

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
TEXAS WORKFORCE COMMISSION
AUSTIN, TEXAS

PUBLIC MEETING)
FOR THE TEXAS)
WORKFORCE COMMISSION)

JOBS AND EDUCATION FOR TEXANS (JET)
ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 2018

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT at 1:12 p.m. on
Tuesday, the 26th day of June, 2018, the above-entitled
matter came on for hearing at the Texas Workforce
Commission, TWC Building, 101 East 15th Street, Room 244.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PAGE

PROCEEDINGS, TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 2018

AGENDA ITEM NO. 13
CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR

AGENDA ITEM NO. 23
EMILY CLODFELTER

AGENDA ITEM NO. 34
AARON DEMERSON

AGENDA ITEM NO. 45
AARON DEMERSON

AGENDA ITEM NO. 515
AARON DEMERSON

AGENDA ITEM NO. 637
AARON DEMERSON

AGENDA ITEM NO. 741
ADJOURNMENT

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 42

P R O C E E D I N G S

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2018

(1:12 p.m.)

AGENDA ITEM NO. 1

CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: All right. I'd like to call this meeting to order. Emily, do you want to do Roll Call?

MS. CLODFELTER: Yes. Chairman, Andres Alcantar?

CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Here.

MS. CLODFELTER: Doctor David Gardner?

MR. GARDNER: Here.

MS. CLODFELTER: Scott Norman?

MR. NORMAN: Here.

MS. CLODFELTER: Steve Lecholop?

MR. LECHOLOP: Here.

MS. CLODFELTER: Tony Fidelie?

MR. FIDELIE: Here.

MS. CLODFELTER: And, Mario Lozoya?

MR. LOZOYA: Here.

MS. CLODFELTER: Thank you. All our present.

CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2

CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Aaron, do we have any public comment?

1 MR. DEMERSON: No, sir. Nobody signed up for
2 public comment.

3 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: All right.

4 AGENDA ITEM NO. 3

5 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Aaron, update on outreach
6 activities?

7 MR. DEMERSON: All right. Thank you, Mr.
8 Chairman, members of the board, thank you for the
9 opportunity. We were recently in an RFA period and so there
10 has not been a lot of outreach activities, but I did want to
11 just thank the members of the advisory board and the
12 Commissioners for your support in going out and talking
13 about the program and the opportunities that exist for this
14 program.

15 We also continue to hear good input and
16 receive good input from individuals that were impacted by
17 the hurricane, past recipients of the JET program. And
18 Emily's been in contact with them and it has been delightful
19 to hear that they're making progress in that regard. So I
20 just wanted to bring that to your attention and note that
21 after this round, we will continue to have JET check
22 presentations and your participation in those efforts would
23 be appreciated and those go forward.

24 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: All right. Thank you,
25 Aaron.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

AGENDA ITEM NO. 4

CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Item 4, Discussion, Consideration and possible action regarding grants to public junior colleges, technical institutes, public state collages, and ISDs. Aaron.

MR. DEMERSON: And members, I'd like you to - draw your attention to Tab 3, the first item that you see behind Tab 3 is an application summary document. Does everyone have that? Okay.

This document shows the first round, second round and third round. And so, we received from the Independent School Districts 69 applications, from the Institutes of Higher Education we received 30, and the responsive ISDs, that means the ones that were complete packages and sent forward, were 62, and from the colleges we had 30 that have been received and moved forward.

And so, seen a lot of good progress in that regard from the applications that have come in from the Institutes of Higher Education, there were 30 and there were 30 that were moved forward, and only seven that remain behind from the Independent School Districts, so 69 to about 62 responsive applications there. And those unresponsive applications, those were missing signatures that you might have, not eligible offers, minimum or maximum or individuals that left information blank in that regard. And so what we

1 will -- what we'll switch forward to the evaluation team
2 were total applications received of about 99 and total
3 response of about 93 that went forward.

4 If you go to Tab 4, these are the JET grant
5 awards for the Independent School Districts and so the
6 threshold is 60 percent and these are the 38 that meet that
7 threshold of 60 percent and above. You get an idea of the
8 type of projects that have been submitted; welders, medical
9 and clinical laboratory, technicians, LVN, engineers,
10 pharmacy technicians, and the like. And so this gives you
11 an idea of all of the applications above the 60 percent.

12 The 2.5-million that was allocated by the
13 advisory board in our last -- last meeting allows this to
14 stop at number 12. And anything after number 12 falls below
15 the available amount of funding.

16 I know in our last meeting we talked about
17 any recaptured amounts that comes out of -- our captured
18 amounts that comes out of the contracts once it goes into
19 contract negotiation, then we're in a position to work down
20 the list from that point.

21 So what we're putting forward today are
22 projects one -- and these are masked project applicants, 1
23 through 12 that expends the 2.5-million that was allocated
24 originally, with the ability to work down the list with any
25 recaptured funds that come back.

1 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Any questions? Yes,
2 Steve?

3 MR. LECHOLOP: Aaron, thanks for this
4 information. I'm curious, to what do you guys attribute the
5 smaller number of ISD applications in this round as compared
6 especially to round two?

7 MR. DEMERSON: Not exactly sure why the drop
8 off, you know, we're in the RFA period and you can't
9 essentially market the program without outreach activities.
10 And then, it may just be that you had a surge from the round
11 two newness of the program and then a waning from that
12 point. But I've not really been able to gain exactly what
13 that drop off. We'll have an opportunity probably to go out
14 in the timeframe when an RFA is not on the -- on the streets
15 to go out to market the program and we may see an uptick in
16 that regard.

