

Executive Committee Meeting
Friday, November 12, 2021 11:00 AM
Mountain

Zoom
525 Camino De Los Marquez
Suite 250
Santa Fe, NM 87505

Rebecca Estrada:	Present
Rudy Garcia:	Present
Vince Howell:	Excused
Sean Medrano:	Present
Jolene Nelson	Excused
Jon Paul Romero:	Present
Joseph Weathers:	Present

Present:5, Absent:2.

Also in attendance: NALWDB Staff: Barney Trujillo – Operations Manager, Kevin Boyar – Program/Policy Monitor, Amber Gomez – Project Specialist/Communications **Guests:** Veronica Alonzo - DWS, Margarito Aragon – DWS, Eric Vasquez – One-Stop Operator, Teresa Quintana – HELP NM, Irene Panlilio – HELP NM, Rick Sandoval – Zlotnick Sandoval

1. Call Meeting to Order

Meeting was called to order at 11:01 by Chairman Weathers.

2. Roll Call and Determination of a Quorum

Roll call was made by NALWDB Project Specialist/Communications, Amber Gomez. Chairman Weathers indicated that a quorum was present.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of allegiance was recited by all in attendance.

4. Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve the agenda. This motion, made by Floyd Archuleta, seconded by Rebecca Estrada and passed unanimously.

5. Approval of Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve the 8/30/21 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. This motion, made by Rudy Garcia, seconded by Rebecca Estrada, and passed unanimously.

6. Action Items

6.1 One Stop Operator Evaluation

Chairman Weathers asked Veronica Alonzo if she wanted the entire board to do the One Stop Evaluation.

Veronica replied no and informed Chairman Weathers that the conversation she had this morning with Madam Executive Director was in regard to the evaluation document. The

State's question was the the intent of today's meeting to conduct the evaluation of the OSO or to discuss the evaluation of the OSO. She explained that while reviewing the evaluation document she recalled seeing the exact document when the previous Director put it together. At that time the state had received the evaluation form however, they didn't have time to give feedback before the form was approved at one of the board meetings. After reviewing the form recently, she stated that the document needs to be revised.

Chairman Weathers asked for Veronica to give the committee feedback on the revisions she would recommend from the form created by the previous Director.

Veronica recommended that the executive committee review the document together today and provided feedback to each other. If the committee feels that this is an appropriate evaluation form, they can move forward. However, this is an opportunity for the committee to review and communicate the appropriate changes to the administrative staff. Once this is done the State can provide technical assistance on the form.

Chairman Weathers asked Veronica if she could share her concerns about the current OSO Evaluation form?

Veronica stated that this form was thrown together and at the time this was one of the evaluations that the board was asked to complete as part of the TAP. She stated that she remembers Margarito Aragon, Alex King, and herself informing the previous Director that this form had more information than what was necessary for a proper evaluation.

Chairman Weathers stated that he understands Mrs. Alonzo's point and then asked the committee if anyone feels that they're versed in helping change this document around. He expressed that personally he didn't feel qualified.

Jon Paul Romero informed Chairman Weathers that at Pojoaque Valley Schools they recently used an instrument for evaluations that he'd be willing to share with the committee. He added that, he believes everyone should read about the evaluation tool and give their feedback before the committee moves forward with adopting it.

Rudy Garcia agreed with Mr. Romero. He then stated mentioned that the first item on the current evaluation form is customer service satisfaction. He followed up with the question, how does the Board ensure that everybody that goes into the One Stop is satisfied? Mr. Garcia then asked Veronica if it's possible to get some examples of evaluations from the other boards?

Veronica informed Mr. Garcia that they could reach out to the other boards and ask if they could share their evaluation.

Mr. Aragon added that in the act there are statutory requirements that the Board needs to evaluate the OSO. This includes the OSO's specific roles and how they're performing to those roles, there is also contract level things that need to be evaluated such as information on how the board is directing the OSO to complete tasks. For example, if there's outreach initiatives, that's not something that's statutorily required for the OSO, however, if the board gives a budget or has it as a requirement within their contracts that the One Stop operator will have certain outreach initiatives, then that would be something that would also need to show on the evaluation form. Therefore, the evaluation form should be a combination of what's statutorily

required by the One Stop operator view and what additional items the board tasks the One Stop operator, and how those are going to be evaluated.

