

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, DECEMBER 18, 2018

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT at 1:11 p.m. on
Tuesday, the 18th day of December, 2018, the above-entitled
matter came on for hearing at the Texas Workforce
Commission, TWC Building, 101 East 15th Street, Room 244.

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

PROCEEDINGS, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2018

AGENDA ITEM NO. 13
CHAIR HUGHS

AGENDA ITEM NO. 26
EMILY CLODFELTER

AGENDA ITEM NO. 37
AARON DEMERSON

AGENDA ITEM NO. 415
MIGUEL GUZMAN

AGENDA ITEM NO. 521
EMILY CLODFELTER

AGENDA ITEM NO. 627
ADJOURNMENT

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 32

P R O C E E D I N G S

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2018

(1:11 p.m.)

AGENDA ITEM NO. 1

1
2
3
4
5 CHAIR HUGHS: All right, good afternoon,
6 everyone. If you could please find your seats, we're going
7 to call this meeting to order. I know there are a couple of
8 folks who've indicated they could be joining us. I think
9 mostly one who is not here yet, but we're going to go ahead
10 and get started without him to make sure that we are
11 respectful of everyone else's schedules as well. And I know
12 that Scott Norman is not with us today, however he did send
13 Loraine Yearie (ph), if I could ask Loraine to stand, he's
14 asked her to -- to come in and take notes, because I know he
15 continues to be very invested in this process. So thank
16 you, Loraine, for joining us. All right, we'll start with
17 roll call, then.

18 MS. CLODFELTER: Okay. Chair Ruth Hughs.

19 CHAIR HUGHS: Here.

20 MS. CLODFELTER: Doctor David Gardner.

21 MR. GARDNER: Here.

22 MS. CLODFELTER: Scott Norman. Steve
23 Lecholop. Gerardo Interiano.

24 MR. INTERIANO: Here.

25 MS. CLODFELTER: Mario Lozoya.

1 MR. LOZOYA: Here.

2 MS. CLODFELTER: Thank you, Chair, we have a
3 quorum.

4 CHAIR HUGHS: Thank you. We are also joined
5 by my fellow commissioners here today. I'm very excited to
6 have the opportunity to introduce all of you who may have
7 already had the chance to meet Commissioner Robert Thomas
8 who joined us almost three months ago now. And so we're
9 very excited to have him joining us. And of course
10 Commissioner Alvarez is also here representing labor.
11 Gentlemen, would you like an opportunity to say some words?

12 COMM. THOMAS: Just glad to be here. Thank
13 you so much.

14 COMM. ALVAREZ: I as well, just glad to be
15 here and be a part of this whole process.

16 CHAIR HUGHS: Great, thank you. This is my
17 first opportunity to chair the JET Advisory Board. I'm very
18 excited to get to do this. I have been an active,
19 interested member, and as a member of the Commission been
20 behind many of the initiatives and seen firsthand the great
21 work that all of you do. In fact, we have had such an
22 overwhelming response in terms of interest for JET funding
23 that we will be seeking this legislative session another \$6-
24 million for the biennium that all three of us have voted
25 unanimously to pursue as a Commission in the summer and

1 continue to have support for. So we're excited for that,
2 and then we'll hear more about that need as we progress in
3 the meeting.

4 I also want to take an opportunity to fully
5 introduce the newest member, Gerardo Interiano, and give him
6 the opportunity to say a few words if you like.

7 MR. INTERIANO: Sure. Thank you, Chair
8 Hughs, I appreciate the opportunity. It's going to be an
9 honor to serve with all of you, with the members of the
10 Advisory Board as well as the Commissioners. I'm very
11 passionate about the work that you guys do and how -- how
12 important this -- these grants are to organizations across
13 the state. I so look forward to learning from each of you
14 and serving in this capacity. Thank you for the
15 opportunity.

16 CHAIR HUGHS: Thank you. And at this time
17 why don't we go around the room and have brief
18 introductions. I know many of the staff from the agency are
19 also here and then there is Jerry's joining us from TEA, we
20 appreciate him joining us as well. Maybe we can get started
21 over here with Aaron and go briefly around the room and then
22 we'll start the meeting.