17 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Anecdotally I've heard
18 from some representatives that the competition was so
19 significant the first time around given the number of funds,
20 some of them decided to not pursue it this time and this --
21 many of the ones that applied the first time that didn't --
22 that thought they had good proposals were not funded, saw
23 that as a detriment.

24 MR. DEMERSON: Mr. Chairman, if you'd like
25 for me to go with the -- the others, we can do that as well;

1 the community colleges, after we take any questions on the
2 ISDs.

3 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: All right. Let's do
4 that.

5 MR. FIDELIE: So Aaron, just a real quick
6 question. Remind me what that 54,000 left after the first
7 12 are funded, if they're all funded in their entirety?
8 That 54 -- my recollection is it goes to the next person,
9 the next, number 13, but at a \$284,000 project how -- how
10 does that work out? I don't want to leave money on the
11 table.

12 MR. DEMERSON: Right. This allows the
13 contract team during negotiations to go back to really work
14 down the list. You may have -- some of the applicants may
15 come in requesting \$200,000 and say they get a deal on
16 equipment and it's 150,000, you have 50,000 left, so any
17 recaptured funds will be in a position to work that down the
18 list. And if it's a request for 284,000 and we only have
19 200,000, is there an opportunity for them to play in that
20 space of 200,000. I believe that allows us to do that as
21 well.

22 And so, you don't leave anything on the
23 table, you're always working down the list. And if they
24 come back and say that we need 284, we can't do it with
25 200,000, then we'll move to the -- the next applicant and

1 find someone that fits that bill.

2 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Want to go through
3 college funds?

4 MR. DEMERSON: Okay. We'll draw your
5 attention to Tab 5, these are the JET grant awards for the
6 Institutes of Higher Education, the community colleges. And
7 again, the same 2.5-million that was allocated by the
8 advisory board during our last meeting leaves us with 13
9 individuals that meet the 60 percent and above threshold.

10 We had 30 ISD applications to come through,
11 2.5 cutoff goes to the institution number 10. Again, these
12 are masked so that we're not sure of the recipients, but
13 they're masked at this particular point, again, leaving
14 remaining funds of about \$37,000 with this -- this round.

15 The areas under -- under this area, you see a
16 lot of healthcare, you see a lot -- welding, registered
17 nurses, process operators as well.

18 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Steve?

19 MR. LECHOLOP: I noticed that especially in
20 the ISDs, but also the community colleges, there's a -- kind
21 of an obviously disproportional number of welding awards.
22 I'm curious why you believe that is, if it's just
23 coincidence, or if the -- or whether welding is actually
24 because of the hurricane or otherwise an especially in
25 demand trade right now in the state of Texas?

1 MR. DEMERSON: Yeah, these are all locally
2 driven, you know, through the Workforce Board, and so it may
3 be the -- the desires and the demand of that particular
4 area. This is our third round and so I'm looking forward to
5 trend data that comes through and so Mike, and our LMCI
6 team, after we approve these, we're going to be in a
7 position to really to kind of gather this, find out where
8 those occupations are and if we see a high number in welding
9 or healthcare, we can go back and kind of look at it from an
10 economist standpoint and try to figure out what those trends
11 are. And it may very well be driven that's what the desires
12 are at the local level because they have to be in demand,
13 high demand occupations that exist in that local workforce
14 board.

15 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Scott?

16 MR. NORMAN: Sorry, go ahead.

17 MR. GARDNER: Just with part of that question
18 is I've wondered as you look at this, we've seen this every
19 time; welders versus, you know -- as you look at it, are you
20 concerned that there are some fields that may be in demand
21 that aren't being addressed? Maybe the demand isn't quite
22 as high, but it's not being met at all? I don't know how
23 we're going to do that analysis. I know the higher ed
24 sometimes you know that you need a hundred of somebody or
25 the other and the state you need thousands of some in an

1 area, but you're producing three of that hundred. Does that
2 weigh into the equation at all?

3 MR. LOZOYA: I can speak to that. I -- I can
4 speak to that I think. We've done some work in looking at
5 high demand fields. And you're right, there are some fields
6 that are high demand that are not reflected here. One of
7 the reasons that we've found out is because they're not
8 available in the schools. So the schools can't apply for
9 those programs because they don't even exist.

10 For example, CT doesn't have coding, CT
11 doesn't have robotics, CT doesn't have advanced
12 manufacturing, so all those are high demand, but they don't
13 even exist in the high school for CT programs, so it's
14 impossible for us to see it reflected here, but that's --
15 you make a good point and I know that there's some
16 legislation that's going to be introduced next session to
17 modernize CT to create those programs, so we'll probably in
18 the -- in the next two years you'll see some change in how
19 high schools request funds for those programs.

20 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Scott?

21 MR. NORMAN: Just going back to Steve's
22 original question, I think -- and not knowing where these
23 institutions are, you know, to really have a good feel, but
24 there's such a boom right now in the petrochem up and down
25 the coast that, you know, multi, multi-billion-dollar new

1 plants or expansions that are going on, knowing that there's
2 a great demand, that probably is where some of this is
3 coming from. And then to just follow up on yours, not as
4 high tech, but representing the construction fields, you
5 don't see general construction represented as much, but a
6 lot of those programs are booming and there is unbelievable
7 demand, not only along the coast because of the hurricane
8 which exists, but across the state continues.