Rudy Garcia thanked Mr. Aragon for the information in regard to the statutory requirements and the contact. He stated that he feels that he needs more time to review the requirements. Mr. Garcia then asked the committee if they feel that this item should be tabled so that everyone can give their input. And get it back to staff by early next week and revisit the evaluation.

Chairman Weathers agreed with Mr. Garcia. He then asked Mr. Aragon if the other Boards evaluation forms are 33 pages long like the current form presented today?

Mrs. Alonzo informed Mr. Chairman that she just sent an email to Art, Beth, and Jay requesting a copy of their OSO evaluation. She stated that the feedback they had given the previous Director when she created the evaluation was that it was very lengthy and needed to be more concise, and really targeted to what the board is trying to evaluate. She noted that she remembered for the Executive Director Evaluation a committee was put together to create the evaluation. She suggested doing something similar for the OSO evaluation.

Floyd Archuleta stated that, because the Executive Director is unable to be here today, and State has expressed their concerns. He feels that there needs to be a more concise evaluation and agreed with Mr. Garcia's recommendation to table until there's more information available with the inclusion of the Executive Director.

Chairman Weathers agreed and recommended the evaluation committee to include Jon Paul, Rudy, and Rebecca. He then asked if they would be willing to be on that committee?

Rudy Garcia stated Yes.

Rebecca Estrada stated that she would be happy to be on the evaluation committee. She expressed that it would be helpful to have some examples of other evaluation forms to refer to. She stated, for the Executive Director Evaluation having examples helped the process go smoothly and gave the committee a sense of what was reasonable and what kind of questions were relevant. She added that, they'll need to refer back to the contract to include the statutory and contractual requirements.

Chairman Weathers agreed

Rudy Garcia asked Mr. Trujillo to make sure the staff provides the committee the statutory requirements and the contract requirements

Motion to table the OSO evaluation. This motion made by Rudy Garcia, seconded by Floyd Archuleta, passed unanimously.

7. Discussion Items

7.1 Indirect Cost

Chairman Weathers asked Mr. Aragon if he could discuss the indirect costs.

Veronica stated that Mr. Aragon might be having internet issues.

While everyone waited for Mr. Aragon to present the indirect cost, Mr. Garcia wished everyone a Happy Veterans Day and thanked all of the veterans for serving the United States of America.

Chairman Weathers thanked Mr. Garcia for his statement. He then stated, from his understanding there's a \$200,000 overpayment.

Barney Trujillo clarified that it's not an overpayment, it's a charge that isn't going to be paid. He added that this subject was supposed to be explained by the fiscal agent. However, what we can gather is it was a billing process error. The state has reached out to our Federal officers to DOL to get clarification for everything. HELP was requesting payment of around \$176,000 which they will not receive due to that error.

Mr. Aragon asked Chairman Weathers if he had any specific questions about the indirect cost or if he wanted an overall explanation of the issue.

Chairman Weathers stated that he would like a full explanation.

Mr. Aragon explained, when HELP has an approved indirect cost rate with USDOL, that's what is written into the contract. When HELP had their indirect cost rate established, part of the process is, they take the direct participant costs, out of those equations to come up with that percentage. Any money that is spent on ITA, OJT's, supportive services, those direct participant costs are removed, and the percentage is calculated based on all other costs, staffing level, and office supplies. Mr. Aragon stated, when HELP applies the indirect costs, they want to include some but not all of the direct participant costs in the formula so that when they apply the percentage, they increase the amount of money that they get for indirect costs. Rick is arguing that based on 2CFR, direct participant costs are not allowed to be part of that calculation and that's where the discrepancy is.

Chairman Weathers asked if they've reached out to the feds to get clarification.

Teresa informed Chairman Weathers that they have reached out to their legal counsel and their auditors to look into this. Collectively they've had a meeting and are currently waiting for the resolution. She stated that while they're waiting for a resolution, they have submitted their billing without the indirect cost rate, so that way billing can continue.