23 MR. DEMERSON: Aaron Demerson, Office of
24 Employer Initiatives

25 MS. CLODFELTER: Emily Clodfelter, Office of

1 Employer Initiatives, Program Manager for JET.

2 MR. ROBINSON: Dale Robinson, Office of
3 Employer Initiatives, Skills Development Planning.

4 MR. SERNA: Ed Serna, Deputy Executive
5 Director, Texas Workforce Commission.

6 COMM. ALVAREZ: Julio Alvarez, Texas
7 Workforce Commissioner.

8 MR. GARDNER: David Gardner, Texas Higher
9 Education Coordinator.

10 MR. INTERIANO: Gerardo Interiano,
11 consultant.

12 CHAIR HUGHS: Ruth Hughs with the Workforce
13 Commission.

14 MR. Lozoya: Mario Lozoya, Economic
15 Development, Brownsville Texas.

16 COMM. THOMAS: Robert Thomas, Workforce
17 Commissioner.

18 MS. RAMOS: Cristina Ramos, Texas Workforce.

19 MS. TROKE: Jen Troke, Texas Workforce
20 Commission, Workforce Grants and Contracts.

21 MR. GUZMAN: Mike Guzman, Labor Market and
22 Career Information.

23 MS. HUNTMOSES: Karol Denise Huntmoses, Grant
24 Administration and RFP (indiscernible) for the
25 (indiscernible) JET Program.

1 AGENDA ITEM NO. 2

2 CHAIR HUGHS: Thank you, and Emily, do we
3 have any public comment? Has anyone signed up for public
4 comment?

5 MS. CLODFELTER: We do not.

6 AGENDA ITEM NO. 3

7 CHAIR HUGHS: All right, so not hearing any
8 public comment we're going to move on to Agenda Item 3,
9 Discussion, Consideration and Possible Action Regarding
10 Grants to Public Junior Colleges, Public Technical
11 Institutes, Public State Colleges, and Independent School
12 Districts.

13 MR. DEMERSON: Okay, good afternoon. Make
14 sure I turn that on. Good afternoon. Chair Hughs,
15 commissioners, members of the Advisory Board let me just
16 express our sincere thanks to each and every one of you guys
17 for the work that you're doing throughout the year. This is
18 our third round of JET funding -- fourth round, Emily
19 reminds me -- of our JET funding and the work that's been
20 done by the staff, the support that we receive by the
21 commissioners and the Advisory Board has been phenomenal,
22 and so we appreciate all of that as -- as we go into this
23 round of funding as well.

24 I'd like to draw your attention to tab 3. In
25 the tab you'll find the JET's Education for Texan's

1 Application Summary. This is a summary document before we
2 get into the mass list of -- of grant applications that kind
3 of summarizes what we've done over the -- the past rounds;
4 Fiscal Year '16, '17, '18, and our fiscal year for '19 as
5 well. And so you'll see 46 applications received from ISDs,
6 25 from institutes -- institutions of higher education for a
7 total of 71. And -- and you'll start seeing the trend where
8 we're at 101 Fiscal Year '16, 121 Fiscal '17, and 99 Fiscal
9 '18 and 71 Fiscal '19. Some of that's due to some of the
10 marketing efforts that we actually were doing grant rounds
11 in a pretty fast pace, and so we have not had an opportunity
12 to get out to market as much, and so you'll see that number
13 probably change, more than likely, based on some of the
14 market efforts that we'll be taking in the future.

15 And so this is the summary document that kind
16 of lays down. Miguel's going to present some of the trend
17 analysis later on in the meeting, but this pretty much gives
18 you an idea of what's been requested, what's been received,
19 the threshold, and just a bit deep-dive information for our
20 Advisory Board members as we move forward.

21 The next document and summary information
22 that we'll always include in your packets, and it's the
23 Fiscal Year 2016, '17 and '18 community colleges and
24 independent school districts that have received awards. So
25 this is always a nice remember if you're ever out in your

1 community and you're visiting with colleges and or ISDs be
2 mindful of their participation in our program.

3 And so I draw you to tab 5. Tab 5 we have
4 our independent school district -- this is our masked list
5 --

6 CHAIR HUGHS: Aaron, I'm sorry, I've had a
7 request if we could ask some questions on tab 3 before you
8 move on. Unless you think it makes more sense to go through
9 both? There is a request for questions.

