Workforce Community Advisory Committee (WCAC)

Citywide Workforce Development Plan Recommendations: Feedback

---

Recommendation #1:
Develop tools and partnerships to measure system success by unsubsidized employment placements.

Areas of Exploration

- o *Members asked 'where have unsubsidized job placements been successful'?*
- o *Members highlighted the need for best practices research that shows where government has had success influencing workforce outcomes.*

Wording

- o *Members suggested that Recommendation #1 could be focused on a specific sector to narrow its focus; otherwise, the recommendation is too broad.*
- o *The current structure of this recommendation is still too broad. "Tools to Measure Success" is very different than what may be necessary to Develop Partnerships." It would be most critical to clarify what a "good partnership" means and then develop tools that can measure the success from there.*
- o *The key words in the recommendation are "tools and partnerships" and "success".*
- o *It is a step in the right direction since it aligns with SF residents' and the broader communities' goals for unsubsidized employment.*

Tools

- o *Any tool should include ways to quantify success that include: Attendance (work hours attended/work hours available); Advancement; and Quality of Performance.*
- o *There should be a focus on the development of less traditional soft and hard skills such as resilience, temperament management, and mitigation of external challenges to success.*
- o *Any system or tool needs to be laddered to account for age and development. It should also focus on the ability of clients to be high performing employees and in no way incentivize or require the employer to continue employment with low performing employees.*
- o *The "tools" that should be developed can include online easy to access resources that assist with input and monitoring.*
- o *This recommendation is definitely in the right direction; however, we need to assess each training program and identify and clearly articulate the competencies each opportunity presents and how to measure gains. At the same time, we need to know that those competencies are in line with what employers need and want. Once we can articulate these competencies then we will be able to align them with employer expectations and better market our job seekers to private sector opportunities.*

Partnerships

- o *There are several ways instances where the appropriate trainings and pipeline strategies have demonstrated success in maintaining unsubsidized employment opportunities. I feel unsubsidized employment pathways, which include an on-the-job*

(OJT) training component, lead to increased success in unsubsidized employment. The City's Jobs Now and Community Jobs Program (CJP) demonstrate evidence of successful unsubsidized placement, when an OJT opportunity is provided. We need more opportunities where individuals work for companies/organizations for a subsidized wage (or unsubsidized wage) that provide them with actual experience in a particular field or sector. This leads to permanent placements and unsubsidized placement success. Therefore, we must increase and strengthen employment relationships with the private sector to do this well. The public sector and nonprofit sector in SF have done well in providing these opportunities. Now we need to have a more robust system including private sector partners. This increased OJT or internship opportunity with private sector employers is vital in leading to unsubsidized employment placement success.

- o *Members highlighted the need for a companion recommendation for the private sector – a commitment to hire individuals coming out of City workforce development programs. How do we get private sector buy-in to Recommendation #1?*
- o *Is there a way the City can incentivize private sector by providing additional tax breaks for hiring participants formalize the relationship between CBOs who train and serve the community and the private sector who hires?*
- o *Need partnerships with ongoing resources for long-term employment stability.*

Success

- o *Members pointed out that changing the goal to "living wage jobs" would result in a lot of unreported successes.*
- o *How do we measure 'a work in progress' for clients? We need to quantify the work of getting clients from point A to point B, no matter how long it takes.*
- o *It will be critically important on how "success" is defined; including but not limited to longevity, living wage, stability, etc. It will be just as important that the definition include a specified timeline for such employment success. Is three (3) months of non-continuous employment with a living wage considered success? Or is twelve (12) months of continuous employment at minimum wage with health benefits considered success?*
- o *Generally, right direction, but with caution that those with greatest barriers to employment should not be branded as having failed if unsubsidized employment isn't achieved. For some, having completed training or having participated in subsidized employment, while not the end-game, are significant measures of achievement. Not everyone will land and sustain unsubsidized employment, but that should not exclude them from SF's workforce development's scope of concern.*
- o *How does retention fit into this recommendation?*
- o *Job retention should also be tracked as measure of success.*

City as Employer

- o *Where does accountability for Recommendation #1 lie? Members highlighted the need to refine goals for City employment – as a large local employer, City government needs to commit to hiring San Francisco residents.*

<table>
<tr><td>o Needs to be focused further to specify city workforce program graduates as a priority population for new city hires as well as for private employers who are benefiting from tax reductions or as part of developer agreements. Highlighting this specific population of potential workers is critical to differentiate for general first source hiring efforts.</td></tr>
</table>

Recommendation #2:
Explore shared procurement, shared contracting, shared client tracking, and shared program outcomes opportunities.

