going to get into that.

23 UNKNOWN: My apologies. Okay.

24 EMILY CLODFELTER: No, so perfect. This  
25 actually proves that it's flowing well, 'cause it raises that

1 question. So, as you can see, there are still five workforce  
2 board areas that have not received a grant. So, the first  
3 question that is raised is well why. And then you think, well  
4 are we seeing institutions applying in those workforce boards?  
5 And following that I'm actually going to turn it over to Matt  
6 Hidecki to go over the next few slides and kind of do a deep  
7 dive into these regions and then into the few institutions  
8 regarding those reasons.

9 MATT HIDECKI: Thank you, Emily. Great  
10 job. Good afternoon, board, chairmen. As Emily said, that's  
11 where we're going to pick off kind of jumping into our data deep  
12 dive. And we're going to start by focusing on those five  
13 workforce development areas who have not received a grant.  
14 Those five areas are Concho Valley, Rural Capital, Tarrant  
15 County, Capital Area, and Brazos Valley. And we decided to do a  
16 high-level overview of the two WDAs who had the most  
17 applications, that's Rural Capital with 11 and Tarrant County  
18 with nine. So, as we look at this slide, board, I will point  
19 out that we did mask the name of the applicant just out of  
20 respect to those institutions. So, if we look at IHE number one  
21 in fiscal year 17, we can see that their app score ranked 25 out  
22 of 25 applications that year. Their wage impact score, so the  
23 wage associated for HVAC mechanics for that year, was 3,598.  
24 Coupled with the number of unduplicated students, that's how we  
25 gather the wage impact. And as you can see, they were about

1 middle of the road, just on the opposite side of the 50% tile  
2 for their wage impact. And I will note something else, board.  
3 On these slides, we highlighted in red the aspects of the  
4 application that the applicant did have control over. So, they  
5 do select the SOC code. They do determine the number of  
6 unduplicated students who will be impacted by that equipment.  
7 So, that's why the wage impact is very much something that they  
8 have control over. And there are parallels here outside of the  
9 disqualifications in '16. You will notice some similarities  
10 across these applications, that their application scores  
11 typically were near the bottom of the ranking as well as their  
12 wage impact. So, if we don't have any questions for Rural  
13 Capital, I'm just going to slide on over to Tarrant County. And  
14 here looking at the same thing, IHE number one in 2016, again not  
15 a strong wage impact score, ranking 35 out of 37 applications  
16 for that year. And I will also note we highlighted it in red  
17 because they do have control over it. But if you look all the  
18 way over on IHE number one in 2019, you'll see that we did  
19 highlight no ISD partnership. Emily noted that earlier that  
20 there are bonus points associated with IHEs who partner with  
21 ISDs. It is not mandatory, but there are bonus points. So, we  
22 do consider those points left on the table for not partnering  
23 with an ISD. And again, similarities across the board, wage  
24 impact, property wealth score and community type score all  
25 impacting these applications. And here is the final slide of

1 the Tarrant County WDA. Again, similarities across the board,  
2 not the strongest application scores, property wealth score and  
3 community type score impacting their overall application score.  
4 And now, we move into two institutions who had applied more than  
5 three times but had never received an award. There are actually  
6 several of these institutions, but we went ahead and highlighted  
7 an IHE and an ISD to look at the deficiencies in their  
8 applications. Again, we did mask the name of these  
9 institutions, but you can see the WDA it's located in. So, for  
10 this IHE I'm going to start talking about fiscal year 17. I  
11 highlight the school year 17, because that was the only year  
12 that this institution's applications met the minimum 60-point  
13 threshold. And moving across, we can see occupation title for  
14 that year was machinists at a wage of \$43,000. Their wage  
15 impact score was very strong. They ranked six out of 25  
16 applications that year. And again, I will note that they did  
17 received full points for their unduplicated students. So again,  
18 the wage and the unduplicated student combined to get you that  
19 wage impact rank. And they did leave some points on the table  
20 for their letters of support. That is a maximum of 25 points.  
21 And board, I will note this application in FY-17 ranked 13 out  
22 of 25 total applications. And if we had our current funding  
23 that we do now in FY-17, that project would've most likely been  
24 funded. Further examination shows in FY-18, that's a little bit  
25 different of an SOC or occupation title. Electrical powerline