10 MR. DEMERSON: Yeah we will definitely take
11 questions.

12 CHAIR HUGHS: Okay.

13 MR. DEMERSON: Okay.

14 MR. LOZOYA: Thank -- thank you, Aaron. Oh,
15 this is on. But my question is around, one, consideration
16 on establishing the target on applications and, two, is
17 consideration to kind of notify us, or come up with a way to
18 show us, what are new applicants versus old applicants. And
19 I'd like to see do we get the same ones applying all the
20 time, or are we -- are we getting new ones? And it may be
21 even later in the future understand that I think I remember
22 have -- asking about how many total ISDs there are in Texas.
23 I believe it was 1200 districts or so, is that true?

24 CHAIR HUGHS: That's right.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

1 MR. LOZOYA: You know, so then, so then, I
2 mean, the number is huge. Right? Compared to the
3 applicants, so I'd like to understand here in the future,
4 unless somebody in the staff here has the answer, you know,
5 what's a typical percent of already or prior applications or
6 ISDs that have applied before? Are they the same ones
7 applying all the time, or are we actually getting new ones
8 cycled every cycle?

9 MR. DEMERSON: And so we -- we'll have that
10 trend information. Miguel is going to present some of the
11 trends. That number exactly, I'm not sure if we have that
12 now, but I know we have the ability to get that information
13 and so we -- we'll be in a position to share that with
14 Advisory Board members based on the three rounds that we've
15 had. Really coming into this meeting with the opportunity
16 to dig deeper into the numbers that we got. So we -- we'll
17 have that available for sure.

18 Target on applications I'm not sure. The
19 Advisory Board will probably have to talk a little bit about
20 that in regards to -- to what's being recommended to staff
21 in that standpoint.

22 MR. LOZOYA: And then an example would be
23 from a productivity perspective should we target half new
24 applications at a five percent or two percent or some --
25 some level so that we can show that we are reaching out to

1 new ones? And then why aren't they applying so we can, from
2 a gap analysis perspective, what can we solve if there's
3 anything to solve.

4 MR. DEMERSON: Okay, got it. Thank you. Any
5 other questions on the summary document? Okay, if not,
6 behind tab 4, again, this -- these were our independent
7 school district JET grant awards and staff is actually push
8 -- putting forth a document that it's being reviewed by an
9 evaluation committee and actually goes to number 17 on this
10 application, and those are the ISDs that have been put
11 forward for approval from the Advisory Board. We'll answer
12 any questions that you have here.

13 We're starting out with about \$3.2-million in
14 funding. We have about 753,000 that's coming back,
15 recaptured funds, that we're able to bring back to the
16 independent school districts for funding in this particular
17 round. And so your 3.2 your first grant amount is 281,000,
18 which leaves remaining funds of 2.9-million. And we worked
19 down that list on a basis based on what they -- what's being
20 requested from the -- the grantee.

21 So you consider -- continue to see registered
22 nursing, healthcare. That's -- that's been big. You'll see
23 welding, that comes up from time to time as well. Chemical
24 equipment operators. Electricians are also mentioned as
25 well.

1 But this masked application allows us to go
2 down to 17, in Independent School District 4856, and staff
3 will get in a position to negotiate with that particular
4 applicant in regards to not being able to fully fund the
5 entire amount, but looking at what's up, what's left, and
6 negotiating down from that point. We're also asking for the
7 ability that if recipients are not in a position to utilize
8 the amount that they're requesting that staff's in a
9 position to work down the list to determine the varying
10 other additional eligible applicants that could partake in
11 the accepting of those funds.

12 CHAIR HUGHS: So is there a request from
13 staff to move to allow staff to move forward in awarding
14 grants according to the masked list and then move down the
15 list as needed?

16 MR. DEMERSON: Correct. As -- as they're
17 negotiation with -- with the applicants.

18 CHAIR HUGHS: Okay, is there a motion in that
19 regard any of you?

20 MR. LOZOYA: So moved.

21 MR. INTERIANO: Second.

22 CHAIR HUGHS: Okay. The motion passes. All
23 in agreement?

24 ALL: Aye.

25 CHAIR HUGHS: Opposed? Okay, the motion

1 passes.

2 MR. DEMERSON: Thank you. I'd like to move
3 to your tab 5. Pretty much the -- the same situation here
4 where we have a masked list for community colleges. Right?

5 MR. INTERIANO: Quick question, is this the
6 the most, '17, that we've awarded in (indiscernible) it's a
7 high number (indiscernible).

