

## WHITE PAPER

### Proposed WIB III System Changes

#### “Creating A Preferred Future”

February 6, 2005

By Robert W. Glenn, Jr.  
Chair  
WIB III Board of Directors

#### Preface

First of all, let’s start at the very beginning: what’s a WIB or WDB anyway?<sup>1</sup>

Unfortunately, too few people can answer this question (but that is about to change).

WIB is the acronym for Workforce Investment Board and WDB is the acronym for Workforce Development Board (the terms are often used interchangeably; but there is only one Board), as required by the Workforce Investment Act (WIA)<sup>2</sup> passed by Congress in 1998, which revamped the old PIC and JTPA training programs (which most people seem to be able to recall). Under the new WIA, the majority of the members of a regional WIB must be from the *private sector* (the “Demand Side” – where jobs are created and provided) and the other members represent various *support organizations*

---

<sup>1</sup> From the WIB III web site: <http://www.westernvaworkforce.com/about.cfm>

“The WDB serves as a point of contact for business, industry and the public sector to communicate their workforce needs, promote strategies to encourage lifelong learning and improve workplace skills. The WDB assists in the development of new training programs to benefit the area’s workforce, conduct planning, oversight and evaluation of local workforce development programs including the Workforce Centers. It coordinates efforts and activities with economic development to promote the area’s availability of qualified workers and promote cooperation among the business and the public sector.”

<sup>2</sup> From the Department of Labor: <http://www.doleta.gov/usworkforce/wia/runningtext2.htm>

“The **Workforce Investment Act of 1998** provides the framework for a unique national workforce preparation and employment system designed to meet both the needs of the nation’s businesses *and* the needs of job seekers and those who want to further their careers... The Act builds on the most successful elements of previous Federal legislation. Just as important, its key components are based on local and State input and extensive research and evaluation studies of successful training and employment innovations over the past decade. The new law makes changes to the current funding streams, target populations, system of delivery, accountability, long-term planning, labor market information system, and governance structure.”

(the “Supply Side” – where services are rendered to prepare people for jobs). Members of the WIB board are appointed by the CLEO (Chief Local Elected Officials) for the geographic area covered by the WIB, as designated by the Governor.<sup>3</sup>

The organizational structure at the State level is as follows: The Governor is the chief official responsible for the WIA dollars received from the Department of Labor (DOL) and the Governor chairs the Virginia Workforce Council. The responsibility for the programming is delegated to the Secretary of Commerce and Trade, who has designated the statewide program to be overseen by the Commissioner of the Virginia Employment Commission (VEC). The Governor has established a new position – Special Advisor to the Governor for Workforce Development – a cabinet-level position reporting directly to the Governor. The VEC passes through allocated WIA funds to each of the 17 WIBs in the state, based primarily on the regional unemployment rates.

The WIBs are responsible for allocating WIA training funds<sup>4</sup> in each of three mandated categories: Dislocated Workers, Adults, and Youth. However, funding priority is *still* driven by income level and the performance criterion *still* pertains largely to the economically disadvantaged. This has become perhaps the biggest challenge for the WIBs under the new WIA legislation, which was supposed to move the programming more toward training for jobs in demand by local business and ongoing training for existing workers. Most WIBs have been unable to make the shift from the old social services approach to the new private sector and economic development approach.<sup>5</sup>

WIB III has an opportunity to be an exception by changing the paradigm.

This White Paper will outline a Vision for a different future in WIB III.

Additional information about workforce development is provided on the WIB III web site, [www.westernvaworkforce.com](http://www.westernvaworkforce.com).

And information can be found on the State’s Workforce Council, including within the VEC web site,

<http://www.dba.state.va.us/frameset.asp?URL=http%3A%2F%2Fwww%2Evec%2Estate%2Eva%2Eus%2Fvecportal%2Fvwc%2Findex%2Ecfm>

(Please cut and paste the above web link if you need to)

---

<sup>3</sup> Gov. Gilmore designated the WIB III region when WIA was enacted in Virginia in 2000. WIB III covers eight jurisdictions: Roanoke City (the lead jurisdiction and fiscal agent), Roanoke County, Salem, Botetourt, Craig, Franklin, Alleghany, and Covington.

<sup>4</sup> To place the financial responsibility in context, the budget for WIB III is \$1.1 million for Program Year 2004, which runs July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005.

<sup>5</sup> The lack of success in shifting the focus of the WIB is more likely due to lack of community-wide collaboration, but is more likely to be blamed on lack of funds.

## Introduction

The purpose of this “white paper”<sup>6</sup> is to present a comprehensive list of reorganization and restructuring recommendations for the purpose of inviting dialogue, discussion, and debate – all leading to *action*: the adoption of a final white paper by the Board of WIB III that will alleviate board member *frustration*<sup>7</sup> and guide major systems change.

Through ongoing dialogue with Secretary of Commerce and Trade, Mike Schewel; VEC Commissioner, Dee Esser; Virginia Community College Chancellor, Glenn DuBois; and Special Advisor to the Governor on Workforce Development, Barbara Bolin, it has become apparent that WIB III has creative ideas and unusually strong regional relationships with the VEC and the Community Colleges (both of whom, importantly, are state agencies). WIB III is ideally positioned to model a new WIB structure to benefit its region and, at the same time, serve as a replicable pilot for the State.