1 stallers and repairers at \$38,000. So again, they received full  
2 points for their unduplicated students, again, a very strong  
3 rank eight out of 30 for their wage impact rank. However, they  
4 left more points on the board for their support letters, so that  
5 impacted their overall score. One other thing I'll note for  
6 this applicant is in FY-19 the SOC code that they chose was  
7 information security analyst at a much higher wage of \$63,797.  
8 However, they didn't have as many unduplicated students taking  
9 advantage of that equipment. However, because the wage was so  
10 much higher it still left them just above 55% tile for their  
11 wage impact rank. So, I just wanted to note that so you can see  
12 how not only the wage of the occupation title effects their wage  
13 impact, but also the number of students utilizing the equipment.  
14 And that concludes the IHE, and we're going to visit the ISD now  
15 located in west central WDA. Again, I'm going to start with FY-  
16 19. Board, that was, again, the only year that this applicant  
17 met the minimum 60-point threshold. For '18 and '19, this  
18 applicant chose registered nurses. As you can see, in '18 their  
19 wage impact rank was ranked last and they received zero points  
20 for their unduplicated students. So, that has a direct  
21 correlation on that wage impact rank. And we see again that  
22 impacting their wage in FY-19 and FY-20. Again, not receiving  
23 many points even though it was a different occupation title.  
24 They did not receive points for their unduplicated student,  
25 again impacted their wage impact score dropping them to a rank

1 of 54 out of 58. And I know we covered a lot of data there,  
2 board, so I'll open it up for questions if anyone has any, and  
3 I'm happy to go back if I need to.

4 MARIO LOZOYA: This is Mario Lozoya. I do  
5 have a question.

6 MATT HIDECKI: Yes, sir.

7 MARIO LOZOYA: Is there a process by which  
8 these entities are informed of their score so they can hopefully  
9 improve going forward?

10 MATT HIDECKI: I'm going to actually turn  
11 that question over to Carol. I think she'll be able to give a  
12 more comprehensive answer.

13 CAROL: Yes, hello. Yes, the applicants  
14 are notified of their scores. I think one of the slides  
15 actually showed the information they send them as far as what  
16 they can't control, as far as the information regarding their  
17 economic impact as compared to the information they can control,  
18 such as the number of unduplicated students and points for the  
19 support letters. So, yes, they do get that information.

20 MARIO LOZOYA: Excellent, thank you.

21 JEREL: I have a question.

22 MATT HIDECKI: Yes, sir.

23 JEREL: From the earlier chart that Emily  
24 had put up it showed, I don't know, the list of ISDs and  
25 institutions, you know, from 2016 on. I was wondering how do



1 they get word of the application. Are we using glove delivery?  
2 There's 1200 school districts and, you know, a hundred some odd  
3 institutions. So, the institution numbers look good. I was  
4 just wondering how do they get word about it?

5 MATT HIDECKI: That's actually the perfect  
6 transition into the next slide, Emily. So, if you would like, I  
7 can move on to the marketing piece.

8 EMILY CLODFELTER: Okay.

9 MATT HIDECKI: Perfect.

10 EMILY CLODFELTER: Well Jerel, thank you  
11 for that segue. Just a brief overview of the marketing and  
12 outreach efforts that we continue to make for the JET Grant  
13 Program. Obviously, this year has been unlike any other, but  
14 we're excited we're still making strides and getting the word  
15 out. So, Jerel your question about how do they know when an  
16 application is out there, we do send out a gov delivery.  
17 Through whenever that request for applications is issued we put  
18 out an announcement, which we send to quite a few folks, to our  
19 boards, to our IHE partners. We utilize our education outreach  
20 specialists to help us get the word out to ISDs. We utilize our  
21 education service and in our TEA, TSC regions. So, we  
22 definitely work very hard to get the word out when that RFA is  
23 issued. We also during the year spread the word on the process  
24 to sign up for RFA notifications. Currently Maricela and the  
25 RFA grants team, there is a way for them to sign up any time an

1 RFA is issued that they are notified. So, it's all TWC RFAs,  
2 but we do spread the word on that language on how they can sign  
3 up for RFA notifications. Other ways that we continue to do  
4 marketing in our urge for the program, check reservations.  
5 Obviously, pre-pandemic this was definitely a wonderful way that  
6 we got out there. You know, we're continuing to adapt to this  
7 virtual world, but check presentations are a phenomenal way to  
8 get to show how these communities are effected by the grant, the  
9 equipment that they're purchasing, use of social media for these  
10 events, elected officials attending and seeing what their  
11 constituents are getting to do. Which then this leads to, you  
12 know, additional regional visits and presentations that we do  
13 across the state. Whether that be to (inaudible) board ISDs,  
14 economic development corporations, chambers, you know, local  
15 elected officials, several different groups. So, you know,  
16 during the year traveling and spreading the word through all of  
17 these events is definitely a wonderful way that we do that.  
18 Also conferences. Whether that be a statewide conference like  
19 Chocolate (inaudible), which we've presented at before, or  
20 regionally. For example, Texas Forest Country Partnership, the  
21 12-county regional economic development group over East Texas,  
22 during their annual summit, getting to present about the  
23 programs and getting to highlight some of the grants that have  
24 been awarded the nearer region. And then also here, events that  
25 we have put on here within our division. One thing the Skill

