

CHICAGO COOK WORKFORCE INNOVATION BOARD MEETING
Report of proceedings had at the Chicago

Cook Workforce Innovation Board Quarterly Meeting held
at 7222 West Cermak Road, North Riverside, Illinois,
on the 17th day of June, A.D., 2025, commencing at
10:35 a.m.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

JACKI ROBINSON-IVY, Co-Chair

HAVEN ALLEN, Co-Chair (via videoconference)

GEORGE WRIGHT

PAM McDONOUGH

MICHELE SMITH

DR. LISA BLY-JONES

JANE KIMPAYE

DAWN PFEIFFER

ADAM HECKTMAN

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT (continued):

MANNY RODRIGUEZ

MATT JOHANSON

CARRIE THOMAS

SARAH LICHTENSTEIN-WALTER

NICK DESIDERI

VICTOR DICKSON

JASON SPIGNER

MICHAEL THOMPSON

RAHNEE PATRICK

NANCY CAO

JENNIFER FOSTER

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: It's 10:35 so we're five minutes late, right on time, Chicago.

Good morning, everyone.

(Chorus of good morning.)

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: Nicole, let's do -- make sure we get everybody.

MS. McDONOUGH: I think we're one short.

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: We are.

MS. McDONOUGH: We've got to have a physical --

MS. SHAW: We have to have an in-person quorum. People who are virtual are able to participate.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: If we could hold off on voting on the minutes, it's fine.

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: Yeah, we've got some policy stuff we need to do.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Let's start with the roll call and then people (inaudible) -- at least where we stand.

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: Okay, Nicole, go ahead.

MS. SHAW: Okay. For Co-Chair Jacki Robinson-Ivy ...

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: I'm here.

MS. SHAW: Co-Chair Haven Allen ...

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: I'm here.

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

Adam Hecktman ...

MR. HECKTMAN: Here.

MS. SHAW: And if you are here as a proxy and I call the person that you're here for proxy for, you say present and then your name.

Mr. Hardik Bhatt ...

MS. PFEIFFER: Proxy, Dawn Nash Pfeiffer.

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

Mr. Jason Spigner ...

MR. SPIGNER: On video. On video.

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

Jennifer Foster ...

(No response.)

MS. SHAW: Juan Salgado ...

MS. LICHTENSTEIN WALTER: Proxy, Sarah Lichtenstein-Walter.

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

Matt Johanson ...

MR. JOHANSON: Present.

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

Michele Smith ...

MS. SMITH: Present, I'm on camera.

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

Nancy Cao ...

MS. CAO: Present virtually.

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

Bob Reiter ...

MR. DESIDERI: Proxy, Nick Desideri.

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

Don Finn ...

(No response.)

MS. SHAW: Donovan Pepper ...

(No response.)

MS. SHAW: Joshua Davis ...

(No response.)

MS. SHAW: Liisa Stark ...

(No response.)

MS. SHAW: Marc Schulman ...

MS. KIMPAYE: Proxy, Jane Kimpaye.

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

Pam McDonough ...

MS. McDONOUGH: Here.

THE COURT: Xochitl Flores ...

MR. THOMPSON: Proxy, Michael Thompson.

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

Dr. Lisa Bly-Jones ...

(No response.)

MS. SHAW: Manny Rodriguez ...

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Present.

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

Victor Dickson ...

MR. DICKSON: Present virtually.

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

Carrie Thomas ...

MS. THOMAS: Present.

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

We're missing one person for the quorum.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Well, with that, we will hold off on any official votes for now and move ahead with the agenda.

George, if you could start.

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: One thing before George comes. Just point of order for Board members, please remember that if you send a proxy, that's your person. It's like double-dipping if you proxy and have someone, you know, on the call, so just make sure that we are -- we need to be -- we need time to make sure we're right in the order about everything, so one or the other, figure out whichever you're going to do. Preferably you have someone -- you have you or that person in the room, just point of order.

Please make note of that, Nicole. Thank you. Sorry.

MR. WRIGHT: Point of order, do you need to admit those virtual.

MS. McDONOUGH: Not until we have a quorum.

MS. SHAW: If there's no in-person quorum which is 13, 51 person of our Board, the virtual attendees are unable to vote until we meet the in-person quorum.

MR. WRIGHT: All right.

MR. JOHANSON: Is there Wi-Fi in the room?

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. WRIGHT: So good morning all and thank you all for coming in person. I think it's -- You know, this is the last meeting of this fiscal year and one of the most important votes we take is the vote to approve the actual budget for next year, so we're hopeful that we can have a quorum and those votes. If not, Mr. Co-Chair, you'll have to -- (inaudible) -- by the end of -- what's it? -- the 26th of this month, so just a point of order there.

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: And, George, you should note that upon approval, it is to go directly to President Preckwinkle and then it will be carried from there. I was just told that yesterday because we know

we're dealing with a tight time frame.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

So, John, make a note of that.

So once again, thanks to everyone for attending this important meeting. Again, it's the last meeting of the fiscal year. The next time we meet, we will be in the new fiscal year. I plan to go over a few things. And, Susan, no, I didn't prepare my remarks to read like I did the last time. My remarks are going to be fairly brief and fairly consistent. I'm going to cover a couple things, what I know about federal funding which severely impacts the ability of the Partnership to continue to thrive and then I'll talk about some of the things that we are doing in anticipation of some of the staff reports that are going to be, kind of, proposed to you all which kind of gives you an idea on how we're trying to mitigate the risk in case our federal funding is severely reduced.

But the first thing I would be remiss if I didn't do is to really kind of -- and I did this the last time we had our non-profit Board Meeting when we brought all the staff in, but I'VE asked the Leadership Team to come and attend this meeting. I

can't say enough about this great team that I've been blessed and fortunate to work with. You know, one of the first actions that I took when I became CEO two years ago was to change the name. I came into an organization where they were called the senior staff or senior something and it reminded me of senior varsity and junior varsity and I said we don't have junior staff, what we need are leaders and so I immediately changed the name from senior staff to Leadership Team. And, you know, you see these individuals along the wall. They comprise the Leadership Team. Amy is not here, she text me early this morning that she felt ill, but she's the missing member of our Leadership Team. And I think that I would once again not BE doing justice FOR this Team by not having them stand up and you giving them a round of applause for the work being done.

(Round of applause.)

MR. WRIGHT: This Team which I'm fortunate enough to lead, there's two things that I comment to every single one of them as I did my mid-year reviews and my annual reviews with them. Number 1, every single person is all in. They are totally committed to the success of the Partnership and that means a lot. That

was consistent throughout.

And the other thing is that they really work hard. I mean, they were taken aback by when I came in, I was sending them e-mails at 5:00 in the morning and they're, like, you know, who's this guy and I'm, like, you got to keep up. Well, the tables have turned a little bit, they send me e-mails at 4:30 a.m. and so I'm not, you know, expecting that they are going to kind of give it back to me a little bit. Jose is laughing because he's one of the primary culprits of sending me e-mails very early in the morning, but they really, really, really work hard. 57 new accomplishments in the first year and another 52 new accomplishments this year. That's over 100 new accomplishments. This Team has got off the skids, if you will, in two years.

The only other thing I'll say is that when I came on board, it almost felt like there were negatives to be looked for. And while I will say this is one of the best teams I've ever led and had the pleasure to be around, they're not perfect and neither are we and neither are you. And at the end of the day, there are people who live in the negative. I like to live in the positive. I like to talk about

things that we're doing that are positive, but there's a sense, if you will, sometimes for people to point out what's wrong, what's going wrong, what's not going right. At the end of the day, they work their butts off. The accomplishments that they've actually put on the board is something not to be sneezed at and I'm very proud and happy to be working with them.

So thank you very much for your support of the Partnership, for your support of me over the last two years, you've been a phenomenal team to work with.

So the only couple things I have left is really talk about what I know about the federal funding and then like I said I'll talk a little bit about the mitigation of risk in terms of how this federal funding is going to -- or could impact us. Now, before I talk about the federal funding, it's important to note that I and we as an industry know far less than we know. There are so many more questions than we have answers so I'll tell you what I know; and if I don't know it, I don't know it. And if people tell you they know, they don't know that you don't know that they don't know because this changes literally every single day. It's so fluid.

So what do I know? I know that with the

Administration's Skinny Budget, they're proposing that we go to a block grant situation. A block grant situation would be the governor would have dollars that he or she is using for various purposes including WIOA which is what this Committee and your Board is actually charged with overseeing. There is a lot of action with regard to the block grant scenario which in effect would eliminate formula funds. So there wouldn't be any formula funds if we go to a block grant scenario. And there's plenty of evidence out there that says that the Administration really wants to go this route.

What about funding levels? Well, we know that the Skinny Budget actually calls for 2.9- -- so let's just call it \$3 billion for the entirety of Department of Labor, \$3 billion we'll call it. The fact of the matter is that in previous budgets, \$3 billion was the carve-out just for WIOA. So if you follow the logic if I had a pie, that one part of it, one piece of that pie was \$3 billion and now we got a pie that has to include five other aspects under the Department of Labor at \$3 billion. Something has got to give. And so the levels of funding that will be available under WIOA if the budget passes and if this

Administration has its way will be far less.