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's the highest year.
9 Yes.

10 MR. INTERIANO: Thank you.

11 MR. DEMERSON: Okay, again, behind tab number
12 5, our community colleges. Again, a masked list where we're
13 starting out with \$2.6-million, there was an additional 193
14 that we were able -- able to add back to the community
15 college list. And, again, we would work down this list,
16 those that have scored 60 and above, to fully allocate
17 funding for the community colleges.

18 MR. INTERIANO: Aaron, quick question.

19 MR. DEMERSON: Okay.

20 MR. INTERIANO: Does this represent all of
21 the applicants?

22 MR. DEMERSON: No, it does not represent the
23 entire list of applicants. On that summary document on tab
24 3 for this particular round there were a total of 25
25 applications received from institutes of higher education,

1 and there were 24 applications that they were responsive.
2 And of that there were 12 that were above the threshold, the
3 60 percent threshold.

4 MR. INTERIANO: So this would allow us to
5 fund all of the organizations that were above the 60 percent
6 threshold.

7 MR. DEMERSON: That is correct in this
8 particular case, and so something that -- of note that we're
9 -- we at the staff level will be dealing with; if we have
10 any recaptured funds in this particular amount we're not in
11 a position to work down the list, because there's no one to
12 -- scored above that 60 percent. And so that's -- there any
13 remaining funds there we would probably apply that towards
14 the next round as well.

15 CHAIR HUGHS: Any questions on this item?

16 MR. LOZOYA: Sorry, I think I do have a
17 question. I'd like to hear from the staff how do they feel
18 about that 60 percent? Is -- is -- do you feel that you're
19 effective, or --? I think when we first met about this
20 there was a lot of work around digging in and assessing the
21 number of applicants, but I think we ended up at 60 percent.
22 Has that -- has that helped you? Do you see any improvement
23 in -- in the process?

24 MS. HUNTMOSES: No I think the 60 percent is
25 fine, because we do get -- we do get a broader knowledge

1 base, so with the criteria I think you do, you know, give
2 you the best ones group out of the group as far as that
3 (indiscernible) stuff that works fine. So I think that
4 works fine.

5 MR. LOZOYA: Okay, thank you.

6 MS. HUNTMOSES: Mm-hmm.

7 CHAIR HUGHS: Aaron, you want to lead us
8 through the next item, or should I (indiscernible)?

9 MR. DEMERSON: Well, we actually weren't --
10 this is for the community colleges, and so we're looking for
11 a motion to approve the community colleges. You approved
12 the independent school districts, and so if you want to take
13 the same action on the community colleges.

14 CHAIR HUGHS: And the request is to move
15 forward in awarding the grants and then having the
16 opportunity to move down the list as needed. Is there a
17 motion on -- on that request?

18 MR. LOZOYA: So moved.

19 MR. INTERIANO: Seconded.

20 CHAIR HUGHS: Okay. All in favor?

21 All: Aye.

22 CHAIR HUGHS: Opposed? None. The motion
23 passes.

24 AGENDA ITEM NO. 4

25 MR. DEMERSON: Still -- tab 6, and so we're

1 excited -- the last board meeting the Advisory Board asked
2 staff to go back and look at numbers from three rounds of
3 activity that we've had, and so we're going to ask Miguel
4 with our labor market team to present on trends that we've
5 discovered. And then in addition to what's represented here
6 we'll have a lot of additional information from this round
7 and looking forward to addressing some of the questions that
8 were raised even at this meeting plus on a going forward
9 basis. And so I'll turn it over to Miguel to present there
10 or here even, if you'd like.

11 MR. GUZMAN: All right.

12 MR. DEMERSON: Thank you. I believe
13 everybody has a copy of the PowerPoint in your packets as
14 well. Miguel, you can begin to walk us through.

15 MR. GUZMAN: Okay, sure. Okay. Want to say
16 good afternoon board, commissioners, chair. Have the
17 opportunity to present the JET Program.

18 So, basically, I'm going to start off with
19 kind of what you already heard from Aaron as far as, like,
20 the amounts for the -- each Fiscal Year 2016, '17 and '18,
21 just kind of get brought over to you as far as applications
22 received and awarded?

23 2016, as you heard, 59 ISD applications for
24 ISDs, 42 for community colleges for a total of 101.
25 Workforce Development Board Areas 26 out of 28 had applied.

