

**Meeting Notes: Workforce Development Workgroup (WDW)  
Workforce, Education and Training (WET)  
6-9-08, 10:30-12:00 PM**

**Attending**

Amy Ellis	Placer County, ASOC, Workforce Development Coordinator
Diane Shively	CSOC, Parent Partner
Cheryl Trenwith	ASOC, Program Manager
Cindy Brundage	CSOC Program Manager
Jennifer Cook	CSOC, Workforce Development Coordinator
Carol Baker	Administrative assistant, Placer County, ASOC

**MINUTES**

**1. Introductions**

**2. WET updates from state; what other counties are doing.**

The meeting agenda lists the plans approved, submitted and those posted. It has links for viewing each of these plans.

The bigger counties have more money and include more programs, reaching high schools, community colleges and SOC staff.

The smaller counties focus on training. El Dorado County was commended for forming partnerships for maximizing use of the WET funds. Placer County is looking for partnerships but has not determined where the funds will go.

CSUS, represented by Sue Taylor, is interested in partnering with the local counties for on-site training in a convenient location.

Nevada County has been on hold due to a LOA for the WET coordinator. The Tahoe region has 1 school district, served by two counties. Collaboration with Nevada County will be beneficial. A few counties have set up two 3-unit courses, on site, provided by the community college. The courses are "Recovery" oriented. The intention is to jumpstart interested persons for obtaining an AA degree. There have been good results.

**3. WET data status**

Amy provided a PowerPoint document with timelines, goals and survey results. She is still gathering data and plans to present recommendations to the Steering Committee on July 25<sup>th</sup>. Surveys were distributed to ASOC, CSOC, MH community providers, focus groups, school/college groups and cultural groups. One finding is that 32% of county employees identify themselves as a consumer or family member of psychiatric services. Placer County has about 20 direct service employees and 5 "other" staff who speak Spanish proficiently.

A discussion took place on how statistics often do not reflect reality. An example is that having 20 staff members speaking Spanish looks good but when compared to 4% of Placer County who speak Spanish, they are serving 12,000.

Also, while it appears that we have a higher percentage of Latino Staff than we have in our client population (matching the client served population well), this can be misleading. It may be that people aren't accessing the services. The general population also needs to be considered. Similar considerations were discussed about the Native American population.

The survey results were compiled by adding write-in comments and focus groups ideas. Tallies were applied where ideas/comments matched others. The final results were sorted by tallies, high-to-low. Not all ideas were presented when the e-mail survey was distributed. Thus, the ranking does not take into account all the rich data/ideas.

The workgroup decided to rank all ideas again and prioritize all data presented. The results of the voting at the meeting will be presented later.

#### **4. Input from Group**

There isn't much money so impact is a significant factor. Some counties are proposing Five Year Plans so money will have more impact. It is thought that ten years is too long to project what will be significant.

The workgroup came up with new priorities after looking at all the qualitative data. Some priorities matched what the e-mail survey addressed, and others prioritized things that were lower on the list of the e-mail survey. In analyzing this many points were considered. Some of the survey choices reflect principles and policy statements versus strategies that may or may not have cost to implement. Some of the choices the panel members feel are already being implemented by the county and therefore did not get a vote. Another group member cautioned to be sure that we do not overlook something that we think is already being implemented, but may still need improvement. There needs to be a look at policies for determining if they are really implemented as stated. Voting may be influenced by thoughts on what is a new idea compared to perceived existing policies. In summary, the group determined we need to consider "high ranked" options *and* those with less "votes" because we may be able to address the lower ranked ideas that have little or no funding needed (e.g. recommend policy changes).

The team will review ALL ideas that came from the qualitative input. We will use the "ranking" of the ideas as information in making recommendations, but will not discount lower ranked ideas. The measure of success will be in five years when clients proclaim that treatment has improved.

It was proposed that The Workforce Coordinator categorize all responses in 3 ways:

- 1) First, what are principles (no funding required) vs. strategies
- 2) Second, what we already fund/do to meet the principle/strategy (and whether it's successful)
- 3) Finally, cost and practicality of strategy

#### **5. Future agenda items**

- Review the categorization of input
- Choose funding options to present to Steering Committee
- Decide purpose (if any) of group after Plan is written

#### **6. Next Meeting**

Monday, June 30th, 10:30-noon, Large Conference Room (ASOC), 11533 C Avenue, Auburn