9 But we're starting to see places like Del Mar
10 College and others that are really making a big push there,
11 so we'll see how that pans out.

12 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And the occupations
13 listed here do mirror a lot of the projects that we get,
14 Aaron, through our skills development fund? In other words,
15 a lot of healthcare related equipment purchases and many of
16 these other grants we're working with companies very
17 directly. There's often a demand for welding and some of
18 these other things that we're seeing here represented in
19 that.

20 MR. NORMAN: It's also very expensive.

21 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: It is. It is. And I
22 think that's the -- the important part here. These are high
23 demand occupations that are tied to these purchases and they
24 impact a number of different occupations within those fields
25 relative to healthcare and relative to these -- the

1 investments being made by -- or proposed to be made by our
2 high schools. Aaron, proceed.

3 MR. DEMERSON: Okay. So those are the two
4 that are being brought forth based on the RFA that was
5 issued back in after the last board meeting, so we'd present
6 these to the boards and with the ability for funds -- staff
7 to negotiate down the list as funds are recaptured in that
8 regard.

9 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: I want to make sure that
10 we don't have anymore questions before we --

11 MR. NORMAN: I have just one question. So is
12 it normal for staff to negotiate with these either school
13 districts or -- or other institutions for there to be
14 savings and multiple applications that end up being awarded
15 much less -- or somewhat less than what you have?

16 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Christina?

17 MS. RAMOS: Yes. Yes, there is.

18 MR. NORMAN: Okay. So y'all are intimately
19 involved in that process?

20 MR. DEMERSON: And you find the community
21 colleges that have been doing it for a while have a little
22 better -- better feel because they -- the program was
23 initially originated with the community colleges and now the
24 ISDs, this is their second round, I believe; second or third
25 round. So it's new --

1 MR. NORMAN: Well, and they may ask for more,
2 you know, you always ask for more, understand you may get
3 less too, right?

4 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Right. But in terms of
5 what this gets down to is there's some cost items in some of
6 these proposals that we'll kind of look at different and
7 that's where the money becomes freed up as you're
8 finalizing. Is that -- is that what's happening, Cristina?

9 MS. RAMOS: Yes. We did identify some items
10 that we do need clarification from, so these numbers are --
11 will probably change a bit.

12 MR. NORMAN: Well, and I assume y'all's
13 experien -- y'all have much more experience in this than
14 maybe some of these school districts, especially a smaller
15 one that may not have as sophisticated or as much
16 experience, so y'all are able to help them through that?

17 MS. RAMOS: Absolutely.

18 MR. NORMAN: That's good.

19 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Aaron, do you need a
20 motion?

21 MR. DEMERSON: I believe so.

22 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Well actually, any more
23 comments or questions? All right. We need a motion.

24 MR. DEMERSON: So what we're requesting is
25 basically the approval of the applicants that have been

1 submitted based on the -- the recent RFA and the ability for
2 staff to work down that list with any recaptured funds that
3 come back.

4 MR. NORMAN: I'll make that motion, Mr.
5 Chairman.

6 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: All right. Do we have a
7 second?

8 MR. GARDNER: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: All right. Mr. Gardner.

10 MR. GARDNER: Are we voting for or against
11 that?

12 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: We just voted for it.

13 MR. GARDNER: Okay. Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And I'll abstain from the
15 vote. All right. What's next on the agenda, Aaron?

16 AGENDA ITEM NO. 5

17 MR. DEMERSON: Next on the agenda, Mr.
18 Chairman, we know that we were anticipating a meeting to
19 happen in September, but this is an opportunity for us to
20 save a little bit of that summer and board has the ability
21 to look at -- giving us instructions for the next RFA,
22 similar to what we did in the last board meeting where we
23 set parameters. And if you give staff direction in regards
24 to these parameters, then we're in a position to push
25 forward with an RFA, maybe in the August/September

1 timeframe. And that's behind Tab 6. And so these are
2 familiar items --

3 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: This is actually Tab 5.

4 MR. DEMERSON: Tab --

5 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Discussion, consideration
6 and possible action on program parameters for --

7 MS. CLODFELTER: Yes, it's Agenda Item Number
8 5.

9 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: -- to public colleges,
10 institutes, state colleges and ISDs. And so, what we're
11 trying to do here, Members, is want to make sure that these
12 dollars are working and getting out there as efficiently and
13 as effectively as possible. We've been a little bit behind
14 on the cycle. This allows us to fully align with the
15 funding periods, in other words, making the funds available
16 at the beginning of the fiscal year, rather than towards the
17 middle or the end. And by having this discussion, our hope
18 is that we are able to instruct staff sufficiently for them
19 to put another RFA out there in the coming months and have
20 that money available at the early Fall as opposed to late
21 Fall.

22 MR. NORMAN: Do you think, Mr. Chairman, that
23 getting it out earlier in the fiscal year might mean more
24 applicants, might solve some of that concern that was
25 raised?

1 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: I think it raises more
2 applicants, it demonstrates to -- to the legislature what
3 the demand is for these programs. It allows these dollars
4 more importantly to go to work as -- as these ISDs filled
5 out and rollout these programs consistent with what's
6 happening in the marketplace.