1 For 2017 was kind -- it was an increase for
2 ISD to 90 for community college went to 31 for a total
3 application of 121, and 27 out of 28 boards had applied that
4 particular year.

5 A down dip in 2018, 69 ISDs, 30 community
6 colleges, total applications of 99 for that year 24 out of
7 28 board had submitted applications.

8 Okay, so at the end of all three years all
9 WDAs have applied with -- for at least two grants, for two
10 JET grants each, so -- **meeting** 1:29:03 count was at seven,
11 that's not in that particular slide, but that meeting count
12 was seven, so therefore being 50 percent of the Workforce
13 Development areas had seven or under and then the other 50
14 percent -- above 50 percent had over seven applications.
15 Gulf Coast had the most, 44 applications for JET grants for
16 all three years.

17 So looking at the urban to rural ration, it's
18 pretty much a 2:1 ration. That is 2.2 -- 2.1 urban
19 applications to rural for -- were applied. As far as
20 granted it's 1.8 urban for every rural -- every rural
21 application being granted, so mostly urban.

22 MR. INTERIANO: Quick question on that.

23 MR. GUZMAN: Yes.

24 MR. INTERIANO: Is there -- are there any
25 lessons learned on why the Gulf Coast had a larger number of

1 applications that could be applied to other parts of state?

2 MR. GUZMAN: Well, it's a very large -- it's
3 one of the largest Workforce Development areas. The Gulf
4 Coast. Of course, they're comprised of East and
5 Metropolitan Cisco area. There's a lot of school districts
6 in the area. The flip side, though, as -- as you'll see
7 later, is it -- even though it had the most applications it
8 wasn't near like the most successful as far rate, and that's
9 because the way the scoring mechanism is built. So.

10 Okay, and the next slide here, JET put in
11 some -- there -- actually there's a little mistake here
12 where it says 21701 per student. That should actually read
13 21700 per occupation. That is the difference in the amount
14 -- what a high school graduate would -- sorry, try this
15 again. The amount of the child going through the JET grant
16 would get average versus just a typical high school graduate
17 in that area. So that's about 21,000 per occupation. Per
18 student it's actually higher, it's 22,019, so for all of the
19 applications out there divided by the amount of students
20 going through the JET Program they earned about 22,000 more
21 than they would have by just earning a high school degree.
22 The total was 440-million increase in those by going through
23 that program over high school. So.

24 For 2017, \$17,287 per occupation. The amount
25 per student was actually a little bit down, it was 15,151

1 per student. The total amount of increase was 92.9-million.

2 For 2018, 23,297 did increase per application
3 and per student it was 24,670. That's the highest it's been
4 overall for years, so it's definitely increased; 146-million
5 for the total amount.

6 The next slide you see all three program
7 years. As Aaron was saying it peaked, as Aaron was saying,
8 for 2017 121 total applications down to 99.
9 Disqualifications actually fell 22 down to 7 that last year,
10 so maybe they're getting better at -- at that applying for
11 these grants.

12 MR. INTERIANO: Could you -- could you
13 elaborate on that, the seven percent?

14 MR. GUZMAN: Oh, seven -- less disqualified -
15 -

16 MR. INTERIANO: Or seven total, right?

17 MR. GUZMAN: Seven total. Yeah, I'm sorry.
18 Seven.

19 MR. INTERIANO: Anybody on the staff can say
20 why? Are we helping them with the application, or are they
21 getting better at it?

22 MS. HUNTMOSES: Actually both. They're
23 getting better at it. And they -- there -- some areas are
24 clearer and because they have a better understanding with
25 the form so they (indiscernible) did get better this year

1 (indiscernible) to complete the proper(indiscernible).

2 MR. DEMERSON: Right. Our staff's done a
3 fantastic job, I think, getting out there with the goal set
4 to eliminate the disqualifications in certain roles or to
5 make sure that this is a lower, you know, lower number. And
6 They've done a tremendous job of making it clearer, getting
7 out and marketing and talking with the (indiscernible) a
8 good way.

9 MR. LAZOYA: Yes, great job. It's a good
10 number. Good trend.

11 MR. GUZMAN: ISDs basically pick up a larger
12 portion of that, so they mirror the same thing as the total
13 applications peaked in 2017 at 90, disqualifications down.