The resignation of the WIB III executive director in December 2004, together with the strong support for major systems change by Secretary Schewel and others from Richmond, have provided the catalyst for undertaking this ambitious project. State officials have recently referred to WIB III as “policy innovators” and have already awarded two special grants: the Demand Study Pilot (in 2003) and the Marketing Pilot (in 2004). The extraordinary support from Richmond is ideal for promoting creative thinking towards a restructuring in WIB III.

This White Paper could, mistakenly, be read from either of two extremes: (1) assuming that the suggested recommendations are just too difficult or not possible to achieve; or (2) assuming that the suggested recommendations will somehow just take care of themselves. The truth is somewhere in between. We should challenge the regulations to develop the WIB structure *we* want. It is hoped that this paper will stimulate *positive* attitudes towards system change and renewed *dedication* within WIB III to make change happen.

---

<sup>6</sup> A “white paper” is defined as “an authoritative paper issued by any organization.” In this case, it is very much in DRAFT form and is intended to stimulate dialogue and deliberations leading to consensus that results in a Board-approved, official, White Paper that provides an overall outline for *improving* WIB III. This White Paper was requested – to jot down potentially viable ideas – by a number of individuals, including individual CLEOs, CLAOs, board members, and executive committee members. PLEASE NOTE: Richmond has not requested, or even suggested, the reorganization of WIB III; this is entirely a local initiative. ALSO NOTE: It was pointed out in a WIB III committee meeting that these changes are, actually, just to get us in true compliance with the actual *intent* of the WIA legislation. Interesting point!

<sup>7</sup> Frustration Transformed: “In its raw form, frustration can be painful, negative and even destructive. However, frustration also has a positive side. There is an enormous amount of energy in frustration. There is the potential for powerful and meaningful motivation in your frustration. The key to successfully dealing with frustration is not to avoid it or to fight it or to let it overwhelm you. The best thing to do with frustration is to turn it into positive motivation. The more intensely you feel frustration, the more motivated you can be to make positive changes to the situation. When you feel frustrated, stop for a moment and calmly consider your circumstances. Instead of thinking of a thousand different ways to complain or to feel sorry for yourself, think of one way in which you can take a step forward. Then do it, and suddenly the frustration is transformed into something beneficial. Frustration is powerful, but it doesn't have to get you down. Aim that power in a positive direction and it can take you far.” Copyright 2005 Ralph S. Marston, Jr.

WIB III stakeholders are invited and encouraged to support, amend, or make alternative suggestions to this White Paper and to engage fully in a *process* of open dialogue that will ultimately lead to the adoption of a *systems change strategy* prior to the conclusion of the current program year, June 30, 2005.<sup>8</sup> The process of change actually began with Board discussions in the Fall of 2004, and has been an agenda item on virtually every WIB committee and board meeting since, together with numerous emails, conference calls, and one-on-one discussions. The process has been very open to date, with the Chair inviting input from any interested individual, and will continue to be an open process until the Board reaches what it believes is the best conclusion.

On behalf of the Board of Directors of WIB III, we are very grateful to our colleagues in Richmond for the opportunity to “think outside the box.” It is recognized that certain recommendations may require waivers from Richmond and/or Washington, but neither will be allowed to inhibit the board in its systems change deliberations. However, care has been taken to provide recommendations that are thought to be implementable within the purview of the WIB III board. This White Paper may ultimately require assistance from the regulatory experts to determine how to make the recommendations happen, rather than to explain why they cannot.<sup>9</sup>

### Background

The Greater Roanoke Valley Regional WIB, officially known as the “Western Virginia Workforce Development Board,” or WIB Region III, did not enjoy a clean break from the former federal workforce training program as was intended by Congress under WIA. Carryovers included the former Private Industry Council (PIC) *board structure*, the same *service providers* (the Fifth District Employment & Training Consortium), and a *CLEO structure* that was not in keeping with the language or intent of the WIA legislation.<sup>10</sup>

In keeping with many other WIBs, WIB III has experienced ongoing turnover among its private sector board members.<sup>11</sup> Discussions with resigning private sector board members

---

<sup>8</sup> The Chair reluctantly succumbed to the urging of a number of individuals to produce this white paper. Importantly, it should be reiterated that all recommendations are open to debate. The Chair agreed to undertake this assignment in order to provide a comprehensive set of recommendations that would lead to a consensus for change by the WIB III board. The Chair has received considerable input from various individuals and the recommendations presented are truly an amalgamation of a broad spectrum of ideas. The Chair will not serve beyond 6/30/05 and will become the Immediate Past Chair on 7/1/05.

<sup>9</sup> Simply put, the WIB III Board expects a “can do” attitude from both the state and federal officials.

<sup>10</sup> None of these issues were the fault of anyone presently involved in the WIB organization, but are mentioned here for the purposes of context. In fact, a number of the former individuals have resigned, and the Fifth District Employment & Training Consortium has been disbanded.

<sup>11</sup> WIA regulations require a majority of the WIB Board be comprised of private sector members, thereby making the ongoing turnover of private sector appointees an issue of valid concern. The CLEO is responsible for appointing members to the WIB Board. All known organizational problems have been remedied.

indicate an overall frustration with the bureaucracy of the WIB, a lack of meaningful, substantive, and appropriate board roles and meeting agendas, and an unwillingness to continue to participate in a program for which they can see no meaningful results. In short, private sector board members have, in reality, clearly expressed their displeasure with the ongoing bureaucratic nonsense by “*voting with their feet*” – i.e. resigning and walking away from what they perceive as a waste of their time. This is a shame.

Unfortunately, these frustrations are present at other WIBs and even within the Governor’s Workforce Council at the State level.