7 MR. DEMERSON: Okay. So with that, behind --
8 is it Tab 5 or 6?

9 MS. CLODFELTER: 6.

10 MR. DEMERSON: Behind Tab 6, you have the
11 items, the JET funding allocation, minimum and maximum grant
12 funding amount. And so the funding allocation for Fiscal
13 Year '16 we were at 50 percent, 50 percent, same thing with
14 Fiscal Year '17 and '18. And so we're looking for direction
15 on Fiscal Year '19 in regards to the funding allocation of
16 the 5-million. And as I mentioned, in the past it's been 50
17 percent and 50 percent.

18 MR. FIDELIE: You know, I think that this was
19 a well thought out discussion last time. I don't know --
20 robust discussion let me say.

21 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: It was.

22 MR. FIDELIE: As related to how we should
23 divide that up and I'm trying to recall back to some of the
24 comments and thought processes. I know the thought of
25 there's a lot more school districts out there versus the

1 number of colleges. That's what I was looking back at here.
2 I mean, if you just look at the requests, if you funded all
3 the ones that were eligible, it would have been 7-million
4 ISDs and 3-million to colleges. I know that after our
5 lengthy discussion last time, we ended up scaling it back to
6 50/50.

7 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And the thinking was that
8 while we had just added the ISDs, we had also maintained
9 through the statutory framework, an interest in making sure
10 that we provided it equally to both. And with the additions
11 of the technical schools, was it in the most recent
12 addition, that that was an indicator of the need to maintain
13 some level of balance between the two eligible entities.
14 And I think that's a very robust discussion. You're right,
15 Tony, we did agree to keep those 50/50 splits.

16 MR. NORMAN: I would think it would be
17 probably appropriate to have that discussion if we were
18 going to change it after the next legislative session if
19 there was some direction in either funding or statutory or
20 otherwise.

21 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And clearly, we're still
22 meeting a very small percentage of either group based on the
23 number of colleges that are eligible. We're funding -- we --
24 -- we got -- we received fewer but there's also fewer
25 eligible entities. And again, many of these ISDs or

1 colleges do in fact partner up with ISDs on these and other
2 programs.

3 MR. LOZOYA: Commissioner, I have a comment.

4 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Please, Mario.

5 MR. LOZOYA: So I -- I'm -- I was one of
6 those that -- that was gonna push for a change in the
7 percent and that's -- I'm still in the thought that the --
8 the ISDs should have a larger percent. More and more so in
9 alignment with the Tri-Agencies' targets with a 60/30 (sic)
10 target, with PTEC, now being passed in Senate Bill 22, we
11 think that the high schools now with the PTEC option has
12 more of a opportunity to provide certifications.

13 So based on those things and then also with
14 the numbers that you just mentioned, Tony, I still think
15 that -- that ISDs should have more than 50 percent option.

16 MR. GARDNER: So we're re-forming our last
17 discussion, so I would argue that number one, I don't think
18 it belongs with 65/30 techs in the way you say having to --
19 being the one largely responsible for that. But the
20 community colleges, the equipment at community colleges,
21 because they're teaming up with school districts, is
22 available to students in high school with an expansion of
23 PTEC in that, it makes that even more likely.

24 The equipment is available for training and
25 retraining at community colleges for much more of an

1 individual's lifespan, so it can be somebody who -- who's
2 going to be retrained when they're 25, 30 and it's actually
3 there for a longer period of time and has broader
4 accessibility. And I do believe that it would be good to
5 find a way in many communities for even more to be available
6 equipment-wise among those dollars and community colleges to
7 serve multiple school districts and serve as hubs for those
8 school districts, because it really can be more efficient
9 for a community college to have more equipment that will
10 serve more people and not have that have to be set up at
11 each school.

12 Now, there is a transportation issue, but I
13 know there was a model in New York 30 years ago when I lived
14 there that worked very well that way. So as a general
15 statement, I'd like to have more money available to
16 everyone, so we don't disagree that --

17 MR. NORMAN: That ought to be the number one
18 goal next legislation.

19 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Okay. So do you have a
20 formal motion or -- I'm actually not going to vote on this,
21 but I would -- I would suggest that if you look at the
22 different types of equipment, you do get reflected in the
23 college grants some different occupations that you
24 distinguish the types of fields that are being supported,
25 you get automotive, you get the IT, you get in addition to

1 the healthcare, and on the ISDs you have really clear focus
2 on the welding and electrical. So those are good
3 considerations in terms of reaching different sectors and
4 different fields.

5 And you do get the benefit of general
6 accessibility and these PTECS and innovative academies are
7 dependent upon a college partner to do the two year work, so
8 to -- to support Commissioner Gardner's comments about those
9 general requirements. Steve.

10 MR. LECHOLOP: Yeah. So I think regardless
11 of what decision we make today, one thing that I'd like to
12 see for the next biennium, should the legislature reapprove
13 this funding, is actually data that supports kind of these
14 broad contentions that are being talked about. Does dual
15 credit actually touch, you know, for these awardees, are
16 they provided dual credit to ISDs in a way that is
17 substantive and that really does make the impact the type of
18 transfer that David's talking about, right, is dual credit
19 available at these community colleges to a wide geographic
20 area.