1 Summit normally pre-pandemic put on a two-day summit for our  
2 IHEs and workforce boards to come in for us to update them on  
3 all things TWC, the Skills Development Fund, JET being one of  
4 them, making sure that they're aware of the latest. And then, a  
5 skills call with the same group and a pre-TWC annual conference  
6 meeting. However, because those things were not able to happen  
7 we are planning an event on December 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> with our IHE  
8 and board partners where we will be able to present that and  
9 make sure they're all aware where the program stands and any  
10 questions that they might have. So, also talking about cross  
11 training. So, part of the Office of Employer Initiatives is our  
12 skills development outreach team. And these folks are assigned  
13 to regions across the state. So, their relationships with their  
14 college partners and their board partners are phenomenal. And  
15 so, they definitely re-emphasize whenever an RFA is issued, you  
16 know, (inaudible) to those folks making sure that they're aware  
17 what the RFA's about. They're also our phenomenal way to get  
18 questions back to us or help us with communication to those  
19 institutions. And then lastly, thinking of cross training as  
20 well, not just our division but also other divisions across the  
21 agency. Whether it be apprenticeship, vocational  
22 rehabilitation, we've seen grants awarded to people. Coastal  
23 Bend College a few years ago received a JET grant for the  
24 welding program and they purchased some wheelchair accessible  
25 equipment. And Matt and I had an opportunity to present last

1 month to a large group within the VR organization about JET and  
2 what JET can do for all citizens across the state of Texas, all  
3 of our future workforce. And then, ESC, education service  
4 centers. As you know, TWC is divided into 28 regions with our  
5 local workforce development boards. TEA has the 20 ESCs, which  
6 is a phenomenal resource when needing to get the word out to  
7 ISDs. As you all mentioned, 1200 ISDs, and that's a lot. And  
8 so, these ESCs have been a great way for us to get in front of  
9 them. And, you know, working through their executive directors,  
10 we've traveled the state and presented. So, this summer with  
11 the pandemic going on and with school about to start and every  
12 ISD handling the situation differently, you know, it obviously  
13 has been a lot for ISDs to learn how to cope with everything  
14 they're dealing with. So, wondering about with outreach how to  
15 adapt outreach to the new way of things right now. So, recent  
16 individual emails to every ESC CTE director and CTE coordinator  
17 letting them know kind of what's coming down the pipeline with  
18 JET. As of last week, we have done presentations, conducted  
19 presentations to 16 out of the 20 ESCs across the state this  
20 fall, since September. Since September, October and a little  
21 bit of November we have been able to virtually, through Zoom, do  
22 presentations across the state. And sometimes, it's been we're  
23 able to join their monthly CTE meeting and take 30 minutes of  
24 that agenda to give an overview of the program and make sure  
25 that these folks know how to sign up for RFA notifications, what

1 the program can do and has done or, you know, we see some ESCs  
2 decide, hey, we're going to create our own JET workshop where we  
3 come in and give, you know, our overview and historical view of  
4 what the program is. We hop off and then that ESC is saying,  
5 hey, we're here as a resource to help if y'all need anything.  
6 So, it's exciting that, you know, 16 out of 20 ESCs have  
7 definitely been working to spread the word on JET and this  
8 upcoming RFA for the funds that are available this year. So, as  
9 always, we continue to look for new ways to market and outreach  
10 for the program. And I'll also say our commissioners definitely  
11 help with that. All three, you know, help spread the word of  
12 what this program has done and continues to do. So, I wanted to  
13 thank them for their leadership and support and help when it  
14 comes to spreading the word for the program. So, that concludes  
15 this trend analysis presentation. So, with that we can either  
16 answer any questions or, Chairman, I'll turn it back over to  
17 you.

18 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Any questions or comments  
19 for Emily, Matt or others?