WIB III began its “new” life under WIA in 2000, with the hiring of a contract employee to replace the former PIC executive director and, then, upon the resignation of that contract employee, the hiring of a new executive director who served as an employee of the WIB under an employment contract. Upon the resignation of that executive director in December 2004, WIB III initiated an offer for merger discussions with WIB II (New River Valley, et al). The CLEO of WIB II unanimously rejected the offer for these discussions.

As a result of the quashed merger discussions, WIB III requested and obtained permission from Richmond officials “to continue to think out of the box” and model a new WIB structure that would be based on an “executive director-less”<sup>12</sup> organization and would rely on more trusting *relationships*<sup>13</sup> with obvious key community players, including: (1) the only regional economic development organization, (2) the regional office of the VEC, (3) the community colleges operating within the greater region,<sup>14</sup> (4) and other community-based organizations (CBOs) involved in workforce development.

The intent of the proposed changes to the WIB III structure is to greatly enhance its opportunity to meet program goals, while simultaneously reducing as much of the administrative burden as possible. Importantly, the proposed changes seek to formalize obvious *relationships* with key workforce-related organizations -- including a direct tie to local economic development, elected, and administrative officials -- and to greatly expand the awareness and involvement of the greater community in WIB activities.

In addition, as will be further explained in a later section, the new structure would greatly broaden the involvement of individuals and key organizations within the community,

---

<sup>12</sup> This term, “executive director-less” does not intend to leave the reader with the notion that the WIB would abdicate its administrative responsibilities; rather, it is used to make a dramatic point about the importance of true major systems change.

<sup>13</sup> It is tempting to use the word Partnerships instead of Relationships; however, as we are learning, meaningful partnerships cannot be established without trust and respect, therefore the use of the word Relationships seems particularly important. A number of so-called Partnerships have failed.

<sup>14</sup> In addition, relationships with previously untapped resources were identified as an important step in the revamping of the WIB III organization during a December 2004 workshop conducted in Roanoke by the Governor’s Special Advisor for Workforce Development, Dr. Barbara Bolin.

constituting a multi-faceted Advisory Committee approach that would enable critically important issues to be more appropriately and completely addressed outside of board meetings.

For example, the One Stops are currently guided by the One Stop Operators Consortium, which could become capable of taking on the responsibility and accountability of actually guiding the day-to-day affairs of the three One Stops in WIB III. It is also recommended that the focus of the Consortium operations be expanded to include more feedback from customers and a higher emphasis on providing exceptional customer service.

Also, it is imperative to resolve potential conflict of interest issues among program providers (contractors) serving on the WIB board.

Given this overall, intentionally brief preface, introduction, and background, the remainder of this white paper outlines *specific recommendations* for changing the operation of WIB III.

It should be noted that WIB III is neither trying to influence the other 16 WIBs or the Richmond officials, but merely trying to reorganize in such a manner that makes sense within WIB III for the betterment of the various constituencies it is supposed to serve.

## Recommendations

### 1. Change the official name of WIB III.

The current name – Western Virginia Workforce Development Board, Inc.<sup>15</sup> – represents a misnomer: *what constitutes Western Virginia?* This issue came fully to light when merger discussions were initiated with the so-called “New River Valley” WIB (WIB II<sup>16</sup>), which actually covered an area much larger than New River. Conversely, the Roanoke-based WIB does *not* cover the entire Western Virginia geography, by any definition, and should be better quantified. The inclusion of Franklin County (to the South) and Alleghany and Covington (to the North) into the Roanoke Valley Economic Development Partnership (the Partnership) has established the precedent for what is now *comfortably recognized* as the Roanoke Valley or, perhaps, more specifically, The Greater Roanoke Valley. It is recommended that WIB III be renamed The Greater Roanoke Valley Workforce Development Board, Inc.

---

<sup>15</sup> Many readers may not know that WIB III has been separately incorporated as a legal entity.

<sup>16</sup> The official name of WIB II is actually “New River/Mount Rogers Workforce Investment Board”

2. Codify recent operational improvements by amending the WIB bylaws.

Over the past couple of years, WIB III has made improvements to its current operating structure that are not yet codified in its bylaws.<sup>17</sup> These include the establishment of the position of Immediate Past Chair as a member of the executive committee, the use of email as allowed under WIA regs, and the eventual need for numerous changes that would become necessary upon the adoption of whatever combination of recommendations result from this White Paper.

3. Establish formal, working committees of the Board.

As the WIB seeks to expand its outreach and effectiveness within the community, *working committees* of the Board need to be established and made fully operational. This is a critical strategic change: the WIB needs to include more, rather than fewer, stakeholders and participants. The best way to involve more people in the work of the WIB is to establish Advisory Committees populated by interested, experienced, and knowledgeable individuals and to charge those committees with specific outcomes (yet to be determined). Each Advisory Committee would contain a member of the Board, who would serve as its Chair. (See Item 4 and the Attachment) Once the work of the WIB becomes vested in its committees, the Board can adopt its appropriate role as a *policy body*, getting out of the day-to-day operations of the WIB by relying on the expertise of qualified, dedicated, knowledgeable, and unbiased committee members.

A comprehensive group of Advisory Committees<sup>18</sup> is recommended, as follows:

- a. One Stop Operators Consortium – existing
- b. Youth Council – existing
- c. Finance – existing
- d. Nominating – existing
- e. K-12/Vocational Education Advisory Council – to be formed<sup>19</sup>
- f. Compliance Committee – to be formed<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> The current Bylaws were last revised and approved by the Board on February 27, 2004.

