

1 THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2020

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

4 UNKNOWN: CHAIRMAN BRYAN DANIEL.

5 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Here.

6 UNKNOWN: MARIO Lozoya.

7 MARIO LOZOYA: Present.

8 UNKNOWN: Scott Norman.

9 SCOTT NORMAN: Here.

10 UNKNOWN: Steve Lecholop.

11 STEVE LECHOLOP: Here.

12 UNKNOWN: Conley.

13 WILL CONLEY: Here.

14 UNKNOWN: Jerel Booker.

15 JEREL BOOKER: Here.

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

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

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

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

15 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I can read your lips.

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

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

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

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

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Thank you, sir.

4 JULIAN ALVAREZ III: Thank you, Bryan.

5 AARON DEMERSON: Did you say Commissioner
6 Demerson?

7 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Yes, I did.

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

10 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: That's all right.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

14 UNKNOWN: Can I ask a question?

15 EMILY CLODFELTER: Yes, sir.

16 UNKNOWN: How are you, by the way?

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

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

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

23 UNKNOWN: My apologies. Okay.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 MATT HIDECKI: Yes, sir.

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

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

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

20 MARIO LOZOYA: Excellent, thank you.

21 JEREL: I have a question.

22 MATT HIDECKI: Yes, sir.

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

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

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

8 EMILY CLODFELTER: Okay.

9 MATT HIDECKI: Perfect.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Great.

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

12 MIKE GUZMAN: Thank you, Emily.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 MARIO LOZOYA: Okay.

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

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

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

15 MARIO LOZOYA: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Any discussion on the
17 motion?

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

20 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: We've got a second.

21 EMILY CLODFELTER: Okay.

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

25 UNKNOWN: Yes.

1 UNKNOWN: Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

25

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

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

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

11 EMILY CLODFELTER: Good question.

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

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

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

20 EMILY CLODFELTER: Correct.

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

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

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

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

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

11 SCOTT NORMAN: Second, Scott Norman.

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

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

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

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

14 EMILY CLODFELTER: Okay.

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

18 UNKNOWN: So moved.

19 UNKNOWN: Seconded.

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

22 EMILY CLODFELTER: I like that.

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

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

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

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

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

7 EMILY CLODFELTER: Thank you, Kristina.

8 KRISTINA RAMOS: Sure.

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

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

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

18 UNKNOWN: Based off of, right.

19 UNKNOWN: Second.

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

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

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

13 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Okay. Comments or
14 questions?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

25

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

25

1 MARIO LOZOYA: I agree with Scott.

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

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

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

9 EMILY CLODFELTER: Of 100.

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

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

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

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

25

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24 EMILY CLODFELTER: Thank you, Scott.

25

1 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Any additional items?

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

3 UNKNOWN: (Inaudible).

4 UNKNOWN: Second.

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

12 UNKNOWN: (Inaudible).

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

15 UNKNOWN: Bye, everyone.

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

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

20 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Thank you.

21 UNKNOWN: Bye bye.

22 EMILY CLODFELTER: Bye.

23

24 [No audio for rest of recording]

25