20 UNKNOWN: That's a very good presentation.  
21 Thank you.

22 MARIO LOZOYA: Yes, Emily, I have one  
23 comment that I think is relevant to your last slide. Prior to  
24 Covid I know that whenever you would do check presentations  
25 there would be some sort of delegation from workforce

1 commission, including yourself, the commissioner and others  
2 would go and present the check to the schoolhouse. And that's  
3 part of your marketing, actually, because that generates a lot  
4 of media within that community, which then excites the other  
5 school districts and the other community colleges in the area.  
6 So, I've seen it myself and I know it's very effective, and I  
7 hope that we continue doing it once we are able to.

8                   EMILY CLODFELTER: Thank you, Mario.  
9 Absolutely. And I will say, you know, as we are adapting to a  
10 virtual world this is something else that we've been in talks  
11 about, you know, and see how we can adapt that process as well.  
12 So, and Mario thank you for your view of how successful those  
13 events have been. Thank you.

14                   CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Right, any additional  
15 questions or comments for the group?

16                   STEVE LECHOLOP: Yeah, real quick I wanted  
17 to thank Emily and the staff as well for this wonderful  
18 presentation. I think the committee has spoken a whole lot  
19 about kind of geographic representation and making sure that  
20 we're distributing these funds equitably among not only  
21 community colleges and ISDs but also throughout the state. We  
22 want to make sure that everyone has access to these funds. And  
23 so, it's one thing to say that. It's another thing to do the  
24 hard work of analyzing our distribution patterns and the data  
25 that underlies what we've done over the last few years. So, I

1 appreciate very much this robust analysis. And it certainly  
2 gives me an idea about how well we're accomplishing our goal of  
3 that equitable distribution, so thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Great.

5 EMILY CLODFELTER: Thank you, Steve, and I  
6 would like to reiterate, it's such a big team effort. And Mike,  
7 I would like to give a shout out to Mike Guzman in LNCI, our  
8 labor market information group who does a phenomenal job at  
9 helping us with data collection and data analyzing. Our whole  
10 team has done a phenomenal job at putting this whole  
11 presentation together.

12 MIKE GUZMAN: Thank you, Emily.

13 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right. If there's no  
14 further comments, we have a series of what I would characterize  
15 as kind of program parameters that we need to set out.  
16 Traditionally, this group has laid out some parameters for the  
17 program moving forward for the (inaudible) to use in their  
18 decision. So, we need to do that now. Procedurally, we're  
19 going to talk about an item and then we're going to take a vote  
20 on it. That way we can stay organized here. I thin we can be  
21 pretty efficient. So, we'll let Emily take the lead on this.  
22 There are five different program parameter items that we need to  
23 find some resolution on today. Certainly, there'll be room for  
24 discussion, whatever we need to do in that end. So, Emily,  
25 let's start with the first one.

1                                   EMILY CLODFELTER: Thank you, Chairman.

2 And actually, before we get started on that I would like to give

3 a brief update on the funding available for FY-21. As you're

4 aware, we have the \$2 million available from general revenue the

5 legislature has appropriated, but we are excited to say that TEA

6 through an inter-agency contract will be sending over \$2 million

7 of federal (inaudible) for additional ISD grants this year. And

8 so, I have asked and invited Jerry Toussaint who serves as the

9 Division Director of the College, Career and Military

10 Preparedness Division over there at TEA to join us as a resource

11 if we have any questions. But excited that we have even more

12 funding available for grants across the state. And that brings

13 us to, and I'm going to share my screen, and I know I sent out

14 this document but this is the program parameters. And I have at

15 the top that language for promotions as I mentioned earlier to

16 sort of guide us. So, I'll continue to have that up as we get

17 through. But the first program parameter to discuss is the

18 funding allocation. So, remember, I know it's a while ago, but

19 last April during the last advisory board meeting y'all too

20 action regarding the FY-21 funding and decided to split it 40%

21 IHEs, 60% IDs, meaning \$4 million--excuse me. Splitting the

22 funding 40%, 60%. With the \$2 million of additional funding for

23 ISD grants, wanted to bring up this program parameter again to

24 see if there's any additional discussion or if there's, you

25 know, another motion to be made based off of that new



1 information. So, I'll open any discussion or thoughts. So, I  
2 will say, and this is voting on or taking motion on just the \$8  
3 million of the GR JET fund. Okay. If not--

4 UNKNOWN: What's that going to be, about \$3  
5 million for IHEs only and about \$6.something million for ISDs?  
6 Is that how it's going to break out with the addition of the \$2  
7 million?