21 What I imagine is that many of our rural
22 school districts don't have access to many of these
23 community colleges, and so the only way that they would be
24 able to get the training, the funding for the big machinery,
25 would be if we gave it to them ourselves, right? And we

1 funded them specifically. And so, as we -- as we think
2 about that how we -- you know, kind of divide the funding, I
3 wonder as we retroactively look at our applicants, where
4 they are geographically, whether we are seeing school
5 districts that are not getting the funding, but then have
6 the access to the community colleges who are getting the
7 funding as opposed to the inverse, which is kind of actually
8 what I suspect is happening, is that you have rural school
9 districts applying for the funding because they don't
10 otherwise have access to it.

11 MR. NELSON: That raises a very good
12 question. Is dual credit a part of the scoring matrix and -
13 -

14 MR. LECHOLOP: And that's a great question,
15 Scott, yeah.

16 MR. NORMAN: -- and if it's not, should it be
17 and you don't want to hurt places that don't have that
18 opportunity because there isn't a higher ed option. But I
19 think I'll ask that question of y'all and that's something
20 going forward we -- I think that should factor in and should
21 that be a part of the scoring criteria, the dual credit.

22 MR. GARDNER: I think that's a good question
23 and it also raises a point, for example, nursing. You know,
24 UT Arlington actually provides access to some equipment
25 they're able to do it online to programs around the state

1 that an individual institution usually couldn't afford. And
2 so, going forward, are there some areas where that would be
3 possible because you could never -- and I know it would be
4 unique fields, but you could never afford to provide it
5 within every rural community that needed it. And so at some
6 point then maybe working together across sectors if we could
7 figure out where some of those things, where it would make
8 sense for a purchase, you know, and maybe some more
9 opportunity in nursing than in some other fields, to do that
10 in a way that's going to serve many more folks who aren't
11 bound to that one location.

12 MR. NORMAN: And I think our policy should
13 try to drive colocation and multiple use of resources and
14 everything else to stretch those dollars.

15 MR. LECHOLOP: I agree with that.

16 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: So Scott is suggesting
17 that in the supporting criteria we provide some additional
18 points to those colleges that --

19 MR. NORMAN: Is it a factor today? I mean,
20 that was my first question.

21 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: It is not. It is not
22 because --

23 MS. HUNTMOSES: For the colleges to work with
24 an ISD with bonus points.

25 MR. NORMAN: It is --

1 MS. RAMOS: Colleges receive bonus points if
2 they partner with an ISD. But they are not required to.

3 MS. HUNTMOSES: Correct.

4 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: So and that's by points
5 right now or --

6 MS. HUNTMOSES: Yes, it was finalized last --

7 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: We did do that last --

8 MR. FIDELIE: So the inverse is required
9 where a school district has to partner with a college, a
10 college doesn't have to partner with a school district.
11 Correct?

12 MS. HUNTMOSES: Correct.

13 MS. CLODFELTER: And that's through statute,
14 it talks about the ISDs do have to be in partnership with a
15 college to promote career type education to the district
16 students or offer them dual credit.

17 MR. NORMAN: But the other is on a -- the
18 other -- the other way, from the colleges down, is just by
19 policy here.

20 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: But it does provide an
21 extra way and it might be the distinguishing factor between
22 winners and not.

23 MR. NORMAN: Okay.

24 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: That's what we don't
25 know.

1 MR. GARDNER: One quick question. So would
2 the law preclude that from being a requirement? I know that
3 it requires it one way, but would it preclude this group
4 from making it a requirement of the community colleges?

5 MR. NELSON: Are we precluded for giving the
6 bonus point?

7 MR. GARDNER: No, I'm sure we're not there.
8 I'm just saying could -- or are we precluded from requiring
9 them the same thing; the community colleges with the ISDs?
10 I know the law requires it the other way.

11 MR. TROBMAN: I would certainly need to get a
12 definitive answer on that. That's certainly we can analyze.

13 MR. NORMAN: We may need them to eventually
14 report back on that. It just seems -- and it sounds like
15 y'all are doing it to an extent, but dual credit is going to
16 be so -- I mean, it's so important moving forward with what
17 we're doing. But that's good y'all are doing it right.

18 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And we do have another
19 million, 1.2-million, that we make available to our ISDs to
20 receive outside of the JET program for dual credit programs
21 from the skills. Is it 1.25-million? Is that the amount?

22 MS. RAMOS: It's up to five percent of the
23 funding and I will tell you that the way it's weighted, ISDs
24 are the primary recipients of those funds.

25 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And with focus on rural

1 areas?

2 MS. RAMOS: Uh-huh (affirmative).

3 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Yeah. So in addition to
4 this, we do make another million -- let's say 1.2-million,
5 available every year and now for a number of years from our
6 skills development fund, and it has gone primarily to --

7 MR. NELSON: And the idea is to catch those
8 rural schools that don't have access?

9 MS. RAMOS: Correct.

10 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: That's been -- and they
11 actually centered very heavily in south Texas, the
12 recipients of those grants; is that correct? That's
13 accurate for the last years I know, right?

14 MS. RAMOS: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: It's high concentration,
16 majority of those were winding up in rural communities in
17 south Texas. And those funds can be used for equipment.

18 MS. RAMOS: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And they are currently
20 generally used for equipment. So in addition to the 2.5
21 there's another 1.2, that is required to operate separately
22 from this, but has a very specific focus around dual credit
23 and it has gone to our rural areas primarily to ISDs. I
24 wasn't aware of hardly any at all going to the colleges.