Now, Jose, I'm not going to steel his thunder, he is going to present to you a budget of \$62 million. Now, the problem with that budget -- or depending on where you live, do you live in the negative or do you live in the positive, I tend to want to live in the positive, although these times make it increasingly difficult to do that -- is a portion of that budget for adult and dislocated workers is not available to us until October and that -- those dollars which represent \$34 million are at risk because those dollars could never come to us. The remaining dollars of the 62 million we get in youth and we get in first quarter adult dislocated, those dollars seem fine. The good news is that we've heard pundits and we've heard advocacy groups and we've heard lobbyists say that if the block grant situation comes through and if there is reduction funding, it won't take place until at least April of next year, it could be June of next year, but nobody knows. And one thing that we actually have been taught, I believe, in these first six, seven months of this Administration, don't bet on it. Things can change very quickly and they can change on a dime. If

that happens, that will impact the Partnership and its ability to provide services through our partners for adult and dislocated services. That's what I know.

What don't I know? I don't know that timing. That timing could be April. It could be October. It could be June, July 1st. I don't know. And again, if somebody tells you they know, they don't know.

What else don't I know? I don't know the reaction on both sides of aisle relative to a block grant. I don't know the reaction to some of the governments that sit on the left side of the aisle if they would want a block grant and I don't know the reaction to those that sit on the right side of aisle. I just know that this is getting a lot of traction and it's one of the things that is in the playbook of just give it to the states and let them figure it out. There will be strings attached if we go to the block grant situation and so those are the things that I do know.

Now, what are we doing to mitigate the risk and what have we been doing? Well, we've been working on stress testing, so we have various scenarios with our budget planning process. Our Director of Finance

and I have been locked in -- been in lockstep the entire time early in the morning with e-mails back and forth talking about different scenarios on how we can actually mitigate this risk if, in fact, we lose our adult and dislocated worker funding for second, third and fourth quarters respectively.

We still have a situation where we've had seven audits since I came in as CEO after I sat on those seats over there as Co-Chair of the Board and every single audit has been a clean audit, our single audit has been consistently unmodified; so we have consistently put our best feet forward relative to no one can come to this group and say, you know, those WIOA dollars that you oversee, they're not passing your audits and that will, I believe, prove us it will be beneficial as we go into these uncertain times.

I think the other thing that we try to do is make sure that we actually -- considering how we're actually utilizing our dollars. We have an estimate right now that as we -- if we get into, let's say, first quarter of next year, we will have saved \$5 million out of our budget, already over \$4 million of savings. So we have been already tightening the belt, we've already been looking at waste, we've

already been looking at things that we shouldn't be doing. So we've created our own mini Department of Partnership efficiency. I don't know how that -- what that comes out to be, but it's something that we have been really focused on since I took the rug. And then I think, quite frankly, the third thing we've done is we've made that we actually have great people working for us. We've actually turned over about 25 percent of our staff and we just had seven or eight promotions into senior positions where people have now been promoted in these jobs that have never been promoted since their tenure with the Partnership and I'm very happy about making sure people have the opportunity.

What's next for us? I think what you're going to hear, especially from Pilar who is our new Director of Program Performance, and I talked about this in Service Delivery as well as I talked about this in our Youth Committee is this notion of making sure that we are constantly being -- holding ourselves accountable for working with partners in getting them to a level in which they can actually thrive. It's something that I think is -- even if we weren't in these uncertain times, it's something that's important because we actually depend upon our partners to

provide results.

The Partnership last year, you heard me say this the last meeting, exceeded every single -- I didn't say meet, I said we exceeded every single WIOA measurement. So no one can come to this committee and say, you know, that incident you oversee for WIOA funds, they're not meeting and exceeding their goals. No, we're exceeding all of them and we will continue to do that based upon the notion that it's important to put our best feet forward and to work with partners. So how then -- And you will have to reconcile this in your mind because I know it's going to be a little bit off because Pilar is going to come up and say that we have organizations and partners that are going on performance improvement plans. And you say, Well, how can they be on performance improvement plans if you're knocking the cover off the ball because we want to keep knocking the cover off the ball. We want to keep making sure that we're uncovering every single rock and being consistent with our support of our partners because we depend upon them to provide these results. We don't do direct services. We actually provide dollars as a subgrantee situation where our partners, many of which are in the

room, are actually doing the important work and so if we see something, we're going to say something.

Now, I know then in the past because I sat in those chairs, I remember being, Oh, they're on a PIP, they must be out, they must be going out the door; Oh, Performance Improvement Plan, we can't have, oh, my God. If you change your thinking a bit, it's called performance improvement, it's not punishment. We're trying to improve performance by being a partner and documenting our efforts with you to make sure that you're keeping up with the standard we set for ourselves in terms of exceeding. You know, Pilar called it a -- I think she called it continuous improvement plan which is -- and we call it developmental plan. You can use whatever nomenclature you want; but at the end of the day, our responsibility is the responsibility to support our partners in every single way and we're encouraging them to look at this in a different light, not as a punishment or a negative, but something we want to partner with you to look at ways that we can catch things before they become problems, we can mitigate the risk early on and we can continue to move forward with these things because at the end of the day, if we

have clean audits, we have the right staff and we're exceeding all of our performance measurements, then we just have to let the chips fall where they may come April, come May, but we've done everything that we can to make sure that we're putting our best feet forward and that of our partners.

So I thank you. I don't know if there's time where I can take a few questions around the end, but really thank you for your support throughout this year. We've got to get it going because our new year starts in about 13 days.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Thanks, George, for painting a picture of uncertainty; but let's give our commitment to seeing this improvement. It's important to drive for greater efficiency and you and the people are doing a great job.

I think we do have time for maybe two questions from the Board, we'll save comments from the public until the end of the meeting, so if there are any Board Members that have any questions now ...

MS. McDONOUGH: George, why don't you point out a couple of the bigger things of ways to reduce costs because I know some of it's technology, some of it is, you know, real estate, whatever.

MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, I'll try to be brief because there's a lot, but some of the bigger items, every -- First of all, let me just say this. When I came into the Partnership in this role, everything cost half a million dollars. I don't know why that was the case; but it's, like, every time I looked at the balance sheet, half a million, half a million, half a million. I'm, like, this must be, you know, the level in which they actually expect the Partnership to pay. So we had a system in which we enter our WIOA data in that cost half a million dollars a year, I was able to negotiate that down to a little bit more than \$300,000 with the same carrier. We're now going to go on the State system once it rolls out which will save another \$300,000. That's one example.

Another example. We had a PEO that had an automatic renewal, and that's a professional employer organization for those of you that are unfamiliar with it. They had been supporting the Partnership even before the Partnership was formed, and that cost was half a million dollars. And we were able to go to another carrier as a PEO and save ourselves about \$350,000 on that one.

We also had a half a million dollars or

more in what I call areas in terms of facilities that didn't make a lot of sense: they were stand-alone, the landlord wasn't very responsive, couldn't get lighting, they were unsafe and so now we've actually worked with Sarah and we're working with city colleges and chancellors and we are now in about five different city colleges that we can better ready make people that are there looking for careers and employers and we have parking and we have security and we have -- it's a match made in heaven and I don't know why we were paying half a million dollars for it.

But anyway those were some of the big three things, if you will. Jose and Ebony and Susan, Claudia, Mike can actually go into some more details; but those were three big things I remember. Actually, in the last one, I have to mention this, we were paying over half a million dollars for a Great Plains system which is our port in terms of our financial system, we went away from that and combined -- and eliminated four systems into one system and saved ourselves about \$650,000. So if you think about those big things -- and there were little things such as when I came in, I saw that there were storage units all over the city of Chicago, I'm, like, what are we

storing and then I go there, it's, like, boxes from 1855 and 1935 and I'm, like, Well, how much is this costing, it was, like, \$50,000 a year so I eliminated storage units.

You know, the environment that I'm going to bring, and this team has really come along with me, is you have to raise money to spend money. Nobody is giving me anything in terms of corporations. So that discipline right said, Well, even though we're giving these dollars, we still have to be great stewards of these awards, we still have to pay attention to the bottom line because if we don't, especially in this environment, they will pay attention for us and that's something that we do not want.

So I think we just have a quorum.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: We have a quorum. I think we're a little bit behind the agenda so maybe we'll hold any questions to the end. Do you want to update the roll call?

MS. SHAW: Yes.

I did see that Rahnee Patrick joined us.

MS. PATRICK: Yes.

MS. SHAW: Can I have the names of the other two members that just joined us?

MS. FOSTER: Jennifer Foster.

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

DR. BLY-JONES: Lisa Bly-Jones.

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

And we do have quorum.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Perfect. It's an official meeting.

MS. SHAW: The virtual Board Members can vote.

MS. McDONOUGH: I move that we invite the on-line Board Members into the meeting.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Second.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: I have a second.

All in favor.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Any opposed? Abstentions?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: All right. Can I get a call to -- a motion to approve minutes?

MS. McDONOUGH: So moved.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Second.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Any Abstentions for people that weren't at this meeting?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: And with that, we'll move on to Jose and the Finance Department.

MR. MOTA: Okay. Today I'll be covering two things, requirements and next year's budget for FY25. One thing that I always recognize for a meeting of the partners that have to be met for the first year on the PY24 funding. The first requirement is making 80 percent requirement. If you look at the screen, we're well above 80 percent across all funding streams. One thing that we'll keep an eye out for is all the contracts (inaudible) is going to decrease a little bit because not everyone is going to spend 100 percent of their awards so I'll be keeping an eye out over the next few weeks to make sure that we stay above that 80 percent, but there is no concern as of this moment today heading into the end of the year.

The next requirement is the 50 percent requirement of training. So 50 percent of the funds for WIOA are to be spent on direct training. And right now at third quarter, 62.8 percent for 1(a) and 1(b) combined, so (inaudible) I don't see any

concerns.

The last requirement is work-based training. So this is 20 percent (inaudible) as learning for youth and it could be met after the second year of two year grants. Right now after year one, it's at 19 percent. Any questions?

MR. JOHANSON: On the page, the 80 percent, 80 is what?