8 EMILY CLODFELTER: Yes, sir. I have this  
9 on the paper. Just a second. Yes, sir. That is correct. So,  
10 then with the ISDs, the \$4.8 million plus the \$2 million  
11 additional funds from TEA that would be coming over. I failed  
12 to mention, but I brought up TEA and I'd like to bring this up  
13 as well. One of the requirements regarding this fund is that  
14 the ISDs, the program or course they're applying under, be under  
15 one the TEA CTE programs of study. And as staff, we've had many  
16 conversations with TEA in learning more about this and learning  
17 this is already a requirement for ISDs, that these programs fall  
18 under the CTE programs of study. So, this is more of just, you  
19 know, a checkbox to make sure to see what program of study that  
20 falls under. I did want to give that update as well. Yes,  
21 Chairman. So, for the ISDs then, the breakdown would be they  
22 would have approximately \$6.8 million available for ISDs.

23 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right. Okay, so this  
24 is frankly relitigating something we did in April, just to make  
25 sure everybody is still on board with this considering the

1 addition of some funds from TEA that we didn't know about in  
2 April. We probably could just vote to confirm this as is unless  
3 there's changes. And certainly now would be the appropriate  
4 time for any discussion or changes that we might want to make.

5 UNKNOWN: Mr. Chairman, I don't--go ahead,  
6 Mario.

7 MARIO LOZOYA: Okay.

8 UNKNOWN: I was prepared to make a motion,  
9 but I'll standby for discussion.

10 MARIO LOZOYA: Absolutely. I was going to  
11 do the same thing.

12 UNKNOWN: I was prepared to make a motion  
13 that the parameters in prior meetings stand as is regardless of  
14 the additional TEA funding.

15 MARIO LOZOYA: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Any discussion on the  
17 motion?

18 EMILY CLODFELTER: I believe he seconded  
19 it, Chairman.

20 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: We've got a second.

21 EMILY CLODFELTER: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Any discussion? All  
23 right. You guys want to do a roll--are there any dissenting  
24 votes? Can I say it was unanimous?

25 UNKNOWN: Yes.

1 UNKNOWN: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right. Unanimous.  
3 Motion passes.

4 EMILY CLODFELTER: And as a reminder, I  
5 have on the top of this sample language to use moving forward if  
6 you're making a motion if you'd like to use that. So, this next  
7 item we will get to is something that we bring up every year,  
8 minimum/maximum grant amount. I gave historical numbers to show  
9 what has been decided the past five years. And so, we'll need  
10 to have a motion regarding FY-21 minimum/maximum grant amount.  
11 As you can see, the last three years have been \$40,000 as  
12 minimum and \$300,000 as the maximum.

13 SCOTT NORMAN: Emily, Scott Norman. Staff  
14 feel like the last three years' range has worked pretty well for  
15 what we're seeing and the funds that we've had to allocate.

16 EMILY CLODFELTER: I would agree with that.  
17 I will ask Carol or Kristina if they have any thoughts or any  
18 insight that they would like to share.

19 JEREL BOOKER: And along those lines if  
20 they're going to speak, with everything that's happened with  
21 Covid and the additional money from TEA, would it need to go  
22 back up to the FY-16 amounts? Are we worrying about getting all  
23 the money out the door, depending on people being able to put  
24 applications during this time. I'm just curious.

25

1                   EMILY CLODFELTER: Carol, Kristina, do  
2 y'all have any thoughts?

3                   UNKNOWN: Emily, the current funding  
4 amounts have worked well, but I think Mr. Booker brings up a  
5 good point of possibly increasing the amount given the  
6 additional funds that we have.

7                   SCOTT NORMAN: I would be for increasing  
8 the top end, but I think we should keep the bottom at 40 would  
9 be my position on that. I think I've asked this question,  
10 Emily, every year about this.

11                   EMILY CLODFELTER: Good question.

12                   SCOTT NORMAN: But, I'll throw out there if  
13 they get back to FY-17 level 40 to 350.

14                   MARIO LOZOYA: Mr. Norman, this is Mario  
15 Lozoya. Are you suggesting that that adjustment be made only  
16 for the upcoming fiscal year due to the fact that we have extra  
17 funding and then revert back to normal?

18                   SCOTT NORMAN: Yeah, I think that's all  
19 we're being asked to do this FY; is that correct?

20                   EMILY CLODFELTER: Correct.

21                   SCOTT NORMAN: Yeah. But I do think that  
22 since there is that extra funding if there are some large ones,  
23 I don't know. Yes, would be my answer, Mario.