14 Community colleges not much change from 2017
15 to 2018; 31 applications. The very next year roughly the
16 same. Awarded has not changed over three years; 10.

17 MR. DEMERSON: And in the community colleges
18 you -- you'll find the same as (indiscernible) office. They
19 begin to level out. They've been involved with this program
20 longer than anyone else. ISDs were added maybe about a
21 year, two years ago for the first time. But community
22 colleges have been involved in this for a number of years,
23 so that's where you see zero on there, it's because they --
24 they pretty much have this in hand.

25 MR. GUZMAN: Okay, this is a look at the --

1 the top work -- applicants by workforce board. As I was
2 saying earlier, like, at very top you have Gulf Coast with
3 17 applications and they, basically, decrease from there.
4 Most successful actually was lower Rio Grande had 100
5 percent success rate. That is the four -- awarded for four
6 applied. Next was Northeast Texas at 40 percent, and then
7 Coastal Bend at 28.6 percent. Gulf Coast was actually 6th
8 at 17.6 percent of those being awarded for having applied.

9 Just a little, I guess, information that --
10 Gulf -- I looked at the application scores, Gulf Coast was
11 brought down a lot by property values and community type,
12 urban and suburban, so it's basically built-in
13 (indiscernible).

14 2017 Coastal Bend actually replaced the Gulf
15 Coast as -- as far as the amount of applications. The most
16 successful was West Central Texas, with 50 percent that's
17 half of the applications being awarded followed by Coastal
18 Bend at 44 percent and Lower Rio at 33.3 percent.

19 2018 Gulf Coast returns to the top with 14
20 applications for that year followed by Lower Rio with 10
21 applications. The most successful for this particular year
22 was Cameron with 60 percent awarded followed by Lower Rio
23 with 50 percent, and Coastal Bend at 44 percent. Gulf Coast
24 was 8th place at 14.3 percent.

25 AGENDA ITEM NO. 5

1 MR. GUZMAN: At this time, I'd actually like
2 to turn it over to a coworker, Cristine Long (ph), and she
3 will present on major occupation trends.

4 MS. LONG: Good afternoon. We begin by
5 taking a look at the total applications for major
6 occupations in a year. This is going to have the IHE and
7 ISD applications combined. You'll see that the 2016
8 applications are represented by the green bar, 2017 blue,
9 2018 by yellow.

10 From left to right you will see all of the
11 occupational major groups. These are going to include
12 management; which will have your financial managers, your
13 transportation storage managers, et cetera. Computer and
14 mathematical is going to include systems analysts, computer
15 programmers, architecture and engineering. You'll see all
16 engineers here; industrial, mechanical. You're also going
17 to see aerospace, and any of the engineering technicians
18 that are included in this industry. Life, physical and
19 social science; this is a broad occupational group, but for
20 the applications this includes geological and -- and then
21 the petroleum technicians. Education; that pretty much
22 speaks for itself. Mostly this was elementary school
23 teachers and others. Healthcare; this is a broad occupation
24 as well, but some of the examples include RNs, respiratory
25 therapists as well. Protective service; this is your fire

1 fighters as well as your patrol officers, police and
2 sheriff. Food preparation and service; for the applications
3 this was your chefs and head cooks. Office and
4 administrative; that is secretaries, administrative
5 assistants. Construction and extraction; this is where you
6 find the electricians that you were speaking of earlier as
7 well as plumbers. Who are extraction; the applications
8 included service unit operators for oil and gas.
9 Installation maintenance and repair; this is your auto,
10 truck, aircraft repair folks as well as the HVAC, industrial
11 machinery mechanics. Production; here's where you find the
12 welders, as well as your machinists and your CNC machine
13 tool operators. Transportation and material moving; this is
14 your CDL truck drivers as well as your other heavy equipment
15 operators.

16 So if you take a look at this you see that
17 healthcare, installation, maintenance and repair and
18 production are leading the pack. For healthcare the most
19 applications were received in 2017. This is also true for
20 production and the installation maintenance and repair.

21 There's an increase year to year in the
22 architecture and engineering applications while construction
23 occupations dropped off beginning in 2017.

24 Next, you'll see that we have broken apart
25 the ISD and IHE applications.

1 Healthcare, installation, maintenance and
2 repair and production received the most applications each
3 year. Computer and mathematics applications declined year
4 to year. Architecture and engineering applications increase
5 year over year. Food preparation and construction and
6 extraction experience a drop-off from Fiscal Year 2016
7 moving into 2017 and 2018.