<sup>18</sup> PLEASE NOTE: It is extremely important to point out that the shift from a large board to a smaller board, with an expanded set of working committees, can only be successful if the committees are populated with experienced service users, case managers, etc. who buy into the mission of the committee.

<sup>19</sup> The K-12/Vocational Ed Advisory Council would be composed of the superintendents, and others, of every school system in the WIB III region to focus on partnering with the WIB in the areas of improved graduation rates, job readiness skills, and other key issues.

<sup>20</sup> Compliance is a key issue for the WIB Board and needs to be initially overseen by an appropriate board committee (similar to a for-profit Audit Committee). The committee could be comprised of a mix of internal audit staff and finance staff of each governmental jurisdiction, together with other individuals familiar with and interested in rules, regulations, RFPs, audits, and other compliance issues. This is a critically important committee.

- g. WFD Resources Committee – to be formed<sup>21</sup>
- h. Social Services Consortium – to be formed<sup>22</sup>
- i. Community College Consortium – to be formed<sup>23</sup>
- j. Long Range Planning – existing

4. Reduce the size of the current WIB Board.

State legislation in 2003 reduced the size of the statewide Governor’s Workforce Council. This initiative has yet to filter down to the local WIB level, but now is an appropriate time to create a smaller WIB III board. Initial reviews indicate that the Board could, indeed, be reduced in size while remaining in compliance with the Federal WIA regs, particularly with the implementation of Item 3, above, which provides Working Committees to expand the non-board involvement of the community in WIB governance. Each committee would have its representative serving on the Board. Individuals with special interests or long-standing programming needs or desires would, hopefully, select their choice of Advisory Committees of the board. Initial analysis indicates the Board can be reduced to 15 members. (See Attachment)

At the present time, the Board has several vacancies and a number of non-participating members. (The Bylaws contain attendance provisions, but these have not been enforced.) In addition, virtually every active board member, via informal discussions, has requested a change in the meeting agenda to make the board meetings more meaningful. Accordingly, it is felt that there is no doubt that changes to the Board structure must be made.

*It is recommended, and strongly encouraged, that every current board member be offered their choice of a position on one of the key Advisory Committees in keeping with their specific interests and areas of expertise (see Section 3 above).*

---

<sup>21</sup> An annual Matrix exercise needs to be conducted to identify *all* known workforce programs and sources of workforce training funds; for example, “Welfare to Work” funds under the DSS-administered TANF program, HUD funds available to residents of assisted housing, and WFD funds at the community colleges. It is time for a complete review of the training providers in WIB III, which would hopefully be welcomed instead of resisted, to determine how to improve efficiencies and increase outcomes.

<sup>22</sup> It is important to recognize that although WIA is intended to shift the focus of workforce training from “social services” to “economic development” that, in fact, service to the economically disadvantaged remains a huge requirement of the WIB. Accordingly, it is recommended that the various Departments of Social Services, and other community service agencies, constitute a Social Services Consortium of the WIB. It is also recommended that the Director of Roanoke City Department of Social Services, Jane Conlin, serve as a member of the WIB Board and Chair of this Consortium. Ms. Conlin has been serving as Chair of the CLEO and is extremely knowledgeable and well qualified to help bring others orgs into the WIB dialogue.

<sup>23</sup> It is suggested that the presidents of the three community colleges serving the WIB III region comprise the leadership of the Community College Consortium, together with other community college employees directly involved in workforce development activities.

It is possible that a number of current board members would find committee involvement more in keeping with their individual interests and preferable to board meetings. Should this prove to be true, it is hoped that currently inactive board members might re-engage and, even, former board members might return to committee service.

It is critical to the success of the WIB to maintain the enthusiasm, experience, and camaraderie currently enjoyed by the existing board members.

5. Establish formal partnerships with the 3 obvious community organizations:

a. The Roanoke Regional Economic Development Partnership<sup>24</sup>

Officials in virtually every discipline have come to recognize that *economic development* and *workforce training* must be inextricably linked. It is recommended that WIB III enter into a simple memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Roanoke Regional Economic Development Partnership (the Partnership).<sup>25</sup> Specifically, the Economic Developers Committee (comprised of all the economic developers in the region) could be re-invigorated and would then invite a member of WIB III to attend their meetings, together with the Business Roundtable Meetings, to better integrate workforce training with economic development. This interaction would serve as a feedback mechanism between regional economic development prospect contacts and the identification of demand-based job skill sets.<sup>26</sup> In addition, staff members of both organizations, along with private sector participants, would begin to dialogue more regularly, which is the intent of the WIA legislation.

The Executive Committee of the Partnership meets bi-monthly and its composition includes the Chief Local Administrative Officials (CLAOs) of all 8 jurisdictions within WIB III. WIB III has not been successful in getting Chief Local Elected Officials (CLEOs) to actually populate its CLEO Board, as intended under the federal legislation. Since CLEOs can delegate their representatives, it is recommended that the WIB III Chief Local Elected Officials Board (CLEO Board) be comprised of the WIB III CLAOs and that

---

<sup>24</sup> Recent membership by Alleghany County and the City of Covington have resulted in the precise alignment of the WIB III geographic region and the Partnership's economic development region. This is a relatively unusual occurrence in this Region and should be used to full advantage.

<sup>25</sup> Connecting Workforce Training and Economic Development is a critical need expressed by state officials. The Roanoke Region could produce an excellent and replicable model by enacting an MOU between these two regional organizations, thereby putting it on the "radar screen" for both boards.