24                   MARIO LOZOYA: Those are great points by  
25 Scott and Jerel for sure. I agree.

1 SCOTT NORMAN: We'll see what we have to  
2 deal with next year.

3 JEREL BOOKER: Yeah. We have taken this  
4 year-by-year traditionally. So, this'll definitely come back up  
5 as a decision point when we get into next fiscal year's point.

6 UNKNOWN: Thank you, Emily, for scrolling  
7 back up. So, I move that we recommend the FY-21 RFA parameter  
8 to the commission consideration as follows, let's move it back  
9 to FY-17 allocation amounts of a \$40,000 minimum, \$350,000  
10 maximum.

11 SCOTT NORMAN: Second, Scott Norman.

12 CHAIR DANIEL: I heard the motion. It has  
13 been seconded. Is there any further discussion? All right,  
14 hearing no discussion, are there any dissenting votes? Hearing  
15 none, the motion carries. We'll show it as unanimous.

16 EMILY CLODFELTER: Thank you, Chairman.  
17 And then, I'm going to get to three staff recommended updates.  
18 So, the first one is an update to the section of the program  
19 evaluation that deals with the number of past JET grant awards.  
20 For example, if an institution has never received a JET grant,  
21 then they would receive the maximum amount of points for that  
22 section. So, the thought was for the IHEs, when looking back at  
23 the number of JET grants an IHE have had, we look at our grants  
24 since the inception of the program, meaning grants while under  
25 the comptroller's office. And so, the thought was to set a

1 reset button for those IHEs. And now that we've had five years  
2 of grants to now only count IHE grants that have been issued  
3 under TWC. There have been some IHEs that have gotten grants  
4 while under the comptroller's office but have not received a JET  
5 grant while the (inaudible) has been here at TWC. So, the  
6 thought was to again set a reset and for institutions of higher  
7 education only count grants that have been awarded under TWC for  
8 this section.

9 MARIO LOZOYA: This is Mario Lozoya. What  
10 I think is relevant is that during the window of time in which  
11 TWC was responsible there has been a change of criteria, right?  
12 So, it makes sense that we rate based on it, not on prior  
13 criteria. So, I would agree on the reset discussion.

14 EMILY CLODFELTER: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right. Further  
16 discussion? We can entertain a motion at this point to make a  
17 change.

18 UNKNOWN: So moved.

19 UNKNOWN: Seconded.

20 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's been moved and  
21 seconded. Do what Emily said is what the motion is.

22 EMILY CLODFELTER: I like that.

23 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: The experience that  
24 applicants will undergo is their experience at TWC is a great  
25 way to summarize that, rather than the total experience through

1 the program. We'll focus on the life of the program as it is at  
2 TWC. Any further comments or questions? Are there any  
3 dissenting votes? Hearing none, the motion carries.

4                   EMILY CLODFELTER: Thank you, Chairman.  
5 So, the second item under the staff-recommended RFA updates is  
6 regarding the budget workbook scoring. So, for that I'm going  
7 to turn it over to Kristina Ramos, who handles the JET grant  
8 contracts to explain the reason for this recommendation.

9                   KRISTINA RAMOS: Good afternoon, everyone.  
10 This is Kristina Ramos, the department that manages all of the  
11 JET grants. Through the evaluation process we review all of the  
12 individual budgets that are submitted from the applicants. This  
13 usually averages anywhere from 90 to 100 budgets that we are  
14 individually reviewing. There is currently no scoring attached  
15 to the budget workbook, but we have noticed in the past how  
16 grantees do not always comply with the requirements that we  
17 request for these budget workbooks. Sometimes we actually have  
18 to look at all of the calculations for every single budget that  
19 comes in. If they are incorrect, we have to make corrections to  
20 that. Sometimes they do not submit Excel documents, so we have  
21 to have staff literally transfer over their budgets onto an  
22 Excel document to allow for calculation checks. Applicants also  
23 continue to bundle items, which makes it difficult to see what  
24 is included in their request and making sure that they are not  
25 including any disallowed items. And they also continue to list

1 items that are disallowed in the (inaudible) document, including  
2 consumable supplies and extended warranties and such. And we  
3 thought that by applying a score which takes away points, it's  
4 not just a flat score but takes away points for noncompliance,  
5 we may have some additional compliance (inaudible) when they  
6 submit their budgets.

7 EMILY CLODFELTER: Thank you, Kristina.

8 KRISTINA RAMOS: Sure.

9 EMILY CLODFELTER: So, the motion would be  
10 to allow staff to assign point deductions to the overall score  
11 based on the budget workbook scoring.