8 Next, we'll quickly look at the IHE
9 applications per major occupation in the year Again,
10 following the same pattern, you see that healthcare,
11 installation and repair and production received the most
12 applications. There is, however, an observed -- an
13 observable decline in healthcare and production occupation
14 applications from 2016 through 2018. Installation,
15 maintenance and repair high will remain somewhat steady
16 there.

17 The next three slides that we're going to
18 look at reflect a break-out per fiscal year of applications
19 by major occupational group.

20 As we're looking at 2016 you can see that
21 installation, maintenance and repair, production, as well as
22 healthcare make up 75 percent of the applications for Fiscal
23 Year 2016. Followed by computer and mathematical,
24 construction and extraction, food preparation and service
25 and architecture and engineering.

1 For 2017, again, installation, maintenance
2 and repair, healthcare and production, continue to lead with
3 a larger share of the applications. Together these three
4 occupations make up 80 percent of the applications received.
5 We can see computer and mathematical, as well as
6 architecture and engineering occupations continue to receive
7 a number of applications as well.

8 And for 2018, again, what you see is
9 installation, maintenance and repair, healthcare and
10 production aggregate. And now also architecture and
11 engineering are increasing, and the applications for
12 transportation and material moving make their first
13 appearance in Fiscal Year 2018.

14 The final slide that we're going to look at
15 in regards to occupation are going to be the funded
16 applications per major occupation. This is a combination of
17 2016 through 2018. It also combines the IHE and ISD
18 applications. The total awards per occupation group seems
19 to follow the breakout of applications per occupation, with
20 healthcare and production showing -- showing the most funded
21 applications. And then these two groups are followed by
22 maintenance and repair, computer and mathematical,
23 architecture and engineering, food prep and service, the
24 construction and extraction. Thank you.

25 CHAIR HUGHS: Any questions?

1 MR. GARDNER: I have a question. It's not
2 about this, per se, but at some point in -- if you're able,
3 I think it' be interesting to know what type of equipment is
4 actually being purchased and trends over time. Because, you
5 know, it's hard to glean that from this and is there
6 something that's consistently needed, or is there -- or is
7 the state getting closer to meeting the need in some area
8 than another? I have -- I think you have to -- it'd be hard
9 to extrapolate that, but even in what we approved earlier we
10 don't really see, except for a couple, really what
11 specifically is being purchased. And since that's the real
12 focus here I think it would be useful if -- if it's possible
13 to do that.

14 MR. DEMERSON: It -- it is definitely
15 possible to do that, and so I think that allows us an
16 opportunity to go back and look at equipment purchases. And
17 we -- we've been talking with various offices and success
18 stories. That's something that we'll bringing next where
19 we're looking at the use of the -- the grants that have been
20 already out there that received funding; how that's working
21 for the state. Trying to tie that back to some of the local
22 workforce boards.

23 Commissioner Thomas has talked about how --
24 how that was a dreaded funding and other strategic programs
25 that TWC has in other -- and communities have as well. So

1 success stories will be big and allow us to -- to really
2 hone in on -- on what's been purchased, what's being used
3 and -- and then to --

4 MR. GARDNER: I see you have one handed out,
5 but those exact -- next on the agenda. Excellent, okay
6 yeah.

7 MR. DEMERSON: Mm-hmm, yeah.

8 MR. GARDNER: Okay, thank you.

9 CHAIR HUGHS: Thank you. Okay, Aaron, what's
10 next?

11 MR. DEMERSON: We were -- we were about to
12 close out I think with --

13 AGENDA ITEM NO. 6

14 CHAIR HUGHS: Okay. Oh, I see. Well, if
15 there's any discussion, consideration or possible action on
16 any future board meetings which anyone wants to raise
17 specifically at this time?