<sup>26</sup> In its January 19, 2005 Executive Committee meeting, members requested Partnership staff to initiate regular briefings on the needs and concerns expressed by prospects relative to workforce training. This is seen as a major step toward connecting the functions of economic development and workforce training.

the CLEO Board meetings be held in the offices of the Partnership immediately following the Executive Committee meetings of the Partnership. This would accomplish two critical functions: (1) to change the current structure of the CLEO away from the old social services mindset by connecting it directly to economic development; and (2) to enable improved functionality and efficiency by scheduling back-to-back meetings of the CLAOs, who have asked for recommendations for combined meeting opportunities, so as to minimize duplication and to improve overall efficiency with their busy meeting schedules.<sup>27</sup>

There would be no WIB-related staffing requirements, or any WIB-related administrative issues for the Partnership, by very careful design – it is clearly understood that the Partnership must retain its economic development marketing focus. The WIB Coordinator (and, likely the WIB Chair – who is currently a member of the Partnership Executive Committee) would attend the CLEO meetings and provide WIB briefings. However, the Partnership executive director, together with its front-line staff, would be welcomed to attend, if possible, permissible, and practical.

It is further recommended that the WIB coordinate with the CLEO Board to utilize two additional meetings to provide annual or semi-annual briefings on workforce development initiatives within WIB III: the *Mayors and Chairs Meeting* (CLEOs only), along with the *Regional Leadership Summit* (which includes all CLEOs and CLAOs). These recommendations represent an efficient and effective use of valuable time by CLEOs and CLAOs, while working diligently to keep the CLEOs and CLAOs informed on key WIA issues, as intended by Congress. This is not currently being done.

b. The Virginia Employment Commission<sup>28</sup>

It is recommended that WIB III formally recognize the VEC as a *unique and integral partner* through a simple memorandum of understanding (MOU) for three reasons: (1) Federal WIA funds flow first to the VEC at the State level and are then distributed, regionally, among the 17 WIBs; (2) the VEC is the *sole provider* of government-based Unemployment Benefits and Job Placement Services (core VEC services); and (3) the VEC is the responsible state agency for guidance, compliance, and oversight of the 17 WIB programs. It is further recommended that the Dislocated Worker Services be fully integrated with the VEC Unemployment Services in the WIB III region.

---

<sup>27</sup> It is acknowledged that it is perhaps better to have the CLEOs designate the CLAOs to constitute the CLEO Board, but not to permit delegation of responsibility below the level of CLAO.

<sup>28</sup> WIB III enjoys a particularly good relationship with its regional VEC.

The implementation of this recommendation would remove certain unnecessary administrative duties of the WIB<sup>29</sup> and clarify roles.

The WIB Board, with input from the regional VEC office, would negotiate the funding necessary to administer the Dislocated Worker program, which would be covered under the MOU, and would eliminate the need for RFPs and redundant accounting and funding exchanges back and forth from the WIB to the VEC.<sup>30</sup> Since the VEC is a state agency, no procurement (RFP) would be required. Special care needs to be taken *not* to lose any administrative funds; i.e. WIB III funding allocations should not be penalized for increased efficiency.

In addition, to date, the VEC is the only WIB contractor that has consistently exceeded the performance requirements of the WIA program – which bodes well as a conscientious State agency and the State’s provider of similar programs – and further supports the suggestion that the VEC is the appropriate provider of Dislocated Worker services.<sup>31</sup>

There is broad agreement that the *initial* “product delivery system” of the WIA/WIB programming absolutely resides within the One Stops.<sup>32</sup> It is recommended that every effort be taken to expand, improve, refine, and market the services provided at the One Stop locations. It is further recommended that the One Stops conduct ongoing “customer service surveys” to ensure that they are providing extraordinary customer service, which must be the foundation of any successful One Stop. It is also recommended that the One Stop Consortium expand its membership to include case managers from referring community organizations in order to further improve the *relationships* and communications across organizational community agency boundaries.

---

<sup>29</sup> Currently, Federal dollars flow to the State, then to the VEC, then to the 17 WIBs as regional entities, then RFPs for Dislocated Worker Training Programs are prepared, the VEC is the sole respondent to the RFP, the contract is awarded to the VEC -- and then the contracting, reporting, and auditing process beings an ongoing administrative back-and-forth between the WIB, the regional VEC (as contractor), and the state VEC (as monitor and fiscal agent). This is simply nonsensical.

<sup>30</sup> As case in point, since Dislocated Worker funds can be re-allocated to Adult programs, WIB III was notified (proactively) by the VEC that excess funds were projected in the Dislocated Worker program (due to the lower unemployment rate and reduced layoffs by regional employers) and the VEC returned those funds to the WIB for re-allocation to Adult programs. This is an extraordinary example of true partnership.

<sup>31</sup> It is recognized, as mentioned, that WIB III enjoys a very favorable *relationship* with its VEC that does not exist in many other WIBs across the State. However, as this WIB III restructuring model may be replicated, these recommendations may actually provide a concrete opportunity to strengthen WIB/VEC compatibility in other regions of the State.

<sup>32</sup> WIB III currently has 3 One Stop Centers: Roanoke, Alleghany, and Franklin (all certified).

Unfortunately, but realistically, the One Stop function is much more easily described from a philosophical/idealist standpoint, yet much more challenging to implement from a practical standpoint.<sup>33</sup> The name is truly a *misnomer*: how many services are required before a One Stop can really be considered to be a One Stop? And, how does WIB III reconcile the fact that each of its three One Stops offers a very different “blend” of services? It is time for WIB III to really focus on its One Stops.