12 UNKNOWN: I move to recommend that the FY-  
13 21 RFA program parameter for the commission for consideration,  
14 hope I get this right, to deal with the scoring based off the  
15 budget book. Did I say that right?

16 EMILY CLODFELTER: Yes. To deduct points  
17 based off of score.

18 UNKNOWN: Based off of, right.

19 UNKNOWN: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's been moved and  
21 seconded. Any further discussion? All right, any dissenting  
22 votes? Hearing none, motion carries.

23 EMILY CLODFELTER: Thank you, Chairman.  
24 And this brings us to our final staff recommendation, removing  
25 the 60-point threshold. So, I know a few of y'all were around



1 when this discussion happened back in 2016 when we had our very  
2 first JET Advisory Board meeting and the program was brand new  
3 for ISDs and wanting to kind of put in that safety net of a  
4 scoring threshold. And the decision was made to assign a 60-  
5 point score threshold. So, the thought is, you know, now that  
6 we've seen five years of successful grants and we have this  
7 additional funding to remove this to make sure that we do not  
8 leave any funds on the table. I will say last year for FY-20  
9 there were \$10.7 million's worth of application that met that  
10 minimum, that 60-point threshold. So, you know, definitely, to  
11 give flexibility to make sure that we do not leave funds on the  
12 table this year. With that I'll turn it back over.

13 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Okay. Comments or  
14 questions?

15 MARIO LOZOYA: This is Mario Lozoya again.  
16 I mean I appreciate the fact that we don't want to leave funds  
17 on the table. However, I also don't want to create an  
18 opportunity where there are funds awarded to programs that are  
19 not economically effective to communities. So, I don't know.  
20 Is it maybe better to just adjust the threshold versus to remove  
21 it?

22 EMILY CLODFELTER: Mario, are you asking  
23 that to the advisory board or are you asking that--

24 MARIO LOZOYA: Just anybody. If anybody  
25 has any comment to that.

1 UNKNOWN: So, I have a question. Emily, if  
2 this threshold's removed--it hasn't effected anybody to this  
3 point, correct?

4 EMILY CLODFELTER: So, last year, there  
5 were not enough--with the additional funding there was  
6 approximately \$4 million available for IHEs. There were not IHE  
7 applications that met that 60-point threshold for the full \$4  
8 million available for IHEs. So, what happened was then the  
9 remaining funds from that "IHE pot" were then moved to fund  
10 additional ISD grants. So, we haven't in a sense left funds on  
11 the table, but that was the first year that that had happened.  
12 Previously, no, we have never run into that issue.

13 UNKNOWN: Okay. And these funds, do they  
14 have carry over within the buy in or not?

15 EMILY CLODFELTER: No, sir. General  
16 revenue, so by August 31<sup>st</sup> of the year.

17 UNKNOWN: Which is why you did the ISDs,  
18 expanded the ISDs versus money going back. Okay. So, would you  
19 remove it completely or just lower it?

20 EMILY CLODFELTER: We were recommending  
21 removing it completely just, again, to have that flexibility to  
22 ensure that funds are not left on the table.

23 UNKNOWN: Was it arbitrary in the  
24 beginning? Like was it 60 or you felt like?

25

1                   EMILY CLODFELTER: I mean, it was just a  
2 discussion. Discussions were had, absolutely. You know, but it  
3 was numbers--

4                   UNKNOWN: Emily, if I think I recall, I  
5 attended that particular meeting and we asked the staff for data  
6 and I think the staff, based on the data that the staff  
7 provided, the board at the time thought that that was the sweet  
8 spot based on the applications at the time.

9                   EMILY CLODFELTER: Another time we did not  
10 have--we probably looked at data from the comptroller's office  
11 since we didn't have any data ourselves regarding applications.  
12 So, but again, yes. I'm sure we definitely looked into things  
13 and had those types of analyzing discussions regarding it for  
14 the advisory board to come to that number.

15                   UNKNOWN: So, one other question I have is  
16 if you're 58 or 59 you can't be that much lower than someone  
17 who's 60. Do we provide more technical assistance or more  
18 monitoring if they are that? Is that something we'd be  
19 comfortable doing?

20                   EMILY CLODFELTER: Technical assistance for  
21 the grant itself?

22                   UNKNOWN: Well, just if you score low then  
23 we're feeling like I agree with Mario. You don't want to just  
24 throw money into a program that's not meeting the needs. But if  
25 they are under the threshold maybe it's a trigger for, you know,

1 additional monitoring or a technical assistance call or  
2 something like that.