18 I will take the opportunity to mention, I
19 meant to mention it in my introductory comments, and it --
20 sitting next to Mario reminds me of how wonderful it is when
21 the board members have the opportunity to join us at these
22 JET presentations. So I know Emily is making a point of
23 letting the Advisory Board members know when there is a jet
24 presentation in their area, or in any area, but, you know,
25 it's more convenient in your area, if you would like to join

1 us. And we really appreciate it and I think all seen the
2 value of observing firsthand the impact of this equipment in
3 each and every location and I think that they really value
4 getting to show us that equipment and show that that's their
5 students using the equipment, so I really want to encourage
6 everyone to -- to continue to do that where you have that
7 opportunity. And I don't think Mario and I will ever forget
8 the presentation that was given to us in Laredo as an
9 example. So anyway, yeah, because he did almost pass out.
10 But we'll share that with you after this meeting. So the
11 rest of you can be prepared if you find yourselves in that
12 situation. So, anyhow, anything on future board meetings?
13 It's a good story. We'll share it with you after.

14 MS. CLODFELTER: So also like to direct your
15 attention to tab 7, which is an example of an article
16 released regarding the Gregory-Portland ISD JET tech -- or
17 JET grants from FY18. So, as the Commissioner, as Chair
18 Hughs mentioned, how important these JET presentations are
19 in getting the word out We -- I will continue to make sure
20 that you're aware of publications and news articles and
21 press releases regarding JET check -- JET grants as well as
22 JET presentations.

23 As far as future board meetings, so as Chair
24 Hughs mentioned; the 86th Legislative Session is coming up.
25 We will continue to keep you updated regarding any

1 legislation regarding the JET Grant Program, and we'll
2 circle back after the legislative session regarding the
3 planning of the next JET Advisory Board meeting.

4 CHAIR HUGHS: Thank you, Emily. Are there
5 any questions for Emily? All right. Well it brings us to
6 the last portion of the meeting. Having vetted all the
7 applications and instructed staff and looking -- yes sir.

8 MR. DEMERSON: I was going to mention that we
9 spoke to the legislative request that's coming up as well.

10 MS. CLODFELTER: Yes, Chair --

11 CHAIR HUGHS: We did talk about the 6-million
12 biennium, if anyone wants to talk -- and I think that staff
13 was able to present sort of what that need was and how it
14 was far exceeded based on what would have been qualified
15 applications. And so could you give us a little background
16 on the 6-million in terms of what that would cover? Maybe
17 if you know off hand. I think it would allow us 12 more
18 ISDs and 17 more -- I saw statistics on this recently. I
19 don't know if we have them handy now.

20 MR. DEMERSON: Yeah. We don't -- we don't
21 have them handy, but I know our -- our LAR projected out if
22 we're in a position to have 6-million then that would result
23 in x amount of new application, or new grant recipients, for
24 ISDs and community colleges. I'm not sure the exact
25 breakdown.

1 CHAIR HUGHS: Right. I believe it represents
2 about over 6000 individuals who would serve -- that would be
3 impacted by the additional funding. So -- but I won't --
4 don't quote me on those numbers. Let's just refer to our
5 LAR on that, but I'm pretty sure that that's roughly what
6 we'll see if we're able to get that additional funding.

7 MR. DEMERSON: And Chair, I'd like to also
8 just thank the staff, Carol, Cristine and Jim and Gayle and
9 Cristine and -- and (indiscernible) for advancing this
10 program for this past year. And we look forward to the new
11 year here. The work they've done has been tremendous. The
12 evaluation team as well in TWC. We don't take them for
13 granted. We appreciate what they're doing in the work with
14 this.

15 CHAIR HUGHS: Thank you, Aaron. Certainly
16 we're seeing the evolution of the JET program from year to
17 year and really appreciate all the work that staff does as
18 well as our -- our role for the board members. So with that
19 is there a motion to adjourn?

20 MR. INTERIANO: So moved.

21 MR. GARDNER: Seconded.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

23 CHAIR HUGHS: All right, you're both fighting
24 over it. Which one of you wants to take it?

25 MR. GARDNER: I'll second it.

1 CHAIR HUGHS: All right, then. There has
2 been a motion, it has been seconded. All -- to adjourn.
3 All in favor?

4 ALL: Aye.

5 CHAIR HUGHS: All right, opposed?

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible)

7 CHAIR HUGHS: All right, opposed, he wants to
8 keep it going.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

10 CHAIR HUGHS: All right, the motion passes.
11 Happy Holidays to all of you. Thank you so much for your
12 hard work, and feel free to grab a -- a Hershey kiss from
13 the basket on your way out. Thank you.

14

15 (Proceedings concluded at 1:48 p.m.)

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 1st day of January, 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