It is recommended that the Roanoke VEC manager, presently a member of the WIB Board and Executive Committee, continue to serve as Chair of the One Stop Operators Consortium. It is further recommended that this leadership role be codified in keeping with Section 3 above.

Following this rationale, the existing One Stop Operators Consortium<sup>34</sup> would become an even larger “player” in the new WIB organizational structure. This is one of those opportunities to increase involvement from the broader community by continuing and expanding the membership of the Consortium with non-board members, while increasing its scope of duties to include administration, outcome performance, regulatory issues, and certification.

When asked the question whether the One Stop should be located within the VEC offices, the *unanimous* opinion of the One Stop Operators Consortium was that the One Stop should establish its own identity *separate* from the VEC. Given the unanimity on this controversial issue, it is recommended that the WIB III Board follow the advice of the Consortium and begin the necessary planning to enable the establishment of a One Stop away from the VEC,<sup>35</sup> yet integrally connected to the VEC and training providers.

Finally, it is recommended that the VEC investigate relocating from its current leased location at Valley View Mall to the soon-to-be-vacated building currently occupied by the Social Security Administration (known by many as the Stone Printing Building), adjacent to the Roanoke Higher Ed Center. This is a *key strategic issue*: the relocation would enable closer ties with training providers, the potential configuration of a separate, yet contiguous, One Stop (within easy proximity of the VEC and the HEC), while dramatically

---

<sup>33</sup> There are at least two separate schools of thought on the One Stop locations: (1) that the One Stops be located in the same facility as the VEC; and (2) that the One Stops be located anywhere other than the VEC. The “location” question is entirely separate from the “programming” question within the One Stop.

<sup>34</sup> The author met with the One Stop Operators Consortium at its January 28, 2004 meeting to solicit input into the role of the Consortium in the proposed WIB III reorganization. All suggestions from that meeting have been incorporated into this white paper.

<sup>35</sup> This is an excellent example of the “advisory board” function of the Consortium, as described in Section 3 above, whereby the individuals involved in the actual programming – and serving at the committee level – are better equipped to provide and implement recommendations than is the WIB Board.

increasing the “seamless” service to its clients. In actuality, this relocation would create a concentrated, contiguous “campus” environment for all WIB-based services.<sup>36</sup>

It is critically important to mention the issue of *adequate parking*. Any such VEC move would have to be predicated on the availability of adequate and free parking for VEC clients. The Roanoke HEC complex, including the surface parking and the parking garage, contains adequate parking for daytime use. A favorable parking solution could catalyze the WIB/VEC opportunity. All client obstacles must be identified and removed.

c. The Community Colleges

There is widespread agreement that the *subsequent* “product delivery system” of the WIA/WIB programming resides within the State’s system of community colleges.<sup>37</sup> WIB III is fortunate to have, actually, three community colleges actively serving its geographic region, although only two are formally recognized in the WIB organization: Virginia Western Community College (VWCC) and Dabney Lancaster Community College (DLCC). The third community college, serving Franklin County in the southern-most part of the WIB III region, is Patrick Henry Community College (PHCC). It is recommended that PHCC be formally recognized as a community college servicing the WIB III area in the Franklin County One Stop facility.

It is believed that workforce training can be enhanced by the community colleges becoming more completely integrated into the WIB III operations than they are at present. Several suggestions follow.

It is noteworthy that, at long last, the economic development region and the workforce training region are identical.<sup>38</sup> The case for direct connectivity between WIB III and the Partnership was expressed in Item 5(a) above. The Partnership’s executive director was recently quoted in a newspaper article acknowledging the importance of a providing and demonstrating a direct link

---

<sup>36</sup> This may be the most powerful recommendation in the entire White Paper. This recommendation has not been discussed with any State officials at this point, or any local officials. It is recognized, however, that the VEC has some uncertainty with their current lease and that the Social Security Administration had concerns with lack of parking. This opportunity is clearly strategic and deserving of further collaboration.

<sup>37</sup> Studies indicate the more successful economic development programs in competing states contain an even stronger link between Workforce Development and Community Colleges than Virginia currently utilizes. The recommendations in this White Paper elevate the interconnectivity between WIB III and the community colleges within its service area. However, private sector and non-profit training providers are also key stakeholders in this regional workforce training process.

<sup>38</sup> This occurred with the recent joining by Alleghany County and the City of Covington in the Roanoke Regional Economic Development Partnership.

between economic development and workforce training. Direct connectivity is the right thing to do. And, the timing is right to do it.

To that end, it is important to be able to show a visiting economic development prospect an actual *facility* – with integrated programming and service providers – that will meet their workforce training needs. Fortunately, the Greater Roanoke Valley Region already has such a facility: the Roanoke Higher Education Center (HEC). And, both VWCC and the WIB have offices in the HEC,<sup>39</sup> importantly, the VWCC Workforce Training Division is headquartered at the HEC on the main floor in its most prominent space.

Why is all this important?

Because an extraordinary solution is obvious and should be acted upon.

It is recommend that the existing WIB office on the 8<sup>th</sup> floor of the HEC be consolidated within the VWCC Workforce Development Space on the main floor of the HEC.<sup>40</sup> When viewed from the standpoint of an economic development visitor – very different from the standpoint of a dislocated or unemployed worker – the *facility* itself speaks volumes about the *commitment* of the region to workforce training; simply put, it is *impressive*. The jurisdictions in WIB III and the Partnership are working so well together, and the HEC provides such a tremendous facility “presence” for outsiders visiting the region, that the expanded use of this asset should be seen as a natural. It is expected that VWCC would represent the interests of its two sister community colleges, DLCC and PHCC, in the Roanoke-based HEC facility.