Chairman Weathers asked if anyone wanted further explanation from the fiscal agent since he has joined the meeting.

Rudy Garcia stated that he has a complete understanding of the situation and asked Rick to be available in future meetings. He also expressed that this issue needs to be resolved with HELP NM and the fiscal agent.

8. Informational Reports

Chairman Weathers asked Mr. Trujillo if there were any informational reports?

Barney informed Chairman that there are no informational reports at this time. He mentioned that the One Stop Operator might want to highlight some of the events that have gone on

Chairman Weathers asked Mr. Aragon since so many people have been at home, how do we take that into consideration when we're evaluating the One Stop?

Mr. Aragon stated that the primary functions of the One Stop operator are going to be the coordination of partners. The evaluation should look at the partners, whether they're in or out of the office. How are they working with the One Stop operator? Is the entity responsive to their needs? Are things getting done? Is there clear communication with those partners? Lastly the OSO is responsible for IFAs and MOUs are they getting signed timely and are there any issues? My. Aragon stated that the committee should look at gauging the One Stop Operator not necessarily on service but how well the coordination of services is. The committee also needs to keep in mind the pandemic and how that may have had an effect on services and offices being closed. When it comes to the contract, stuff. If there were any numbers built into the contract, then those should be included as well.

Chairman Weathers asked Mr. Vasquez to give an update.

Eric Vasquez briefly went over some of the recent events that have been going on. With the contract modification for Title I, they have been focusing on recruiting/enrolling out of school youth and dislocated worker participants. Mr. Vasquez was directed by board staff to begin these events during the developing of the modification. He mentioned that they've had three events one in Santa Fe, Las Vegas, Farmington, and Gallup. The advertisement was used to target both the out of school youth and dislocated worker populations. They used tools such as the Bridge Report and Cliff Report to find individuals that lost unemployment benefits on September 5th. From these events, they've come to a realization that many employees are not ready to return to work or aren't seeking full time employment. He stated that they had better outcomes at the Santa Fe Place Mall (144 individuals) and the mall in Gallup (99 individuals). Currently Title I is working on pulling together events in Espanola and Taos with the focus on specific career and industrial occupations.

Teresa Quintana added that, they're trying to not only target the individuals, but start to look at it from an educational and business standpoint. Their focus has been on where the gaps and needs are and working in the communities. In Rio Arriba they are trying to get hospitality off the ground and in Las Vegas they're trying to work with Luna to see what pipe ways can be established with the college and business sector there. They are also working very closely with their ABE programs to try and get all of their students enrolled in the Power Up Program, which will be reviewed during the next full board meeting so that those incentives secured. She agreed that despite their efforts it has been difficult to support those populations.

Mr. Vasquez added that, Teresa and himself have been working very closely with the Regional Development Corporation, which is the northern regions economic development nonprofit organization. He stated that it was expressed by members of the board that they start to reach out to economic development entities. He added that, the RDC has also been involved in these events.

Rebecca Estrada thanked both Eric and Teresa and mentioned she works very closely with the RDC, and she's heard great feedback from them. She stated that this is a great partnership and reminded Teresa to always keep sector strategies in mind when forming those partnerships because that will help work towards reaching multiple goals and formulate a three-way partnerships with the employer training organization, and the board.

Teresa thanked Rebecca and informed her that she is always thinking of sector strategies when looking for partners or establishing partnerships.

Rudy Garcia thanked Teresa and Eric for going out to the different communities for these events. He stated that, he's heard from several individuals that the provider is doing an excellent job at trying to get individuals back to work. Mr. Garcia mentioned that Santa Fe County is having a job fair tomorrow and for future reference he asked that they contact the county so that all employers are there at one time. He then commended them for their excellent work in the community. He stated that he's aware that they have reached out to Facebook, Amazon, and the film studios. Mr. Garcia asked Mr. Vasquez if he knows why individuals don't want to return to work?

Mr. Vasquez stated that he believes that there are many different factors. He believes that childcare is a big factor especially with the schools switching back and forth from in person to online. Another reason they think individuals don't want to return is because they may be reevaluating their career choice.