MR. MOTA: Required to be obligated or spent.

MR. JOHANSON: So 80 percent of that?

MR. MOTA: Yes.

MR. JOHANSON: Okay. And you said those are likely to come down.

MR. MOTA: A little bit.

MR. JOHANSON: A little bit. Okay.

MR. MOTA: We'll monitor --

MR. JOHANSON: 80 percent. I think we got --

THE STENOGRAPHER: I can't hear you. I'm sorry. You have to speak louder.

MR. MOTA: I'm sorry.

What was the question?

MR. JOHANSON: The question was, what is 80 percent, how day-to-day its spent and how far might those come down

MR. MOTA: It will drop (inaudible) percent. We've already got preliminary information from the agencies on what they're going spending till 6/30, their projections so I think we should be okay.

MR. JOHANSON: Great.

MR. MOTA: Okay. Okay. Moving on to the juicy part which is the budget for next year, George already alluded to a lot of the information that I was going to present. So thanks, George, for pointing out some of those major points. Next year's award is \$62.2 million which is --

(Short interruption.)

MR. MOTA: So next year's award is \$62.2 million. There was decreases in adult of 418,000 and decreases in youth of 568,000, but there was an increase -- a big increase in dislocated of 6.1 million with an aggregate is 5.1 compared to last year's of 57 million.

First quarter obligated funds that we used starting July 1st, 18.6 for youth and around 8.9 million for adult and dislocated.

George already talked about the \$34.6 million which is not going to be available until October 1st which is unknown, so right now we sit

around and wait then for -- you know, for the updates that we get from the State, it's looking like we are going to get the 34.6 million, but we're not sure yet so we're going to have to sit around and wait another three months until next quarter's Board Meeting. I can't point it out here, but I wanted to talk a little bit about the --

(Brief pause.)

MR. MOTA: So the QI 24 preliminary carry-in, what we do to get that amount which helps us refund all the agencies for next year is we send out e-mails to all our providers to get a preliminary estimate of what they're going to spend on through June 30th. So when we have over 150 contracts over 70 agencies, we're putting all this information together to kind of get a sense of what's going to be available for next year; and just looking at this, we don't see any carry-in for adult and dislocateds going into next year, but that's still in play depending on it comes to fruition that we don't spend those dollars. So in total, 3.5 million for QI 24 that's unused that's going back into the pot for next year, that's going to be used to refund all the agencies.

QI 24 obligated funds. So two-year

contract, QI 24, these contracts are ongoing going into the second year and dollars that are obligated. So when I do the budget, I have to account for every single dollar that is a on the street because, you know, I don't want to make a mistake and put money out there what we don't have. So these are pretty solid numbers going into next quarter which is in September.

Going through it, one of the big changes that's going to require a vote is transferring youth -- increase in dislocated funds \$3.3 million of dislocated going back to the adult funding Stream which is going to require a vote.

And those are pretty much the highlights for next year. You know, a lot of it is sit and wait until October 1st to make sure that this 34.6 million comes into fruition, but we won't know that.

MR. JOHANSON: So again can you explain why in October? Like, doesn't the Federal budget if it changes, isn't that on calendar year --

MS. McDONOUGH: No. Federal fiscal is October.

MR. JOHANSON: -- for when this starts, the program starts in October?

MS. McDONOUGH: The State is July, Federal is October.

MR. HECKTMAN: State is July, Federal is October.

MR. JOHANSON: Okay.

MS. PATRICK: And humans are January to December.

MR. MOTA: Okay.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: My question is aren't the dislocated and adult -- it seems like you're having to come to the Committee to move money from the dislocated pot to the adult pot because that's what we're finding in our area. Is that just formula governed and that's why you have to basically put it?

MR. MOTA: Yes, create the numbers. The State comes with an allocation that nobody knows what the formula is, but we just get the funding.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Correct. I don't think anybody knows.

MR. MOTA: And below, you see what type of spending is going into next year, what's going for the AJCs, the delegate sectors, career pathways. There is increases in ITA funds, incumbent worker and then there's a reserve for possible increases to the American Job Centers based on meeting their benchmarks.

Any questions?

MR. THOMPSON: Why are the incumbent worker

dollars budget under dislocated worker as opposed to adult?

MR. MOTA: Can someone on the program team help me with that?

UNKNOWN PARTICIPANT: Repeat your question.

MR. THOMPSON: Why are incumbent worker training dollars budgeted under dislocated worker programs versus adult programs? It seems somewhat counterintuitive incumbent workers are currently employed versus dislocated workers are on unemployment insurance or about to be unemployed.

MR. MOTA: As long as I've been here the incumbent worker has always been a dislocated and I've been doing it for 15 years. I can get back to you on that one and give you a better explanation.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay.

MR. MOTA: Any other questions?

MR. JOHANSON: One more. So back to, George, your comments, the risk that comes with the Federal budget, so is -- the total dollar amount is 3 billion for all of labor, I don't know what their baseline is -- what the Department of Labor budget is in total today, so we're reduction and then also this block grant. So block versus a formula. And so who

makes the decision then on how a block grant would get spent and allocated?

MR. WRIGHT: The governor.

MR. JOHANSON: So it's allocated by the State and then within the State there will be a second decision?

MS. McDONOUGH: Right.

MR. MOTA: It's a possibility we might not see any of that money to be honest.

MR. JOHANSON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. WRIGHT: The short answer is yes to your question, but there's nuances, right, and so the timing, right, because now you're undoing an entire form of the system, right, so the workforce system will look entirely different than what it looks today. If there is a block grant, you will then have strings attached. We've heard part of the string attached even the governor has the discretion to spend these dollars would be they got to be spent on apprenticeship programs, there's also AI involvement there. So the government decides to spend dollars, it's not a free for all. But by the end of the day for this committee, the important take-away is, and you mentioned it, is \$34 million and we don't know -- if you think about it, the State got a 15 percent

increase total.

MR. MOTA: I think so.

MR. WRIGHT: So \$62 million represents an increase, \$57 million last year, so we're getting more money. That's counterintuitive. You're getting more money, but we're only giving you the allocation which discounts your second, third and fourth quarter of dislocated; so if you think about it from the most illogical perspective, we did not be (inaudible) in this (inaudible) at all because we won't have the money if, in fact, all that money is taken away or could some of it be taken away.

MS. McDONOUGH: You can't undo the Workforce Investment Act which is a statute through Executive Order. So there's going to have to be something legislatively that takes place in DC. So I mean, I think this is a more drawn-out process than just shifting to a block grant. I mean, they can choose where to appropriate money, but you can't undo a statutorily designed program so I think we're all just trying to figure out where to go next.

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: Adam, what were you going to say?

MR. HECKTMAN: I was going to say you could see

why some governors may like that.

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: Absolutely.

MS. McDONOUGH: Well, probably smaller states, I mean where they don't have as much -- you know, our Workforce, our -- you know, we have more industries than most places in the country, so -- We have such a diversified business community, you know, labor pool, I mean, which all should be positive in the big picture scheme of things so -- and hopefully, like, manufacturing, we have the most diversified manufacturing, you know, system in the country so I hope they pay attention to these things.

MR. THOMPSON: It is important to keep in mind there are two skirmish lines, though. So there's the Omnibus Bill, the Skinny Budget, but then there's a Stronger Workforce for America Act which is a re-authorization of WIOA and so to your point about the legislative attack -- or the legislative standpoint, we don't know if that legislation will even pass and what will conflict with the Skinny Budget.

MS. McDONOUGH: We also need to engage the business community because there's nobody more important to them than keeping businesses viable than,

you know, figuring out that this isn't a partisan issue, this is a -- like, how do we grow our businesses in this country.

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: And the one thing we can all be sure of is that the governor of this state is --

MS. McDONOUGH: Yeah.

MS. FOSTER: One thing I would add because you did mention that it was statutory, the State will -- whether it comes in a block grant or it's distributed the way it is now, we will have to maintain our match and our maintenance of effort. So those are things -- And, you know, I represent adult education at the state level, so those are things that we have to also look out for.

MS. PATRICK: This is Rahnee also for location and rehabilitation because we're part of the Department of Ed as well, so thank you so much.

MR. MOTA: So fingers crossed come October. Thank you, everyone.

MS. McDONOUGH: Pam don't we have to vote on something?

MS. SHAW: Because we're going to have the financial aspect from the service vote now.

MS. McDONOUGH: Moving the money.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: So if there's no questions or discussion, I would like to have a motion to transfer \$3.3 million in dislocated worker funding to adult funding?

MS. McDONOUGH: So moved.

MR. HECKTMAN: Second.

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: Was there a question on the floor?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Seconded by Adam Hecktman.

All in favor.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Any abstentions?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Motion carries.

Thank you so much, Jose.

MR. MOTA: Thanks.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: So we move into -- If possible, can we shrink this by about five to seven minutes?

MS. TREJO: Sure.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: You have 25 minutes allotted.

MS. TREJO: Okay. Good morning, everybody. My name is Pilar Trejo. I'm the new performance director, but I'm filling in for Amy, my colleague.

So what we are going to do here is talk about the dislocated worker policy revision and the main purpose of it is that it's now going to include layoffs from sectors and occupations that are substantially significant to the local economy. We basically want to combine substantial layoff industries and the dislocated worker eligibility into one policy. So the overall purpose is to broaden our reach of dislocated workers. They are hard to find. Sometimes they're hard to be made eligible so this is definitely going to help us. We do need to vote on this.

Are there any questions?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Pilar, I guess my question is what is the substantial change, I -- between layoff (inaudible) or occupation to a dislocated worker by definition? So I'm confused on what that actually is.