This combined VWCC/WIB presence in the HEC would provide a “hub” facility that would serve as a focal point for the Greater Region. Importantly, it would not serve as a single destination but, rather, as the headquarters for *the coordination and collaboration of regional workforce services*,<sup>41</sup> which would then emanate out to PHCC to the South<sup>42</sup> and DLCC to the North.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Purely ironically, the two are currently as far apart as physically possible: Top Floor and Main Floor!

<sup>40</sup> In the best of all worlds, Roanoke would have ONE facility that combines the WIB, the Partnership, the HEC, the VEC, Social Services, and Community College training space all under one roof or within a campus-style environment. This option does not exist; hence, the “hub and spoke” and “interconnectivity” recommendations are the only *practical* solutions.

<sup>41</sup> Comprehensive coordination of regional workforce services is the key mission of the WIB.

<sup>42</sup> Franklin County established a Workforce Development Center (which currently serves as a One Stop and provides space for the VEC, PHCC, VWCC, Adult Education, and others); in addition, the County has acquired a new site and announced plans to build an even larger facility.

<sup>43</sup> DLCC is a key player in WIB III, as is its One Stop; consideration needs to be given as to how and where to replicate something similar to the HEC and the Franklin County WFD Center for the Allegheny area.

## 6. Revise the Staffing of WIB III

A goal of the WIB III “reorganization” was to explore methods for minimizing both the administrative burden and the feeling of frustration shared by many board members that its true potential was not being maximized.<sup>44</sup> These are still valid issues (administrative burden and frustration) and cannot be remedied without making substantive changes, as outlined in this white paper. To that end, several staffing recommendations will be offered for the intentional purpose of dramatically altering the operation of the WIB.

The so-called “executive director-less” organizational structure of the WIB could be accomplished vis-à-vis shared space with VWCC at the HEC, together with revised administrative and internal audit requirements in the program contracts<sup>45</sup> and the establishment of working Advisory Committees of the board (see Item 3 above). Obviously, there are many details to be worked out – ideally within the Advisory Committee structure! – so that this white paper presents an overall *Vision* and not a *prescription*.

Currently, WIB III has a Coordinator<sup>46</sup> instead of an Executive Director. This arrangement is working extremely well, is the only one in the State, and is signaling the intentions of WIB III to conduct its affairs in a very new and different manner. The breadth of “outsourcing” *currently* utilized by WIB III is significant: Fiscal Agency services are provided by the Finance Department of the City of Roanoke; Accounting assistance is provided by a former Finance Department employee on a part-time basis; Program Monitoring is provided by the assistant executive director at WIB II (New River Valley) on a part-time basis; Administrative Assistance is provided through a temp agency on a part-time basis; and additional Office Assistance is provided through a partnership program with the League of Older Americans (LOA) on a part-time basis. WIB III has *already* demonstrated innovation in its staffing.<sup>47</sup>

It is recommended that an MOU be signed with VWCC to combine the WIB office function within a *showcased* “Workforce Development Center” in the HEC and that the profile of the Center be heightened, so as to both provide the Partnership with an economic development prospect destination and to assist Existing Employers with training needs. Administrative services would be integrated between the WIB and VWCC, together with shared leases, thereby providing economies of scale from the

---

<sup>44</sup> Interestingly, this may be the single issue upon which all WIB board members would immediately agree!

<sup>45</sup> The WIB contractors have a wealth of knowledge that has not been fully integrated into the operations (RFPs and Contracts) to date, such as ongoing internal audits.

<sup>46</sup> The term Coordinator is truly a better descriptor of the WIB’s mission; the WIB, by intent, should not be the *director* of anything.

<sup>47</sup> It is very possible that some board members are not clear about these existing and ongoing staffing innovations.

clout of a community college, a bonafide state agency. The WIB administrative staff would be integrated into the VWCC WFD staff at the HEC and associated expenses would be reimbursed to VWCC by the WIB. Since VWCC is a state agency, no procurement (RFP) would be required.

#### 7. Utilize the Results of the Community Matrix Exercise

One of the newly formed Advisory Committees, the WFD Resources Committee (See Item 3(g) above), would be responsible for convening community meetings to update the Matrix Exercise annually. It is recommended that the committee be responsible for two key issues: (1) determining *all* of the current and interested non-government training providers in the WIB III region; and (2) determining *all* of the current sources of “workforce training funds” throughout the entire WIB III region.

Examples of non-governmental *training providers* include TAP, Goodwill, National College of Technology and Business, ECPI, the Jefferson College of Health Sciences, etc. The WIB is responsible for identifying – and certifying – and collaborating – and coordinating with *all* training providers. It has not done so.

Examples of non-WIA *training funds* include the Department of Social Services (DSS) with its Welfare to Work training program, the Redevelopment and Housing Authority with its Self-Sufficiency program, the Public Schools with their technical and vocational programs, TAP grants for their This Valley Works programs, and the community colleges with their workforce training programs. Such unconventional dialogue is very much needed. The WIB is responsible for encouraging greater efficiencies with *all* available workforce funding sources. It has not done so.