Rebecca stated that they've been studying some of this at the Laboratory for a variety of reasons, in terms of helping build regional workforce with their partners. One of the things they've been coming across is the lack of childcare.

She stated that childcare opportunities are the backbone for every workforce and its imperative for parents to have a safe place for their children in order for them to feel comfortable going to work. In New Mexico about 30% of daycares shutdown after the pandemic, and they're having a very hard time building that workforce back up. Rebecca mentioned that there's a lot of conversations at the State level on how to build that daycare, and early childhood education opportunities back so that parents feel safe to go back to work.

Chairman Weathers commented on what Teresa said about working with Luna. He stated that, the chairman and president from LUNA reached out to Sean Medrano, Elena Maestas, and himself and the ETPL committee had a meeting with them and encouraged them to get more involved with getting more programs registered with ETPL.

9. Announcements

Floyd Archuleta announced that President Bailey from Northern New Mexico College decided to take another appointment in Oregon. This is unfortunate to the board because he's been a great asset to the community in Espanola and all of Northern New Mexico. He's been a great partner and supporter of the board.

Rebecca Estrada added that President Bailey is trying to wait to stay through at least the first or second week of January. She believes that in the announcement he made this morning he stated that he plans on staying through January 14th.

Eric Vasquez stated that, as a resident of northern New Mexico, this is a loss for the region, President Bailey helped bring true professionalism to that college and he will be missed.

Veronica Alonzo informed the executive committee that the Northern Board will be monitored beginning Monday. The State monitors will be conducting their annual entrance conference Monday. She also mentioned that the annual report was submitted to them, and they provided some feedback on the Annual Report. They will be working with the administrative staff to make those edits and changes to the Annual Report.

10. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

11. Next Meeting Date _____

Chairman Weathers stated that we'll wait for the Executive Director to set our next meeting date.

12. Adjournment

Chairman Weathers entertained a motion for adjournment.

Motion to adjourn at 11:46am by Floyd Archuleta, seconded by Rebecca Estrada, and passed unanimously.

- An Executive Session may be called at any time during the meeting. Pursuant to New Mexico Open Meetings Act Section 10-15-1 (H) Subsections; (1) Meetings pertaining to issuance, suspension, renewal or revocation of a license, except that a hearing at which evidence is offered or rebutted shall be open. All final actions on the issuance, suspension, renewal or revocation of a license shall be taken at an open meeting; (2) Limited personnel matters; provided that for purposes of the Open Meetings Act, "limited personnel matters" means the discussion of hiring, promotion, demotion, dismissal, assignment or resignation of or the investigation or consideration of complaints or charges against any individual public employee; provided further that this paragraph is not to be construed as to exempt final actions on personnel from being taken at open public meetings, nor does it preclude an aggrieved public employee from demanding a public hearing. Judicial candidates interviewed by any commission shall have the right to demand an open interview; (3) Deliberations by a public body in connection with an administrative adjudicatory proceedings For purposes of this paragraph, "administrative adjudicatory proceeding" means a proceeding brought by or against a person before a public body in which individual legal rights, duties or privileges are required by law to be determined by the public body after an opportunity for a trial-type hearing. Except as otherwise provided in this section, the actual administrative adjudicatory proceeding at which evidence is offered or rebutted and any final action taken as a result of the proceeding shall occur in an open meeting; (4) The discussion of personally identifiable information about any individual student, unless the student or the student's parent or guardian requests otherwise; (5) Meetings for the discussion of bargaining strategy preliminary to collective bargaining negotiations between the policymaking body and a bargaining unit representing the employees of that policymaking body and collective bargaining sessions at which the policymaking body and the representatives of the collective bargaining unit are present; (6) that portion of meetings at which a decision concerning purchases in an amount exceeding two thousand five hundred dollars (\$2,500) that can be made only from one source is discussed and that portion of meetings at which the contents of competitive sealed proposals solicited pursuant to the Procurement Code are discussed during the contract negotiation process. (7) Meetings subject to the attorney-client privilege pertaining to threatened or pending litigation in which the public body is or may become participant; (8) Meetings for the discussion of the purchase, acquisition or disposal of real property or water rights by the public body.