MS. TREJO: So the thing is, for example, the second bullet, includes layoffs from sectors and occupations that are substantial or significant to the local economy. For example, with AI and other skills,

upgrades, some people are losing their jobs in industries where they haven't before. You can have an industry, Manny, that is basically, you know, losing a business, but now we're also seeing -- and this is just an example with technology, for example, with AI, you see certain positions or occupations. So that's one example of that and that's why we have to, you know, make sure that we're moving along with times in our labor market.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: So in practice, if somebody came to an AJC and they were in one of these sector occupations that was being eliminated by AI, to use an example, they would automatically be eligible for dislocated?

MS. TREJO: We would be able to make them a dislocated worker. So we've done things in the past to help reach out to dislocated workers, like our five-year look-back period. All of that really helps. dislocated workers sometimes hang out on unemployment for several months and they don't come to our centers, so we're doing everything we can to bring them to our centers.

DR. BLY-JONES: I have a question. Is there a way to get the revision in the letter so that we can

have -- we can see what the changes are being made to the policy letter that exists?

MS. SHAW: Yeah, that was included in the packet that I can share it on the screen if you would like, the portion that's highlighted, it's specifically the additional sectors that are included, and I can show that.

MS. TREJO: Thank you, Nicole.

MS. SHAW: Of course. This is -- The highlighted portion would be the revised.

MS. McDONOUGH: Why don't you read it?

MS. TREJO: Sure.

Layoffs -- I'm reading No. 3: Layoffs from sections in occupations that are substantial or significant to the regional or local workforce or economy as identified by the Local Workforce Innovation Board, LWIB, in Regional, slash, Local Plans. We have seven applicants laid off for many of the below listed sectors shall be considered to have been part of the substantial layoff for purposes of WIOA dislocated worker eligibility. And those are leisure and hospitality, manufacturing total, trade, transportation utilities, retail trade and accommodation and food services.

MR. JOHANSON: Can you scroll up a little bit to see?

MS. TREJO: Anything else?

(No response.)

MS. TREJO: All right. I think we're at a point where do the vote; is that correct?

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Can I get a motion for our dislocated worker as the revised policy?

MS. McDONOUGH: So moved.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Second.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: All in favor.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Any abstentions?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Motion carries.

MS. TREJO: I think there's one more item. So there's one more item we're are going to be voting on and it's the Providers -- the Training Provider List and that will also be very quick.

(Brief pause.)

MS. TREJO: I believe it's basically approving a Trainer Provider List; and if you want to see it,

we'll have to go through the screen so I'm sorry.

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: That's why it's so important for Board Members to look at their materials before the meeting because you never know what could happen.

(Brief pause.)

MS. THOMAS: I'll make a motion to approve the service and recommendations.

MR. JOHANSON: I'll second.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: All in favor.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Opposed?

(No response.)

MS. LICHTENSTEIN-WALTER: Abstain. City Colleges abstain.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: All right. Makes sense.

All right. Motion carries.

MS. TREJO: In case we're still having some technical issues, I can move on to the Youth Committee recommendations. You will not get a screen right now until something pops up, but I just wanted to go through some of the information we shared with our committees.

My new role as the performance director at

the Partnership, I've been actively listening to what our front-line staff have to say in leadership and I'm glad George spent some time talking about PIPs because one of the things we want to make sure that we know where the gaps in performance are. We can't guide and empower our agencies unless we know. So one of the things that I really want to spend some time talking about is I want you guys to think about this as the Performance Department is looking at the health of the programs so --

Are we going back to the provider list?

(Overlapping talking.)

MS. TREJO: So today I want you to know what period of data we're looking at as we're looking at the health of our programs. We are looking at a snapshot of July 1, '24, to March 31 of 2025, so that's three quarters of data that we're looking at for Program Year 25. The models that we're going to start out reviewing are the American Job Centers, both comprehensive and regular, as well as sector. The programs that we are reviewing are the adult and dislocated worker.

It's real important that we understand, as you go through this, you're going to hear that some of

our agencies have been put on PIPs, maybe some later on down when we look at the youth have a decrease in funding. But why is that happening? There's benchmarks we have to look at. These benchmarks are negotiated early on at the beginning of the year in July with the agency to make sure everyone is on the same page about what the scope of work is. And you can see there on the bottom it says 100 maximum points. So when we do the reviews and we come to you to the WIB to say we're recommending PIPs or whatnot, we're looking at that 100 maximum point. It's broken down 10 points for different benchmarks, you can read them there. They are color coded. I want you to note the ones that are color coded or color, anything in black, we pull information from our Career Connect system, anything that's in red is an annual compliance visit we make; and then in green, we use a system called I-pass; and then in purple, that is what comes out of the Illinois Workforce Development system which DCO holds us to. And those are individuals that have been exited and we're looking at retention in employment and media -- So that's the benchmarks and points for American Job Centers.

And these are the benchmarks for the

sectors. The only thing I'll say about this is because they are sectors, we did weight heavily the placements, not heavily, but we weighed them a little higher because they are sectors.

Any questions about the benchmarks?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Pilar, there is a question. Is there a reason you're only looking at second and fourth and not -- or is that just happen to be the time period?

MS. TREJO: That is what the funder looks at and that's what we -- and it did change. In the past for those of us that have been doing WIOA work for awhile, it used to be a different quarter, but right now it's second and fourth.

MR. JOHANSON: But looking at three quarters of date, so is it the fourth quarter of '24?

MS. TREJO: So what we're looking at is the three quarters of this current program year which started July 1st and ends March 30th. So that's the data we're providing. With the exception, Matt, if you look at the purple, those are exited files we're looking at from previous years. It's important to see how people are retained.

MS. THOMAS: It's the second quarter after exit?

MS. TREJO: Yes, correct. And the best person to be telling us that is right next to you. Thank you, Carrie.

Okay. Great questions. I just want you to know this is what Carrie was referring to. This is the Illinois Workforce Development system, we call it IWDS, and this is what we look at very carefully. So when we say an agency didn't exceed or they didn't meet or they failed, it comes from this information. I do want you to know that our local workforce area as of this weekend, we are all exceed. So that's wonderful news, yes. We are holding our standard. That's always been our standard and I'm very proud to say that. I just want you to see this. I think it's important to understand these benchmarks when we say somebody didn't meet or failed, that you understand where it's coming from.

All right. I think we are going to the next slide and we should start looking -- Recommendation categories. So we have four, on this slide here there's two. If an agency scored 100 to 70 points -- and now you know what the points are based on the benchmarks -- and they had zero to 1 benchmarks with a low score -- and a low score means

zero to 5 points, a weak or a fail, now you know what fail means -- they will continue to get some type of level funding.

Now, if an agency, for No. 2, their overall score was under 70 points and they hit two or more benchmarks that were low, fail or zero to 5 points, they will go on a Performance Improvement Plan. Again, re-framing the idea it is continuous improvement, it's how we empower our agencies. We don't want it to be a negative thing so I just want to make sure that that's part of this. The other way for -- If there's a question in the room, the other way is if you have a low program compliance score or a low fiscal score, you could have 90 points, but if you do not pass that program compliance annual visit or the fiscal compliance visit, we will be putting you on a Performance Improvement Plan. Throughout these recommendations, you'll see Partnership discretion. We have to have that based on funding based on emerging needs. So these are two of the four recommendation categories.

Any questions about this?

MS. LICHTENSTEIN-WALTER: Can you talk about what the improvement plan entails and what the

outcomes of that are? I notice a couple centers recommended for continued funding with a PIP, but for the same things last year as well and their numbers actually went down. So what are we looking for and what constitutes success in that plan?

MS. TREJO: So the Performance Improvement Plan, those will be going out in July. What we are doing is we'll be meeting with the agency. There is a form that gets filled out. It's very clear how much time they have to meet their -- the performance. It's very clear what the issue is. And even for, you know, it could be something that we are going to provide technical assistance or it could be something that we recommend they do at the agency level. So there's going to be a very clear explanation of how you got on the PIP, here's some resources that the Partnership will provide through the point of contact, who's the relationship manager, as well as here's some suggestions that you need to do at your agency level, maybe supervisory or something, you know, of that nature. And then there will be a time frame. There will be a revisit, everybody signs the PIP; and then at the revisit, that's when we see where the agency is at: Did they meet their goals, did they meet what

they needed to do. So a lot of these -- If you look at your packet, a lot of agencies scored zero on placements and it could be partnering, it could be working more closely with our business services, you know, partnering at the AJC level. So depending on the scenario, that's how we're going to address it. Again, going back to if we don't know what the gaps in the performance are, we won't be able to do a targeted guidance.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN-WALTER: So if they don't improve their performance from last year to this year, is that factored in? I mean, let's say they scored zero last year on placement, they scored zero this year on placements, like, the rate actually went down, they did not improve their performance. How is that factored into the recommendation?

MS. TREJO: Well, as far as last year's, we -- some agencies -- I will say this: Some agencies did not go on a PIP last year, the reason being that some of the data changed. We had a data lag with regard to information going into IWDS so some agencies were removed from a PIP, so that could be one of the scenarios. Unless I know which agency it is, I don't know that I would want to say much more about that.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN-WALTER: Is it appropriate to go into specifics -- like more specific here or is that, like, a subcommittee?

MS. McDONOUGH: I think you're raising a good point. If they failed last year and they failed this year with a PIP --

MS. LICHTENSTEIN-WALTER: Specifically, the IT Sector Center had 28 percent placement last year and it was recommended for a PIP and 19 this year and is recommended for a PIP. So that's not --

MS. McDONOUGH: There's not an improvement.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN-WALTER: They didn't improve their performance on that most important metric. So I am wondering what we do with that because the recommended PIP continue without a decrease in funding.

