

**Workforce Community Advisory Committee (WCAC)
Tuesday, February 21, 2017
3 p.m. – 5 p.m.
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor
Pacific Conference Room**

In attendance:

Anni Chung, President & CEO, Self-Help for the Elderly
Debra Gore-Mann, Executive Director, San Francisco Conservation Corps (SFCC)
Liz Jackson-Simpson, Executive Director, Success Center San Francisco
Ken Reggio, Executive Director, Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco
Shamann Walton, Executive Director, Young Community Developers, Inc.
Amabel Akwa-Asare, Director of Strategic Initiatives, OEWD
Mike King, Sr. Workforce Analyst, OEWD

Twelve members of the general public were also in attendance, including staff from the following organizations: Code Tenderloin; New Door Ventures; Hospitality House; BAVC; Mission Language and Vocational School; Community Housing Partnership; Hire-Ability; Goodwill Industries; JVS; and the Human Services Agency of San Francisco's Workforce Development Department.

1. Introductions
2. Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted with one revision – to finalize the Letter in the Citywide Plan after reviewing and commenting on the Final Citywide Plan Recommendations.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes from November 7 and January 25 Meetings

Meeting minutes from November 7 and January 25 were approved without revision. A member recommended listing the organizations represented by general public attendees in future meeting minutes.

4. Review Citywide Workforce Development Plan Timeline

Mike King provided a brief overview of the timeline for completing the Citywide Workforce Development Plan, including presentation of the Plan at WISF's March 9 meeting.



5. Review and Comment on Final Citywide Plan Recommendations

Mike King provided highlights from two sections of the Citywide Plan – an Economic Overview and a Workforce System Overview. Members discussed:

- *Do we know the number of underemployed individuals in San Francisco? We could determine underemployed status by looking at wages, educational attainment, part-time versus full-time employment, as well as the percentage of individuals earning less than a living wage.*
- *The Economic Overview section should include information about the demand for succession planning.*
- *In regards to regional employment opportunities, we should think about people who commute to San Francisco, especially from the East Bay, and their effect on local hiring and the economy. The workforce system is still serving clients who move out of San Francisco. The City has more commonalities with the East Bay than other surrounding areas, given numerous transit options across the Bay. Manufacturing is a major opportunity in the East Bay currently.*
- *In framing analysis of our Workforce System, we should note ‘fewer clients served’, not necessarily ‘less demand’ for services. A reduction in clients served may be the result of remaining jobseekers being more discouraged, as well as higher costs of living. To that point, a member shared a story about a worker at their agency who earns \$45K, but was still discouraged to keep working; this worker was in public housing and saw public assistance as a potentially better option.*
- *In FY 2015-16, jobs were plentiful, which resulted in more placements, but less services, and as a result, fewer clients were retained in their placements.*
- *We should look into the Gig Platform sector; we could speak with Ted Egan in the Controller’s Office, who partnered with Lyft recently.*

Recommendation #1: Adopt the Workforce Transit Map as a representation of local government’s role in the system. Members discussed:

- *Stabilization and barrier removal services need to be in the spectrum of workforce development services.*
- *The Workforce Transit Map may need some fine-tuning; for instance, the Map currently shows a client being able to move through H.S.A.’s programming*



from stabilization services to unsubsidized employment and that simple is not the reality.

- *The Workforce Transit Map is a helpful visualization of the workforce development system.*
- *The Map should consider incorporating trade skills, the timeline for services, and other dimensions of the system. It should also illustrate how clients may move ‘backwards’ or navigate the system in non-linear ways; if possible, it would be helpful to describe all of the ways a client could navigate the system.*
- *A necessary component of workforce services for individuals without homes, a large demographic of the client population, is hygiene and cleanliness. H.S.A. is currently providing these services, but OEWD is not and needs to be – perhaps it could be addressed through a future RFP. The City needs to set up a shelter expressly for individuals accessing training programs; there is no shelter in the Bayview that allows clients to shower/bathe.*

Recommendation #2: Build data sharing infrastructure across City workforce development departments. Members discussed:

- *In the Recommended Action Steps section, we should replace ‘TBD’ with concrete timetables, such as completion by a specific fiscal year. The bulk of funding for this recommendation is further out, so we hopefully have time to cultivate a bigger budget request. Concrete goals are necessary to ensure this work happens.*
- *We might want to tap into Code for America expertise; their staff could help us navigate the work of building data infrastructure.*
- *We should look into public-private partnerships to fund this work. Use H.S.A. data infrastructure as a starting place.*
- *The transitional work of moving from current systems to a new system will be the challenge – how do we ‘roll-over’ or migrate existing data?*

Recommendation #3: Actively use demand-side relationships and data to guide workforce development programming. Members discussed:

- *We need two-way information sharing between community-based organizations and the City.*
- *OEWD used to host symposiums, which were focused on employer engagement. That was a good practice that could be revived.*
- *The job opportunity email blasts from OEWD are helpful to providers.*



- *Members disagreed about using local hire mandates as a strategy. One public attendee said that there may be adverse effects to only hiring local residents, while one member cited the need to prioritize local residents, especially given the size of local workforce development funding.*
- *Providers are all pursuing the same employers – we need a coordinated account management and employer engagement strategy. For that reason, this recommendation is pointing us in the right direction.*
- *We need to better link training to employer demand and coordinate employer relationships. We may need to reconsider our services being offered (e.g. cover letters and resumes may not work in the Tech sector).*
- *We need a coordinated strategy and trainings need to be completely customized to the specific hiring opportunity.*
- *At future meetings of the WCAC, City departments could share their particular employer engagement approach.*

Recommendation #4: Continue to explore efficiencies gained through aligned procurement and shared contracting between City workforce development departments. Members discussed:

- *We should reword to acknowledge that CBO staff already spend a lot of time with clients.*
- *What does ‘duplication’ mean? Duplication does not necessarily have to be a bad thing.*
- *If there is only one procurement opportunity for CBOs, there could be a drop in service quality. Would aligned procurement result in less funding available for certain strategies? This recommendation does not work if the administrative savings are not passed through to CBOs. We do not want to diminish the overall pot of funding to a particular strategy.*
- *CBOs need a patchwork of funding to make their operations work.*
- *Consider changing the wording to the ‘duplication of administrative services’ instead of services in general.*
- *We should consider doing a pilot around shared procurement first.*
- *The consolidation of SWEP and MYEEP experienced a net reduction in funds but it was better for the participants.*

Recommendation #5: Contribute to breaking the cycle of poverty for San Francisco residents through targeted outreach and service delivery. Members discussed:



- *This recommendation should include individuals with disabilities and veterans, too.*
- *It is good that this recommendation specifically focuses on results for vulnerable populations.*
- *The City lost HUD funding for services to the homeless; we need recognition that this loss in funding needs to be addressed.*
- *How do we think about 'exits' – including retention and skill/resiliency building? We need to shift the perspective, because placement into entry-level jobs is just not cutting it anymore.*

6. Finalize Letter in the Citywide Plan

Mike King gave an overview of the WCAC Letter in the Citywide Plan. Members provided suggested edits. Mike will share a revised letter with members within a week for their final edits before the Plan is presented to the WISF Board on March 9, 2017.

7. Public Comment

No public comment.

8. Adjournment