25 MS. RAMOS: Last year there were no colleges

1 that received funds. This year one out of seven.

2 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: One out of seven.

3 MR. LOZOYA: What's the name of that? Is
4 there a name to that?

5 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: It's under a rider, it's
6 a rider requirement for TWC.

7 MS. RAMOS: It's in the skills statute, the
8 statute was changed to require up to five percent of the
9 general appropriations funding to be used towards dual
10 credit.

11 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And we have very specific
12 requirements.

13 MS. RAMOS: It's labor code chapter 303.

14 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: So that's just another
15 piece of information. And we covered that the last time,
16 too, I think, so just want to remind everyone that we have
17 that part of the discussion.

18 MR. NORMAN: In light of this discussion, I'm
19 not proposing any change since it's already there. I
20 believe that's --

21 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: So do we have any motion
22 or do we have two motions? I think we have two competing
23 ones.

24 MR. LOZOYA: Yeah, I think I'm a little
25 confused. I think we were talking first about the

1 percentage and then we went on to talk about the scoring.

2 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: All right. Let's talk
3 about the percentage.

4 MR. LOZOYA: We were talking about the
5 scoring --

6 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: We can go through the
7 percentage first. Let's go back to Tab 6. Do we have a
8 proposal to keep the percentages as they are? I think we
9 might have two competing ones. Do we have 50/50 split or
10 one that Mario has -- are you offering a counter-proposal?

11 MR. LOZOYA: I'm still at the thought of
12 60/40.

13 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Okay.

14 MR. LOZOYA: ISDs.

15 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Do we have a second? And
16 we do not have a second. Do we have a proposal to move the
17 -- to keep the funding allocation at a 50/50 percent?

18 MR. GARDNER: So moved.

19 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: So moved. Do we have a
20 second for that?

21 MR. NORMAN: Second.

22 MR. FIDELIE: If I could just make one
23 comment, Mr. Chairman.

24 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Please.

25 MR. FIDELIE: Is that during the discussion

1 period now it's -- and I -- obviously last time I was more
2 on the splitting up more the Mario method if you want to
3 call it that, but you know, today, if you talk about it, I'd
4 just defer to -- I mean, I've got to defer to Dr. Gardner
5 who's been in education a long time and his thought, and I
6 think his concept of the fact that where can we do the most
7 good, and if you put things at the colleges, it -- it is
8 somewhat -- I don't want to say discouraging -- but it's
9 easier to get the money if you're a college because there's
10 less applicants, but that's why I went back and looked at
11 the scoring and really, the cutoff line on the school
12 districts was the low 70s and the cutoff line on the
13 colleges was the high 60s, so there's not that big of a
14 discrepancy in the actual quality of the program.

15 So that's why I have a tendency based on Dr.
16 Gardner's recommendation to leave it would be kind of my
17 position, but I think we do need to continue to get that
18 data. I mean, there's a lot more school districts out there
19 than there are college districts, for sure, so.

20 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Steve?

21 MR. LECHOLOP: And I -- I serve on the school
22 board for San Antonio ISD and so I am certainly an advocate
23 for -- for school districts and I believe eventually like we
24 should be moving toward a -- a higher percentage going for
25 the school districts. I think, the reason that I -- I am

1 going to vote in favor of the -- maintaining the 50/50 split
2 is number one, we haven't seen the data yet, I'd really like
3 to see the data, especially now that we're on third round, I
4 think we have enough to make kind of any analysis
5 statistically.

6 And then number two, since we're in the
7 middle of a biennium, I -- I just think it would -- it would
8 not be prudent to change the course in the middle. And so I
9 -- you know, I anticipate that based on the representations
10 of the folks here that this -- and the speaker's office that
11 this is going to be something that's continuing as far as
12 funding, I know it's going to be asked for continued
13 funding, and I look forward after the next session that we
14 get together to have kind of this discussion that in a way
15 and using tools and metrics that allow us to actually make
16 kind of strategic decisions based on the numbers going
17 forward.

18 So I support Mario's idea, I want to make
19 that very clear.

20 MR. GARDNER: And I just want to make clear,
21 I do think it's something we should continue to discuss and
22 I think the comment about the next legislative session I
23 think we do need to think about what TWC might propose going
24 forward and I think part of it is we actually need more
25 money, that's clear, and part of the reason it is the way it

1 is is because probably politically, and you know where I'm
2 going with that. And but I do think we need to expand and
3 maybe the expanded money goes primarily to ISDs. But there
4 are a number of things we need to discuss in terms of going
5 forward.

6 And a side note, Mario, I think you mentioned
7 CT earlier, but that's not all for community colleges at
8 all, it's not in the ISDs, let me know about what you're
9 talking about, we can see if we can help out on the
10 community college front to make sure they're all good at
11 least there. Because I'm not familiar with that, so please
12 let me know.

13 MR. NORMAN: I agree with you and I think as
14 part of the discussion, whether it's this group or
15 individual organizations advocating is that ask to make the
16 pot bigger next legislative session. I think as part of
17 that discussion is the allocation. And there may be an
18 argument to raise it with the understanding that it -- a
19 large percentage is going to go to ISDs or something else.
20 And so, I would hate to cloud that debate before we get into
21 it.