MR. WRIGHT: I think it's -- The challenge is trying to put a scientific approach to something that is -- so there could be various variables, right, and each individual situation is different. Our goal is not to defund, our goal is to support and unless I am totally convinced, quite frankly, that we have provided 110 percent support to those organizations, I am not going to take action because we have

responsibility to make sure that it goes from 28 percent to 19 or goes from 28 percent to 30 percent, right. That's our job. And so at this point, especially now that we have a department called Program Performance, right, that's totally committed to this and 100 percent actually engaged in it for us to take action would be somewhat premature, especially if we're trying to say the blanket rule is if you go here, you go there, then you get kicked off the rolls. And I'm not saying, Sarah, that's what you're saying.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN-WALTER: Right.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm just answering the question that it's more art to this than science.

MS. McDONOUGH: And I think the point of this new system is to dig deeper and figure out why that happened, why those differences happened between the two years and what resources can we infuse to help them, you know, go the right direction which is moving the placements up.

MS. TREJO: Okay. There is a on-line question.

MR. THOMPSON: You can go on line first.

MS. TREJO: Nancy ...

MS. CAO: Hi. Thank you. This is Nancy Cao.

I was just trying to understand. The

3.3 transfer from dislocated workers to adult, that's for closing out this year, right? I'm trying to understand whether this upcoming year's funding recommendations incorporate that or not because it seemed to me that from the performance notes that we may struggle a bit in the dislocated worker performance and yet as is being noted, everything was recommended to continue funding and it also seems like we always have excess funding in this area. So I'm just trying to follow a bit the logic of whether we should kind of more proactively decrease some of the dislocated worker funding entering this next program year.

MR. MOTA: Nancy, the 3.3 is for PY25, it's not related to PY24. There is going to be other funding opportunities for dislocated which is going to come in the form of 1(e) grants or supplements of funding from the State so that's the reason why we're transferring the 3.3 million.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Jose, I think she was asking why -- she was asking the same question I asked about why was the dislocated worker pot higher when we know that we serve more low -- you know, 1(a)s than we do and you gave me the answer because it was the formula.

MR. MOTA: The formula comes from the State.

MS. McDONOUGH: We don't determine the formula.

MS. CAO: So we can't be proactive?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I think her question is can we be proactive and move the money now even if it says that the formula says this, right, Nancy? I don't want to put words in your mouth.

MS. CAO: Yes, that's a simpler way to restate it. Thank you. Are we able to be proactive now and allocate more funding to high performance adult programs, for instance, entering the program year?

MS. TREJO: And the answer is no I'm being told by Madam Chair.

MS. CAO: Okay. Thank you.

MS. TREJO: You're welcome, Nancy.

I think we had one more question and then we're going to move into a couple more things because of time.

Yes, Michael.

MR. THOMPSON: For those programs that had low job placement rates, have we explored using the shared placement tool as potential resource to bring up their placements because I'm assuming -- or I know there's some agencies that have more of an expertise in

business development, some agencies have more of an expertise in case management; but if they can work together more, the shared placement model allows them to get equal credit for their work.

MS. TREJO: Absolutely. Michael, that's a great comment. Thank you for bringing that up. That is definitely the kind of strategy you would be seeing on the PIP. We -- You know, I refer to it as partnering, I didn't want to go deeper into it, but you nailed it, it is shared placement.

MR. JOHANSON: I'm sorry. One more before you move on. So we understand how the score happens and the recommendations coming out of those. Before we look at the detail, can you explain kind of the engagement that you have after scoring? Is there a review, is there -- you know, with a provider, is there a kind of dispute process at all?

MS. TREJO: Absolutely. So right now we've only seen two out four of the different categories, but what happens is during -- throughout the year, there is -- first of all, at the beginning of the year, there's negotiation with the work plan, everybody is on the same page about what the benchmarks are. Every month the agency is working with a point of contact to

make sure that they're on target. When we get to the third quarter, this is that snapshot, the agencies are receiving an e-mail about a month or so earlier saying, hey, make sure you have all your data in because we realize data does sometimes there's a lag, employers don't follow up as quickly as we'd like them to and then we start making sure that we're all on the same page that on this day, March 30th that is the snapshot because that is what is going to be presented to the WIB. Now, granted some agencies can wind up kicking up those numbers towards the end of the year, and we do look at that again, but we have to be proactive -- I'll use the word that we used a little while ago -- and present this information to the WIB. So that is the process and I am actually putting together a standard of operations to outline that so we have that.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I just want to say something as a practitioner and as a person that partners with a lot of our agency sector partners. I'm glad to have you, George, say that this is meant to be a tool to help and I think saying that and owning that in a public setting and having that noted is important because I think in our current environment, given all the

uncertainty, you know, I just know for me running an organization, it is very -- not easy times, right, and so you're saying putting me on the PIP and now I'm taking that not as you my friend, right, I'm taking it as you're threatening my funding and so I just want us to highlight that because there is a human thing to this too and I understand that wasn't the intent of this. I want to highlight that because I thought it was important that you said that and we got to make sure that it isn't that, right. We got to figure this out together. And I think, George, you've been good about saying we've got to figure this out together. So I just want to reiterate that, pay homage and acknowledge some of our partners in the room that probably are a little worried about all of this and so I'm glad that you said this.

MS. McDONOUGH: It's in our best interest because we have metrics we have to meet, you know, broader metrics, but it happens because all our people are making their metrics. So we have a vested interest in success which is to George's point, it shouldn't be viewed as negative, it should be how do we help you, how do we move that needle up a little bit on placement or maybe you don't know how to manage the

grants as well as some other people. And to your point, I've suggested we look at people who have best practices and team people up with the people that do the grant stuff really well can help the other people and the people that are better at placements should give some of their -- you know, their skill sets to help people improve.

MS. PATRICK: I wanted to add to that. This is Rahnee. We got monitored -- You know, we're Title 4 under WIOA. We got monitored in August from, you know, officials from the Department of Ed, our grantor, and they reminded us that Workforce and WIOA is about -- not just about placement, it's also about upscaling, it's about increasing people's credentials and -- So while I do totally get your point about the ultimate, the most important thing is placement, I was reminded by the Federal grantor, we're also, though, about getting people more skills, more credentials to make them more competitive in a diverse job market.

MS. McDONOUGH: Yeah, good point.

MS. TREJO: Thank you. That was a very good point.

Okay. We're going to move on to look at the last two of the recommendation categories. And

the third and fourth, you see decreased funding with a PIP, that is when the agency scored less than 70 points -- and I will say in italics, except for first year new providers, that's not something we have to deal with now -- but less than 70 points and they've got two to three benchmarks showing a low score, so less than 70 points. That's the difference. Now, overall the benchmarks were low.

And then the final one was defunding, that's when they scored under 50 points, again except for first year, and just because of the -- in the interest of time, you could see that it talks about, you know, a history of underperforming, having low scores consecutively for two quarters. And other indicators which I'm happy we haven't seen fraud -- or we have seen some agencies do voluntary closure, but these are the four recommendation categories. I'm going to jump in and show you where we land.

AJCs. So right here you're looking at the adult program American Job Centers, either comprehensive or regular AJCs. We have -- You'll see in the center how many points they scored and you'll see the reasons for the PIP. I wanted you not to have to worry about looking at the grid; but if you want to

go into a deeper dive, you can look at the scores and all that. So the first one is our AJC at Prairie State College operated by National Able Network, the next one is our AJC in Pilsen also operated by National Able Network, the other one is our AJC at Malcolm X College's West Campus which used to be known as our West Side location operated by KRA and then last in this category is AJC at Kennedy-King College also operated by KRA.

The next slide we're going to be looking at also the AJCs but under dislocated worker. You'll see there are seven. We have our Maywood, King Center AJC in Harvey, those are operated by Employment and Employer Services and then we have our AJCs at Prairie State College and Pilsen again for National Able Network and then the last two are Malcolm X College's West Campus and Kennedy-King, both of those operated by KRA. You'll see the points, but you'll see most importantly the reason for the PIP. And again, re-framing the mind, continuous improvement, we're going to help, it doesn't mean you're leaving, it means we're helping here. We're going to empower these agencies to get these numbers up.

So if we go to the next category or

section, this model is the sector model. Okay. And I put the adult and dislocated together in this one. You'll see the IT sector, you'll see their adult and dislocated and then you'll see the TDL sector, their adult and dislocated. In the middle, you'll see the points again and the reason for the PIP.

Okay. If we go to the next slide or the next -- These are the total recommendations for Performance Improvement Plans. We had 15, four were comprehensive AJCs, seven were our regular American Job Center programs and four were sector programs.

And we would need to do a vote at this point.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: All of the programs are basically representative, they all received a PIP, essentially?

MS. TREJO: Only the ones we mentioned here, not all of them. So that's a great question, Manny.

I should say if they're not listed here for the sector and American Job Center model, they're going to get level funding and possibly some increase based on some funding.

MS. LICHTENSTEIN-WALTER: How can the Board support the team and these performance improvement efforts?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I guess the question was how can the Board support the team in the PIP process?

MR. WRIGHT: I would take that question quickly and say be actively engage in a service (inaudible) that's where these discussions are held and so when I sat in those chairs, I tried to make it a habit of actually attending those meetings open to every single Board Member. So I would encourage people to get on the calendar, you know, dig deep, sit in those meetings and push back and help give support.

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: You read my mind.

If there's nothing else, I don't mean to hijack you, but I am concerned about this question about is this a managerial issue or is because of funding.