Wording

- o *It should be relatively simple to "explore" shared systems. It may be more helpful to state a stronger recommendation such as explore, articulate and outline shared systems opportunities.*
- o *Yes re shared procurement and shared client tracking. Not clear on meaning or intention of shared contracting and shared program outcomes.*

Right Direction

- o *I think sharing of each could create efficiencies for both the providers and funders. The challenge will be allowing the "lead" agency the autonomy needed to administer.*
- o *Yes, #2 is a step in the right direction. Shared procurement, contracting, tracking will create collective efficiencies among all agencies, organizations and companies. By simplifying systems, organizations and agencies can focus on the important work with San Francisco residents.*

Drawbacks

- o *We recently discussed this at a meeting with CBO leaders and City leaders (department heads, mayoral staff, etc.). At the end of the day this is a good idea in theory, but here are the drawbacks: the CBO culture in SF promotes organizations being strong and successful on their own, which means that it is extremely difficult to get people to work together to develop the systems needed for success in this recommendation; and City funders are clear that organizations need to be strong fiscally, administratively and programmatically. This is means that organizations— that build these strong infrastructures—would have to share best practices, high level staff and capacity building strategies. This is only possible with a culture shift in how we all work together and with a tremendous investment in capacity building and partnership development for all organizations involved; otherwise, we will not be able to develop a system where CBO's work together in this manner (think about the voluminous amount of CBO's we have in this city).*
- o *Federal funding streams pose very egregious reporting requirements that turn clients and employers off from taking advantage of public resources; and there aren't enough of any particular funding stream to support the need. It is important that we leverage all the resources we have to develop a system that supports the demand and ensures "no wrong doors" for our clients (job seekers and employers).*

Recommendation #3:
Collaborate to create a clear pipeline for the hardest to serve that leverages our strengths.

Wording
- If this is going to be a reality, we would need a true definition of hardest to serve (universal) as perceptions of hardest to serve vary across CBO's and the workforce system as a whole. We would also need to make sure that we include partners that truly serve this population well.
- It should be relatively simple to "explore" shared systems. It may be more helpful to state a stronger recommendation such as "explore, articulate and outline a pipeline to serve". An exploration may not be a good use of the WCAC's time and efforts.
- Definitely want to bring in and maintain those "hardest to serve" in workforce development system. Unclear to me the meaning of "pipeline… that leverages our strengths."

Right Direction
- I think a clear and singular pipeline with clear objectives and goals for progression would be helpful and create efficiencies.
- I like this recommendation and I am fully onboard with a cohesive strategy around developing a pipeline for the hardest to serve that leverages all of our strengths.
- Yes, #3 is a step in the right direction. A defined pipeline that is specific to the opportunities and challenges of San Francisco is critically needed to address. As noted by research, workers and employers in the United States (and San Francisco) face new realities and uncertainties that current public policies and programs were not designed to address. The Great Recession and other disruptive forces have altered the environment that workers, job seekers, businesses, educational institutions, and government all face. Source: The publication of Transforming U.S. Workforce Development Policies for the 21st Century. Creating a "clear pipeline" needs to address the existing workplace environment.
- This has always been the mandate for all of our service provisions.

Drawbacks
- A singular pipeline may not be achievable as the disparate needs, including geography and other barriers of clients may prove difficult.
- I think this is also an area that we have to be careful around because this can open the door to organizations that don't have the capacity or cultural presence to try and do the work. There has been a willingness to accept where organizations may be best suited to serve in the pipeline.

Recommendation #4:
- o *Laddered common goals and objects for client development would be useful. That would allow for providers to more efficiently communicate about clients when they migrate and/or matriculate to different agencies. The key challenge will be to create an agreed upon common ladder.*
- o *Ensure San Francisco's Workforce Development System streamlines and dedicates increased resources—specific to eliminating the most strenuous and deep seeded employment obstacles—to reduce employment barriers through job readiness, vocational skills, and permanent job placements.*
- o *The WCAC presentation demonstrated a lots of money going toward funding with little outcomes (placements). We need to ensure training is in alignment with the needs of employers and support sector demand. As well, there should be alignment with real opportunities.*
- o *Workforce funded efforts need joint planning and alignment among departments again driven by demand.*
- o *Transitional employment opportunities i.e., OJT should be bolstered to encourage more employer participation and assist LBEs.*
- o *Community Benefits should be pooled to that sectors can be better supported and benefit folks citywide.*
- o *MTA needs support and nudging to get their workforce dollars out the door. Agencies have been waiting over two years for contracts. Departments such as this that does little procurement or contracting with CBOs should be encouraged to allow another savvier department to oversee process.*