22 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Aaron, I think the vote
23 is to continue the allocation at a 50/50 split. The
24 advisory board is asking I think as -- that staff work --
25 and I'd like to ask you to work with a cohort to the extent

1 that you need assistance to examine the -- the allocations,
2 do a data review of how these things are aligning with some
3 of the dual credit offerings, to what extent those are
4 actually materializing, by examining the past grantees and
5 to provide or report back to this advisory board the next
6 time that they meet.

7 Is that accurate, Steve? Is there anything I
8 need, any amendments to that?

9 MR. LECHOLOP: I don't think so.

10 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: All right.

11 MR. NORMAN: And Mr. Chairman, could I also
12 amend that report to have staff to look at the weight that
13 is given to dual credit and if there's any recommendation on
14 that if that needs adjusting when we move forward to the
15 next round?

16 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: I would agree. Aaron, if
17 you and the team could work on that and include in that a
18 report on the other skills development fund related funding
19 just to -- as context for some of the investments during a
20 current year. And then second thing that we'll do is report
21 back to -- and I know the -- I know Commissioner Hughs,
22 Commissioner Alvarez, both have staff here. They are here
23 to report back to them, but I'll ask staff to report back to
24 my fellow Commissioners about the interest of the advisory
25 board in looking at the funding levels for this program to

1 consider the feedback that we've rec'd from the advisory
2 board members in terms of how we move forward with the
3 funding levels for the JET program.

4 All right. And now we also have to look at
5 the -- the minimum maximum grant amounts under Tab 6, to
6 complete -- to allow staff to move forward with this.

7 The current -- do you want to give us the
8 current, Aaron?

9 MR. DEMERSON: With -- for Fiscal Year '16
10 fifty -- 350,000, historically 50 -- Fiscal Year '17, 40,000
11 to 350,000 and our last board meeting, Fiscal Year '18,
12 40,000 to 300,000. We actually lowered it -- lowered the
13 upper end from 350 to 300,000.

14 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And so did that actually
15 allow us to serve more?

16 MR. DEMERSON: Yes, it increased.

17 MS. HUNTMOSES: It was -- well, no, we were
18 able to fund one more.

19 MS. RAMOS: There was one application that
20 came in at 40.

21 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: All right. So do we have
22 any discussion on this? Comments?

23 MR. FIDELIE: I'd like to hear staff's
24 thoughts, do you think that this current spread is
25 reasonable with what you see the applications coming in? Do

1 we need --

2 MS. HUNTMOSES: No, I think it's reasonable.

3 MS. RAMOS: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: For the record, would you
5 identify yourself, Karol?

6 MS. HUNTMOSES: Oh. Karol Denise Huntmoses,
7 I work with procurement.

8 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Thank you. Comments? Do
9 you have a motion on this?

10 MR. FIDELIE: I'm going to make the motion
11 that we leave this -- the grants amount between 40,000 and
12 300,000.

13 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Second?

14 MR. LECHOLOP: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: We're -- Aaron, I think
16 that answer provides you direction. Do you want to give us
17 an update on any kind of timeline that you're looking to
18 maybe making these funds available? Are you that far into
19 the -- along?

20 MR. DEMERSON: Yeah, and one thing before we
21 report, I wanted to note that in our last RFA, we had points
22 allocated for the hurricane areas, and so, do we want to
23 keep that in this particular RFA as well? Bonus points
24 options there.

25 MR. LOZOYA: I believe we agreed that we

1 would maintain it for a year? I think -- I -- I remember we
2 did -- we put a parameter --

3 MR. DEMERSON: Okay.

4 MR. LOZOYA: Around it, didn't we?

5 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: That it was going to be a
6 one time --

7 MR. LOZOYA: Right.

8 MR. DEMERSON: Okay. So it remains from that
9 standpoint?

10 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Well, and let's clarify
11 that. What was your statement? That it remains or?

12 MR. DEMERSON: For the timeframe that you
13 guys have allocated and that's it. And I think you said a
14 year, then --

15 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Well, I think -- I think
16 Mario's suggesting that it was going to be for that first
17 year and not necessarily for both years. Is that what
18 you're -- is that what you're considering here?

19 MR. LOZOYA: I'm trying to recall --

20 MR. NORMAN: What's our definition of a year?

21 MR. LOZOYA: I'm trying to recall -- I'm
22 trying to recall what the conversation. I think we agreed
23 on -- on a year.

24 MR. NORMAN: We did, but I didn't know if it
25 was for -- that meant last year only or does that mean --

1 MR. FIDELIE: It looks like the comments in
2 the minutes were made -- were made by me, apparently. We
3 kind of see this as a onetime thing, not an ongoing thing.
4 So --

5 MR. LOZOYA: We didn't give a timeframe.

6 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: So the recommendation is
7 that it would be as a onetime thing, I would take that as to
8 mean that the members agree to make the additional points
9 available for the first year as we assessed impact and is
10 there a proposal to extend that for another grant cycle or
11 do we stick to the --

12 MR. NORMAN: How many did we get?

13 MS. HUNTMOSES: I -- there was only two that
14 actually were awarded that use of bonus point, as far as for
15 that particular category. So I don't see it having much
16 extra value.

17 MR. NORMAN: I think we can stick with what
18 we decided last time.

19 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Okay. Stick with what --
20 what's on the record for the last time?

21 MR. LECHOLOP: Just to clarify, we will not
22 be offering bonus points for round four.

23 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Second year of the
24 biennium, that's correct. Are we all in agreement?