MS. McDONOUGH: Yeah, they're asking why do we need to vote on this. Is this -- Is it because it's connected to funding?

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: Is it because of funding or --

MR. WRIGHT: It's just the voting committee. We voted, you don't have to.

MS. McDONOUGH: No, I mean, we voted for support.

MS. TREJO: All right. Well, let's move on then.

That will be the change, George, then we won't be voting.

MS. FOSTER: I would just suggest that if there's someone that's on a PIP and they're going to be defunded in some way, then it does come back through the Board.

MS. McDONOUGH: That's a good point.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Because then there's money.

MS. TREJO: And we will see that with the youth review that I'll be doing, so to that point we will see that shortly.

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: The one thing I will say very quickly, George made a comment, this has to be both sides coming to the middle. It seems we have a common theme on what people want in here today. If we can do our part, the staff and the agency can do their part, I think we get back from coming off of the PIP, et cetera, so we the Board to do whatever it is needs to do. I guess, Pam, who are noted, it goes without saying we are here.

MS. McDONOUGH: Yeah, I mean, let's not forget that we're exceeding all our metrics. I mean, don't look at this in a -- with any negative connotation, look at we can even do better which is amazing. So we

got a plus A plus instead of A. So why not go for it.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I mean, they had 80 to your point, I mean, they were scoring high.

MS. McDONOUGH: Yeah, and we have a responsibility to meet the metrics, they do too. So we have a joint mission here and there's no reason that this should be viewed as negative unless, you know, there's fraud or something inappropriate, but that's not what we're seeing. It's just they need help with fiscal, they need help with figuring out placement strategies, and that's not a negative. It's just, like, that's a weakness, let's improve it.

MS. TREJO: Exactly. And that's our job. We're here to serve the local workforce area. I'm going go ahead and move on real quick to one more slide because I think it's good to see the strongest performance now that we've had this conversation.

You will see here we had 10 programs being operated by five subgrantees. You can see what their score was: 100, 97s, you see 94. These agencies Business Career Services, Equus, Employment and Employer Services, SERCO who's housing us here today, Pyramid and Equus, they had zero benchmark issues and I think that is fantastic. Yes, I think they deserve

a round of applause.

(Round of applause.)

MS. TREJO: So back to the point, maybe these are the folks that can help the other agencies that aren't doing as well.

So the next part is youth and I'm going to go straight to the PIPs because we already discussed benchmarks.

I'll actually just say, Nicole, when get -- keep going through, if you go to the benchmarks -- right here, just stop real quick.

I just want you to know youth benchmarks are a little different. You'll see towards the bottom for out of school youth, we do look at the second quarter median earnings like we do with the other programs that you saw -- or the models you saw recently; but for in-school youth, we looked at measurable school gain. Why? Because they're in school, we want to make sure they're getting some type of skills gain. So the youth benchmarks are basically the same, I just wanted you to see the minor difference.

If we could swing over to the first Performance Improvement Plan. Okay. Again, I've done

these in categories. Under American Job Center, we have one Performance Improvement Plan for our Pilsen AJC operated by National Able Network. You'll see the points and the reason for the PIP.

The next one is these are out-of-school youth, so they're not attached to an American Job Center, they're standalone. We have Good Will; Alternative School Network; Boys and Girls Club; Central State SER, their Little Village office; Greater West Town; Bridges to Work; Metropolitan Family Services District No. 8 which just means they're on the North Side; Phalanx and Pyramid WorkWise Alliance and also Youth Job Center. Again, you'll see the points and the reason for the PIP.

All right. And if we can go to the next category in-school youth, again standalone. We have two, AERO and Township High School. Points are there as well as reason for the PIP.

So for a total of Performance Improvement Plans, we have 13, one for American Job Center Youth program, 10 for out-of-school youth programs, two for in-school youth programs. Those are the youth agencies that got a PIP. We also have youth agencies that are going to get a PIP with decreased funding.

And remember, those agencies scored under 70 points and had two or more benchmarks that were zero or fail.

We have a total of four. You'll see the reason on the far right along with the points: Central State SER, Juvenile Justice, Lawrence Hall, North Lawndale Employment Network, the Cabet Group and I think the last one is an in-school youth, it is Youth Guidance. The total of recommendations for agencies with a PIP and decreased funding is five.

And then we do have a category for defunding with our youth. We have two and they are our sectors, IT sector operated by National Able Network and our TDL sector operated by YWCA. We also have an out-of-school youth standalone, it's not a sector, it's YWCA, you'll see the score there and they also are going to be defunded.

For the total recommendations of defunding are three. So that's the last category.

Yes ...

MS. LICHTENSTEIN-WALTER: Sorry.

MS. TREJO: Don't be sorry. Yes

MS. LICHTENSTEIN-WALTER: Do we have plans for how we're going to support these youth in these areas when the defunds --

MS. TREJO: Absolutely. We have a transfer process that we do. We review files to make sure we know where the customers are out, exit out the files that are done, make sure we refer the customers and make sure we find the closest location and/or the location they want to go to. They may not want to be in their neighborhood, they may want to go somewhere else so it's a coordinated.

MS. SHAW: We have an on-line question from Nancy Cao.

MS. TREJO: Nancy ...

MS. CAO: Hi. I'm wondering in the spirit of what we were talking about with the goal not being to decrease and defund, it does -- it did strike me looking through the materials that we had decreases in youth funding and defunding and so I'm wondering if you can shed a little bit more light as to, you know, are these examples of agencies that already had a year of performance improvement that did not yield results leading to the defunding decision; and then in addition, I am wondering about this impact on our ability to serve the youth in our counties, especially with the City and County both having emphasis on youth employment and having ARP funding which has increase

support over the past few years going away, you know, just concerns me to see decreased youth funding across the board as we kind of go into this next program year.

MS. TREJO: What I'll say, Nancy, is I can go back and get information about last year's scores for the particular agencies that are decreased funds, I can definitely do that and we can definitely take a look at that. However, the scores were so low and right now I think if I may say this, George, you know, with funding being something we have to look at, we have to consider who are the best organizations that can assist. Now, the agency did get decreased funding; however, if something changes, maybe that's something we can offer more funding in the future. I don't know, but as far as performance goes and now that I'm the director of this particular department, I wanted to make sure that we had categories that made sense and I've also been a practitioner for many years and I understand what this is, I'm coming from understanding this from the other side. This has to happen. We have to do this to help our agencies understand we've set a bar. We also have to make them understand that we're here to help them. And that is

again, I want to refrain that, so I can get back to the WIB about the information about these particular agencies most definitely, but we need to start making a change right now.

MS. McDONOUGH: With the risk of, you know, if this becomes disallowed costs because they're not doing what they're supposed to, then it comes out of our pocket. So you can't just because they had it before, you don't have to just keep giving it to them if they're not performing. I mean, everybody has got, you know, to level up and do what they're supposed to if you expect to continue public funding for your enterprises.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Pilar, I'm wondering if -- again, not getting into specifics in one of these five, I mean, I'm assuming the decision to do these five was not made lightly, the scores are reflective of that, all of them are not first year so they -- I'm assuming the process was that they were talked to last year and this was kind of unfortunately a negative trend that continued into this year.

MS. TREJO: Correct.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Okay.

MS. TREJO: And I'm glad that you mentioned.

None of the agencies are new providers, none of them are.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: The only thing I would aid there. I've been on the Board for eight years, I think there's been a drive to create greater data decision-making and having the level insight and driving accountability. And with that, you're going to uncover things that maybe -- an opportunity to reallocate funds. As a Board, as stewards of these dollars, we do not have infinite dollars, we need to maximize impact with them. And with that, sometimes it will mean we have to defund and reallocate. So it has been a journey. We are at a better place and continuous for both for us as a WIB, as an organization and our centers.

MS. TREJO: Thank you, Haven, for saying that. That is part of our Partnership discretion to reallocate funds and also use them with emerging industries and now more than ever we're seeing that coming through the pipeline.

So we are not voting or do we vote?

MS. McDONOUGH: We do vote because we're defunding.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: So it's two votes. There's

probably the reduction in funding and defunding. I would like to entertain a motion, if you could pull back the slide, on the reduction of funding. So a motion to reduce funding for these four organizations --

MS. TREJO: There's five. All right.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: -- five.

MR. HECKTMAN: I make the motion.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Second?

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: Second.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: All in favor.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Abstention?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Motion carries.

MS. TREJO: And now for the defunds.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: So I'd like to entertain a motion to defund a total of three organizations.

MS. McDONOUGH: So moved.

MR. HECKTMAN: Second.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Adam Hecktman seconded.

All in favor.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Any abstention?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: The motion carries.

MS. TREJO: Beautiful. Okay. We are at the last part here to show off some of our strongest youth performers. Again, we have 11 programs and eight subgrantees. Thank you to Equus, Employment and Employer Services and Pyramid WorkWise as well as Bethel Family Resource Center, Main Township, New Moms, Trellus formerly known as Asian Human Services and UCAN, they had zero benchmarks with any issues and scored very highly. Again, I think we should give them a round of applause.

(Round of applause.)

MS. TREJO: And I think the only other thing we did not vote on is the One Stop Operator Renewal. I don't remember that being voted on; am I correct?

MS. McDONOUGH: Yeah, you're right.

MS. TREJO: The one thing I will say is that their ARPA benchmarks are on target. They've been doing the comprehensive AJC Partnership Coordination

Meetings and have invited the six non-comprehensive AJCs. They've established the calendar meetings which have been very helpful with streamlining information. They're doing a wonderful job with the Airtable referrals and Disco platform which does a lot of the videos to help partners learn about each other and providing reports and surveys to the AJCs. That's just a little quick summary before the One Stop Operator recommendations are approved or voted on.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Motion to approve.