3                   EMILY CLODFELTER: Well, and I will say,  
4 and this brings up the point that Kristina just went over  
5 regarding the budget score. So, you know, up to 10 points off  
6 their final score, well that could take an application that, you  
7 know, only got a 65 and moved them to a 59 because they forgot  
8 to turn it in--and this is obviously hypothetical, but forgot to  
9 turn it in in the correct format or, you know, staff had to work  
10 with them to unbundle some of their items and that sort of  
11 stuff. So, meaning what would have been last year one that  
12 definitely made that 60-point mark because of now assigning, you  
13 know, scoring the budget, maybe that has some of those great  
14 grants and great programs would fall under that 60-point  
15 threshold now. Again, that's all hypothetical.

16                   SCOTT NORMAN: I have a comment. I think  
17 the scoring means something and we, y'all especially, came up a  
18 lot of time creating that scoring matrix. And so, you know, we  
19 should have applicants that's incumbent on them doing a good job  
20 and doing their homework before they turn their papers in. So,  
21 you know, I'm kind of with Mario to an extent. I also don't  
22 want to leave the funding. What if we just lowered it to 50%?  
23 Would that catch some of that and make it a 50% threshold  
24 instead of 60%?

25

1 MARIO LOZOYA: I agree with Scott.

2 Actually, I was about to make the motion that the score be  
3 adjusted to 50 points and not remove it completely.

4 SCOTT NORMAN: It seems like that would  
5 catch some of these that are on the edge but not encourage  
6 sloppy applications.

7 UNKNOWN: Yeah, what's the total number of  
8 points available?

9 EMILY CLODFELTER: Of 100.

10 UNKNOWN: Yeah, so Mario's proposed motion  
11 would say that you have to get at least 50% of the available  
12 points to be in the running for the money. That doesn't seem--  
13 that seems prudent on our part from sort of a caretake of the  
14 taxpayer dollars. At the same time, I mean, you only have to  
15 get half the points to be at least in competition. So, that  
16 seems to give some ground on both sides.

17 SCOTT NORMAN: Yeah. And I don't want any  
18 of us to be accused of throwing money away to folks that turned  
19 in stuff that maybe they can do a better, you know, whatever it  
20 may be. Mario, (inaudible).

21 MARIO LOZOYA: My apologies. I have to  
22 bail out and that's my motion.

23 SCOTT NORMAN: I'll second it on your way  
24 out the door.

25

1 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's been moved and  
2 seconded. Any further discussion? Any dissenting votes?  
3 Motion carries.

4 EMILY CLODFELTER: Thank you. And  
5 Chairman, that is the conclusion of the FY program parameters.

6 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right. Next item on  
7 the agenda is just the discussion, consideration and possible  
8 action for future board meetings.

9 EMILY CLODFELTER: Absolutely. So, we will  
10 continue to keep the advisory board updated on when the FY-21  
11 RFA is issued. And after that time, we will contact everyone to  
12 schedule the advisory board meeting.

13 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right. Any further  
14 business that needs to come before the advisory board today?

15 SCOTT NORMAN: Two question. One, please  
16 continue to share any events that occur once those start  
17 happening again. And two, I don't think I noticed we adopted  
18 the minutes. Do we not need to? They were in your packet.

19 EMILY CLODFELTER: We do not need to.  
20 Those were a transcript from the last meeting. So, that was  
21 just more of an FYI for y'all.

22 SCOTT NORMAN: Okay, thank you. That's all  
23 I have.

24 EMILY CLODFELTER: Thank you, Scott.

25

1 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Any additional items?

2 Any other business? Is there a motion to adjourn?

3 UNKNOWN: (Inaudible).

4 UNKNOWN: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's been moved and  
6 seconded to adjourn. Before we adjourn I'm going just take a  
7 point of personal privilege and say thank you again for your  
8 service. I know it's volunteer and we really appreciate all the  
9 input, you guys. I give considerable thought to this and it  
10 really helps us have a stronger program, so thank you very, very  
11 much for that.

12 UNKNOWN: (Inaudible).

13 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: We adjourn and if no one  
14 disagrees, we are adjourned.

15 UNKNOWN: Bye, everyone.

16 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Thank you, everyone.  
17 Scott, good to see you.

18 SCOTT NORMAN: Good to see you, buddy.  
19 Like the hair.

20 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Thank you.

21 UNKNOWN: Bye bye.

22 EMILY CLODFELTER: Bye.

23

24 [No audio for rest of recording]

25