25 MR. LOZOYA: Yes.

1 MS. HUNTMOSES: Excuse me, I'm sorry. I'm
2 not clear. Are we just talking about for the disaster or
3 are we talking about that and the partnering with a college?

4 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: No, just for Harvey.

5 MS. HUNTMOSES: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Thank you for the
7 clarification, Karol.

8 So the advisory committee agrees to not
9 extend the Hurricane Harvey points into the second year of
10 the biennium given the first year demand and given the prior
11 agreement. Okay. I think that's it.

12 Aaron, anything else on this agenda item?

13 MR. DEMERSON: Not on this agenda item. I
14 think that concludes that.

15 AGENDA ITEM NO. 6

16 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Okay. Get us to the next
17 one then. That would be item, item 6, discussion,
18 consideration, possible action of future board meetings and
19 including a review of what you think the time is going to be
20 on the next round that we just agreed to.

21 MR. DEMERSON: Yes. So we -- is it our bel -
22 - and the staff is basically going through -- we're going to
23 go into the contract negotiation stage and so we're thinking
24 around the August, September timeframe may be an opportunity
25 for us to put a new RFA out which would allow us about two

1 to three months after that and maybe coming back in the
2 November or December timeframe, if that makes sense. I'm
3 looking over to the contract team and Jennifer as well.

4 We talked about it internally and does that
5 match up with what we discussed?

6 MS. RAMOS: Yes, it does.

7 MR. DEMERSON: Okay. So November, December
8 timeframe we'd be in a position to kind of survey the board
9 members to look at coming back to approve this round, this
10 fourth round.

11 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And two Steve, would that
12 be sufficient in terms of the report? Would that be
13 acceptable in terms of when staff would report back to you
14 on some of their findings or would you like another meeting?

15 MR. LECHOLOP: No. Well, I believe yeah,
16 that will be sufficient.

17 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Okay. And any other
18 questions on the timeline? The -- the goal is, as we wrap
19 these contracts up, that we've just approved, that there'll
20 be a period -- well, staff will be actively promoting the
21 program again starting today. Emily will be out there
22 promoting the program with a foc -- any guidance, you'd like
23 to give staff on the focus of how we continue to promote or
24 market this program before the RFA goes out again?

25 MR. NELSON: Just make myself available to

1 the extent I can help schedule allowing.

2 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Okay.

3 MR. NELSON: For appearances or something.

4 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And staff will be working
5 with a Commissioner, the Commission offices, on setting up
6 some presentations for some of these new grantees and we'll
7 be sure to extend invitations to the advisory board members
8 for those public events moving forward.

9 MR. FIDELIE: And I will make the comment
10 that Emily and I visited several times about getting to the
11 area where I live in north Texas and she made herself
12 available, we had a service center meeting where all the
13 superintendents were coming and then an ice storm shut down
14 everything. So kudos to Emily that she was willing to do
15 that. And so hopefully -- and then the timeframe had
16 wrapped up for the presentations, but she's been willing to
17 come up and we appreciate that and look forward to this Fall
18 doing the same thing.

19 MR. NORMAN: It's the thought that counts?

20 MR. FIDELIE: That's right. That's right. I
21 do have one last housekeeping question, Mr. Chairman.
22 Karol, when will those -- because we've had people in our
23 area they know I serve on this board, ask questions about
24 when the notifications -- clearly we don't know as far as
25 board members don't have any idea who's getting what, when

1 will that be released to us or to the public?

2 MS. HUNTMOSES: Oh, they should be released
3 by the end of August at the very latest.

4 MR. FIDELIE: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And so we'll release it,
6 we'll do a press release, we'll announce all the winners,
7 their amounts, and their general programs, and then we'll
8 make sure and send that to the advisory board members
9 specifically right before -- right as we're releasing to the
10 public. And make sure that they have those in hand in case
11 of any questions.

12 MR. FIDELIE: Thank you.

13 MS. HUNTMOSES: Uh-huh.

14 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And I'd like to take this
15 moment with staff to thank Aaron, Emily and the rest of the
16 team for all the wonderful work that they do in supporting
17 this program. They've -- they do this as well as the skills
18 development fund and a number of other important initiatives
19 led efforts and so I want to ask you to join me in thanking
20 Aaron and staff and the rest of the team who are in
21 contracts who, by the way, have been understaffed for well -
22 - almost two years now and yet continue to find a way to get
23 all the work done, so thank you for all that you do.

24 (Applause)

25 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Members, do we have any

1 other comments before we close and adjourn this meeting?

2

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7

3

CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Do we have a motion to

4

adjourn?

5

MR. LECHOLOP: So moved.

6

MR. GARDNER: Second.

7

CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: We're adjourned. Thank

8

you.

9

(Proceedings concluded at 1:57 p.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF TEXAS)

COUNTY OF TRAVIS)

I, Kimberly C. McCright, Certified Vendor and Notary in and for the State of Texas, do hereby certify that the above-mentioned matter occurred as hereinbefore set out.

I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT the proceedings of such were reported by me or under my supervision, later reduced to typewritten form under my supervision and control and that the foregoing pages are a full, true and correct transcription of the original notes.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 10th day of October, 2018.

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright
Kimberly C. McCright
Certified Vendor and Notary Public

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC
1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165
Houston, Texas 77058
281.724.8600