MS. McDONOUGH: Yes, I move we approve the renewal.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Second?

DR. BLY-JONES: I'll second.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Okay. Second.

All in favor.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Opposed?

MS. McDONOUGH: He abstains.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm the Board president. I have to abstain.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Motion carries. Thank you so much.

MS. TREJO: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: I just want to acknowledge that we are now over time officially, but I do think it's really important to spotlight our agencies in the house that we're in today so we will be extending approximately 15, 20 minutes because we also need to make sure Carrie has an opportunity to communicate on communication. So with that, I would like to invite up the North Riverside AJC and Morton College to present.

(Round of applause.)

MS. GOMEZ: Thank you, everyone, for this opportunity of being here. As you know, we were originally going to be at Morton College, but this was a last minute change and I'm sorry about the Wi-Fi situation. This is like a bunker here to be protected against phone signal too.

Welcome. Our office is located on the third floor. If any of you have five minutes and would like to take a tour, you're than welcome, let me know. Some of the programs that we host at American Job Center upstairs is our regular, right, WIOA programs, but we also have an opportunity (inaudible) program, the Road Home which is our justice program. And since last year, we've been working with

supplemental programs to assist immigrants and migrants, you know, that came in and were looking for job readiness and employment services.

Last year, I think PY23 was a very good year for us, you know, some of our metrics that we were able to complete for our adult, youth and dislocated and also, again, you know, opportunity works program, I am not going to go into detail, but this is some of the numbers. As we know, placement is definitely a thing for absolutely every program and every provider that's here knows how difficult it is to assist. Each population of people that we work with, it's totally different and it definitely has different directories that we should know about in order to help them. I just wanted to show you some pictures of what our office looks like on the third floor. This is our entrance and then we have our resource room and our waiting area. We have our -- our career coaches are located, we have adult and dislocated career coaches and we have youth career coaches. Then we have what we call a peace room and that peace room is for anyone that needs a minute, right, or if we're going to do an assessment, we figure just the name going into that room will bring

someone some coolness to calm down if that's what they need to. We -- One of the services that we provide in our office is also GED. So what we do -- you know, one of our programs that we most treasure, right, and we strive to, you know, create an impact for the young people that we serve. It's a youth program. We serve 16 to 24 because of the communities where we're at which are Cicero, Berwyn, they have a high number of drop-out rates youth. So we have GED classes in our office and they come in and do classes every day. We an instructor and so we have a yearly celebration because our GED, you know, the people that finish their GED, they never get to celebrate. With our youth, it's really important to celebrate the milestones, right, and so this is one of the milestones that's going to connect them to the next goal that we're working on with them.

I just want to highlight, you know, a couple of youths here, a very short story about them. We have young of our young lady, Ashanti. This is to give you an idea of the different youth that come into our office. She -- Her mother had passed away and she came in looking for services. So she had not finished her GED, her grandmother had custody of her. It took

her over a year for this young lady to finish and the interesting thing about dealing with youth right now, I mean, it is -- some of them -- If you know, our Gen Z generation are entering the workforce a lot later than a lot of us in here. Where we probably went to work at 16 or 17, they're entering the workforce at early 20s or mid 20s. So engaging youth into services and placements and helping them discover their motivations is definitely has become a lot harder than before. So finally, it took her over a year to finish and now she is in full-time employment, now she's the provider for her mother -- for her grandmother -- I'm sorry -- where before her grandmother was taking care of her, now she's taking care of grandma.

(Round of applause.)

MS. GOMEZ: Then we have Asaru. Asaru came in, he was home schooled his entire life with three of his siblings. His mother had to get back to work and could no longer do it. So he came in here, tested really high. In two months, finished his GED, but guess what happened? Asaru said he has no set skills, right, he had never been into the workforce, he was been in his entire house with his three siblings all

the time. His siblings are still in GED, but he actually finished in two months. He is now working in on pay work experience opportunity gaining some work skill so then he can go to college because that's -- it's his goal.

So just showing you the different youth that definitely come into through our doors and like mentioned, all generations are very definitely very different, right, and now we're seeing a lot more dislocators come into our office that are also looking for employment. Now, dislocator workers back in the day maybe 17 years ago were the baby boomers and now the millenniums started coming in, right, and the millenniums are not in such a hurry to look for employment right away so it takes a lot of every year we go through, you know, trying to stay innovative, what are the services that our populations need in order for us to create different activities that promotes, right, innovation, that promotes passion that gives them an opportunity to discover themselves especially with youth.

We're going to move into our other thing that I wanted to highlight which is our business services; and for that I am going to invite our

business service manager that is Ana.

MS. GRANADOS: Hi, everybody, good morning -- actually, afternoon already. So we did want to share a little bit -- yeah, I'm not sure what's going on with this slide, but we could skip to the next one, but we do provide a lot of great business services to our employer partners.

For under the on-the-job training program, we did want to share with you guys a few of our highlights through a special grant working with Beds Plus, we were able to reimburse about \$124,000 to the employer that was able to employ about over 20 full-time employees. We also want to highlight Hyatt Lodge which is another one of our great employer partners and we have been able to reimburse them on their on-the-job training about \$60,000. Through our -- Just summing up a little bit about our adult funding for OJT, we've been able to provide about \$200,000 for adults that have started full-time employment. And under the dislocated grant, we have been able to provide about \$125,000 within the past two fiscal years, '23 and '24.

For new arrivals. So this is another special program that we were assisting and working

with. We were able to provide ESL classes to our new arrivals in assisting them with better employment opportunities, so we did have ESL classes in our office that had about 20 participants. We did also provide a job fair for the new arrivals communities. And with this job fair, that was targeting individuals looking for employment that had just arrived from other countries, we were able to assist 600 job seekers that day. So this was in our fiscal year last year about in July -- actually, it was already this Fiscal Year 24, we were able to place as Clelia mentioned earlier, about 167 individuals into employment under full-time.

So following up in our next slide, we did want to share a little bit about some of the collaborations that we do. We do provide different -- We do collaborate with different local officials, churches near our communities and also with other (inaudible). We were able to provide a job fair for youth. We did put together a job fair for targeting individuals 16- to 24-year-olds. So this was just in the month of May. We were able to assist individuals with clothing for interviews and also for them to start employment. We do have a picture there with a

young individual trying on a VR. So again, technology is moving really fast and we did implement these VRs to able to showcase and actually give the youth our WIOA experience of what those jobs looked like instead of just talking about them, we were able to provide them an actual visual of what it is.

We are able to move onto the next slide and I'll pass it on over to Clelia.

MS. GOMEZ: So like I said, every year we try to be as innovative as we can. We sit down and brainstorm and decide what work, what can we continue doing, what didn't work and why, what do we need to change, right, just because every generation that comes in through our doors is definitely different; but like I mentioned in order for us to stay current, we have to also know what is the demand of the people that coming into our doors.

Because we are an American Job Center, we don't have all of our core partners in office, right. So that's another creativity thing that we have. How do we work with our partners that are not in our location? Well, we have great partners with IDES, Community Colleges, our local government, but one of our great partners that was also going to house us in

their college was Morton College. So throughout the years, we have different forums and how do we collaborate. We go to their offices. We connect with the IDES office. We go to Morton College. We do orientations there. We go and present about job readiness. We do dress workshops in our local libraries, in our school districts in here. This is how they know about us. We do career exploration with them so we go and we do a lot of our services and we take the young people and we go canvassing the streets also so they can talk about what program they're in. And this is how we definitely use to connect with our core partners, right; but ...

You know, and rapid response is one of the things that we've been doing a lot lately is also participating in rapid responses, especially job corps in the capacity we -- with our funding. We have an office in our Little Village community and we connected really well. We went in and provided a fair for the youth and we did a meeting and a presentation for the employees so they knew what kind of service and where they can go in case, you know, the worst happens, right.

So we're definitely very engaged in our

community and with the different organizations that are around us, but with Morton College, that would be one -- You know, give them a big thank you because they're always there for us and they're always supporting us and sometimes things happen, but we weren't able to --

(Round of applause.)

MS. GOMEZ: But Morton College is one of our great core partners, and this is Michael and he's going to present the last of the presentation. I don't know if anyone has any questions.

(No response.)

MR. ROSEN: Awesome. Thank you.

Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Michael Rosen. I'm the executive director for Workforce Innovation and Strategic Partnerships from Morton College and it's my pleasure to be here today. I would have start with an apology. I was hoping we would be at Morton College this morning and we are undergoing some significant renovations. Actually, that picture is not accurate, it looks nothing like that, there's no excavators in it. So we had a bit of a power outage issue yesterday and I appreciate Clelia hosting us today. Clelia, I met on my first day

working in higher ed as a transition specialist and I've been in her debt ever since and this is only digging that debt further. So thank you, Clelia.

Morton is the second oldest community college -- and I'll keep this brief, I know we're getting late here, but we're the second oldest community college in Illinois, one of the smallest, the most compact districts and so for us it is really valuable to have such a great partner with the American Job Center. And as a Hispanic serving institution, we really do reflect the community that serve. We serve Cicero, Berwyn, Lyons, Stickney, McCook and Forest View.

As I mentioned, we've had a consistent partnership over the last ten years since I've been here with the AJC. We attend their orientations weekly. We have staff on-site here every Tuesday morning and they are often at our campus hosting orientations, information sessions, tabling. They serve on our area planning counsel and have been instrumental in helping to direct a lot of our adult education services and referring students to us.

We have a number of WIOA programs that are also covered the AJC refers customers to for us:

non-credit programs, for-credit programs, on-line, in person, everything as flexible as can be to fit the customers' needs and we are continually expanding those.

As we look to the next slide, which will be the last one, you know, we celebrated our 100th year anniversary this year and for us there was a lot of looking to the past in FY24, FY25, but FY26 is all about looking to the future and we know that we need to expand, we need to be nimble and flexible with the programming that we're offering and look to our partners to see what we could be doing better and so being here with you today is a real great honor and we hope to expand the partnership that we have with the Partnership.

The College just in April started the Workforce Innovation Strategic Partnerships Unit which the idea was to bring together career services, all of our non-credit programming, grants office, partnership management, business solutions, a unit that can be nimble, that can really go out into the community, assess the needs and then provide services to meet those needs. So looking to the future, that's where our focus is. It's on the work that we're doing and

how we can support it.

I would also be remiss if I didn't say that we have a bunch of land that we're looking to develop we are looking for ideas. We are looking for partners in ways that we can work with the Partnership, with our AJCs and what we can do into the future to help meet the customer we're they're at and bring Morton College into the next 100 years.

So thank you again for having me here today. I apologize for not being able to say thank you for coming to Morton College. Thank you.

(Round of applause.)

MS. CATTOUSE: Real quick announcement. I think that Amelia has reached out to many of you individually. We do have our Careers Golf Event happening in August so we're really looking for everybody to participate, you know, sponsor us, but also I am tapping into the Board to use your connections and your partnerships and your networking to also pass that information forward to be able to support us. I mean, I think that the conversations that we've had here is for government funding, tie eligibility and so forth and this actually gives us the flexibility to creative and innovative and create

programs outside what's tied to these specific eligibilities and restrictions, right. So we're looking for your support. Again, reach out to me or Amelia if you have any questions and we'll be more than happy to support to bring in that fun in August.

MR. JOHANSON: When is it again?

MS. CATTOUSE: August 22nd. Okay.

MS. MASSEL: So you may recall that at the last meeting we talked about we did last call of survey of stakeholders to really understand how we can better connect as -- I'm sorry. I am Susan, the director of communications and external affairs of the Partnership, I think most of you know that. Anyway we look for a voice that inspires branding that reflects our missions and tools that make it easier for the network and customers to engage.

So one of the ways we're doing that is we're refreshing our website. We spent a lot of time on it. June 30th is when the curtain should go up. If you look at our website the week before June 30th, you'll see some work in progress. As we -- It's not a new website, it's a refreshed website and the main thing is that you're going to notice a difference in the voice. It's going to be much easier to connect

with. It should be more aspirational and inspirational. It should be warmer.

And the program descriptions. So the way we talk about all of our programs, we're going to have some consistent elements that had not been consistent before. I thought of our current website as sort of the mountain range. You could see the new pages that were great and then you can see the bad ones that we hadn't given enough thought to lately. So every program page is going to have program description: a call to action, why should I care, a success story; look, somebody else has done well; where do we get the money; the funder being lifted up; the outcomes and impact. So we place 20 people, but those people altogether put \$100,000 back into the economy and maybe the partnership is great, but maybe I'm curious about going right to Manny, okay, yeah, let me tell you how to find Manny. So much more transparency hopefully making it more to what we do and who all is under our tent.

I showed this to you guys last time, but I just wanted to remind you this will be our new logo. We'll be sending a digital tool kit to our whole network within next few weeks with the new logo. I'm

not going to bore you with it, especially now at the end of the meeting, but it ticks a lot of boxes that met a lot of the feedback that we heard in the survey.

Okay. So I'm going to take just a little bit more time on, maybe 30 seconds. One of the things is I've learned -- we've all learned that connection, right, people understand you, what our network means is something that we've not done well enough. For instance, New Moms, they were just up here as somebody that does great. If you get a flier from New Moms, how do you know they're part of our world? If you go to our website, how do you know they're part of our world? Well, the American Job Center is a really good brand and we have somehow just reserved it for, like, a dozen of our organizations. Why? So they could be called career pathways or satellite services. That means nothing to anybody. So we're going to expand the AJC brand and you're going to start seeing that in the next few weeks and months that you're either a comprehensive AJC like our partners in Wheeling, your an affiliate AJC like our partner here, you're a youth only AJC -- I'm not going to be able to pull that up right now, but you know what I mean that serves in school, out of school. You're a specialized AJC which

maybe is, like, somebody that just focuses on manufacturing or you're a sector center and then a career is what we're calling the folks who are not funded by WIOA; so those are construction works, CEJA, so other programs that are really important, but can't really bear the AJC name. Did I explain that? I'm trying to go quick, I know you guys -- I'm so respectful of your time. So you'll start seeing more information about that.

So again, what do I say every time? We're very well known among the people who know us. That is our blessing and our curse. So getting expanded, that matters. I'm always happy to see these numbers go up. Remember, though, our website is sort of HQ. We have a lot of other websites to send people to so I like it when these numbers go up.

Again, social media followers. I just like to see these numbers going up and I always want to share them with guys, you people.

And the ones that poll best: Hospitality Hires was in April. It's always an outstanding event. It had record registration of over 3,000, record attendance of almost a thousand and you can imagine these poll really great because you can feel the

heartbeat. You can feel the excitement.

And social media that works, social media that sort of gets people excited, honoring people with we work and, again, getting the inspiration and the aspiration of connectivity that we keep hearing people want.

These are some of the places we've been. This is an event hosted by OAI that Claudia and George went to. And then we actually traveled, some of us, to a conference in Virginia and NAWDP, the National Association of Workforce Development Professionals every year honors an employer and our nominee won, Northwestern Medicine, so we're really proud. And they sent two people, it was really quite cool actually to bring such a huge regional employer to be honored by a national organization and they were very excited about it. It's a win-win. You know, we help them find great people and they say we know what we're doing. That's it, right. That spells it out.

Next slide. And this is just more Hospitality Hires. You can see that picture is worth a thousand words. All the people there that are our partners and our funders and our supporters. This gentleman who got the offer, that's what it's about.

Next slide. We have an event coming up on June 26th, our second to last career connector event. It is funded with ARPA and those funds are set to sunset. Again, we have, like, 700 people registered. I actually had to ask them if we should stop promoting. That is not something I ask very often, and I think 64 employers. This is in South Holland, this isn't the Loop. It just shows you the need is really there, don't tell me people don't want to work, people want to work. Anyway this is coming up and registration is still open. It's the 26th, I might have said. And there's a second one in September that I should say Clelia, right, that you're leading that one. Where is it, Clelia? North Riverside?

MS. GOMEZ: No. It's in the park district, the North Riverside Park.

MS. MASSEL: We haven't put that one up because we're focusing on this one.

Next slide. I told you I'd be quick. Apparently I'm finished. Okay.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. I just want to make a quick announcement. I've been asked to do a workforce summit and so I will be connecting with all of our partners here to figure that out. Some of the

officials said we want you, George, to kind of facilitate this, so you will be hearing more about that. And I just got a message that the FBI is at one of our partners so I'm going to leave, grabbing files and this is something that once again I talked about earlier is that we go through this and it's changing every day. And then finally, I would just like to thank you all for your support. I don't know if we did the vote with the budget, but I think if we did, that's fine because we have to get this once again signed by the CEOs by the 26th.

(Overlapping talking.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Motion to approve the proposed budget.

MS. McDONOUGH: So moved.

MR. HECKTMAN: Second.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Seconded by Adam.

All in favor.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Any abstention?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Motion carries.

Again, I want to apologize that we went so far over, but I do want to reserve time for public comments and questions. So with that, I will open the floor to everybody else that is in this room. If you're interested in public comment, please come up to the podium, introduce yourself, say your name and the floor is yours.

MR. COLBERT: I'm going to stand right here. Good afternoon, everyone. Derrick Colbert from KRA Corporation. First and foremost, I just wanted to say thank you to the Cook County Workforce Partnership for the nine years that KRA has been a partner with you guys, it's been a great pleasure as well. I just wanted to say KRA is truly committed to making sure that we do everything that we need to do to make sure that we remain good partners with the Partnership as well. So I just wanted to say my name is Derrick Colbert. I serve as the managing director of operations at KRA Corporation and I'm responsible for all program outcomes to make sure that we meet and exceed our benchmarks.

And I just want to give a special shout-out to my colleague Nieal who runs our Chicago operations, her and her team have done a phenomenal job to make

sure that we meet our program benchmarks every step of the way as well. And also I will be remiss if I didn't extend the invitation for this Board to come out and look at our new center at Kennedy-King. We're doing some awesome work and we would love for you guys to come out and take a look at the space and see all the great work that KRA is doing here in Chicago. So thank you a lot.

MS. SHAW: Does anyone else have a public comment?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Any on-line?

MS. SHAW: Is there any on-line public comment?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Seeing none. With that, I would like to offer a motion to adjourn.

MS. PATRICK: So moved.

DR. BLY-JONES: Second.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: All in favor.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CO-CHAIR ROBINSON-IVY: Thank you, everybody.

CO-CHAIR ALLEN: Thank you.


(Which were all the proceedings
had in the above-entitled cause.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS
COUNTY OF COOK)

Lisa M. Walas, being first duly sworn, on oath says that she is a Certified Shorthand Reporter doing business in the City of Chicago, County of Cook and the State of Illinois;

That she reported in shorthand the proceedings had at the foregoing Chicago Cook Workforce Innovation Board Quarterly Meeting;

And that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of her shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid and contains all the proceedings had at the said Chicago Cook Workforce Innovation Board Quarterly Meeting.



LISA M. WALAS, CSR

C.S.R. No. 084-003787

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO
before me this 2nd day of
July, A.D., 2025.





NOTARY PUBLIC

--	--