Examples of current unacceptable gaps in partnerships/relationships include the integration of the Secondary School programs, such as the Roanoke City School Blue Ridge Technical Academy and the Roanoke County School Career, Technical, and Adult Education, as well as similar programs in all 8 represented jurisdictions. These programs must become fully interconnected into the operations of WIB III. The current disconnect between the public school programming and the WIB III mission is an issue that must be immediately addressed. (See Item 3 (e) above for an appropriate Advisory Committee that can address this problem.)

With ever-increasing needs in skilled training (from nursing to welding to carpentry), the WIB should be committed to promoting the necessary *culture shift* that would enable young persons to feel good about themselves by following their interests and abilities into technical and trades career tracks instead of traditional college educations. This represents a critical community issue for which the WIB should become involved, committed, and able to demonstrate measurable outcomes.

It will be the mission of the WFD Resources Committee to guide the collaborative process of maximizing efficiency and effectiveness by minimizing or eliminating duplication, gaps in service, and poor performance. In true “reverse logic” measure,

the WIB finds itself scrambling every year to develop RFPs for services, but not really clear *what* the services need to be – especially with regard to *critical* community needs and potential *innovations* – and this status quo approach should stop. This will be a challenging endeavor, but the WIB is responsible for promoting collaboration and coordination of the delivery of *all* workforce-training services, not just spending the budget it receives from Richmond of WIA funds.

By working with its Matrix results, the WIB will know the *sources* of funds and the *uses* of funds – region-wide – and can then perform its mission to look at workforce training from a true systems standpoint. This will require an unprecedented level of honesty, trust, relationships, partnerships, and willingness to do things differently.

## 8. Conclusion

Hopefully, this White Paper will offer some workable solutions for moving away from the status quo in WIB III and/or providing a *purpose*<sup>48</sup> for continued dialogue that leads to consensus and major systems change. Significant economies of scale are available by capitalizing on the inherent clout and officially partnering with two state agencies: the VEC and the Community Colleges – and the Region’s only economic develop organization, the Partnership.

It is critical for every WIB board member to participate with thoughts and suggestions as this restructuring plan unfolds. Likewise, current contractors and service providers are invited to participate, but it is suggested that each should acknowledge their inherent conflicts of interest and allow the board members to discuss the issues in a productive and non-confrontational manner.<sup>49</sup>

Attached is a proposed Board list (reduced in size to only 15 members) and a proposed Committee list (expanded in size, with unlimited opportunities), *which gives every existing member of the WIB Board a role and a voice in the continuing operation of the workforce mission if they so choose.*

---

<sup>48</sup> Give This Day A Purpose: "Don't be content to let the moments of this day slip silently and uselessly away. Fill them with life and with meaning. Give this day a purpose. And you'll transform it from a day merely to be endured into one that will always be cherished. Give this day a purpose. And its richness, its value will stay with you long after its time has ended. Make something useful and meaningful of the moments. Live them in the service of a real and consequential purpose. This day is here and now, and yours to live. Give to it a purpose, a reason, a true measure of respect for the possibilities that come with it. Live this day by giving it a purpose. And the best of its possibilities will be yours." Copyright 2004 Ralph S. Marston, Jr.

<sup>49</sup> To be fair to all concerned, it is recognized that not all stakeholders can be expected to be supportive of change. Realistically, there are financial, control, political, and turf issues that are very real within any organization. The best WIB III can be expected to deliver is a program of change that meets the needs of the majority of its stakeholders, without allowing the diversion of too much time and attention on those issues that are likely to be fundamentally irreconcilable.

Please take a look, read in detail the recommendations in this White Paper, and be prepared to express your views in an upcoming meeting.

As always, I am extremely interested in your feedback if you have alternative suggestions. Please email your thoughts to [rglenn@issuesmgmtgroup.com](mailto:rglenn@issuesmgmtgroup.com)

Following my February 2, 2005 email request to Board and CLEO members, our February 4, 2005 discussion at the Board meeting, and my request at the Board meeting for feedback and suggestions via email, this White Paper is now ready for release.

This White Paper has been prepared to formulate the basis of our reorganization and improvement of the WIB III operating structure and, somewhat amazingly, has included every suggestion anyone has been willing to share (which must indicate that the ideas are not all that divergent, and/or that the WIB organization is complex enough to accommodate the many good suggestions; I suspect it is some of both, but have been extremely pleased with the commonality of thinking around the *problems* and the *solutions* to date).

Your support of major systems changes for WIB III is requested.

## ATTACHMENT

### Potential Revised WIB III Board of Directors & Advisory Committees

#### I. Board of Directors (effective 7/1/05)

15 members total – 8 private sector (majority) + 7 community-based (with representation from each of the 8 local jurisdictions within WIB III).

How was the number 15 selected? *Simple*: by making sure that all 8 jurisdictions were represented (majority) and then determining the community-based members by areas of need and ensuring they totaled only 7 (8 – 1 = 7) to comply with the WIA regs for private sector majority.<sup>50</sup>

#### Private Sector Members

1. To Be Determined, Chair – private sector<sup>51</sup>
2. Wayne Flippen, Vice Chair, private sector, Roanoke City<sup>52</sup>
3. Bill Jones, Treasurer, private sector, Salem<sup>53</sup>
4. Rob Glenn, Immediate Past Chair, economic development, Franklin<sup>54</sup>
5. Ronald Brown, labor organization, private sector, Covington
6. Tom Richmond, private sector, Botetourt
7. Lutheria Smith, private sector, Roanoke County<sup>55</sup>
8. Debbie Snead, private sector, Craig

#### Community-Based Members

9. John Mulvey, Secretary, CBO, economic development, Alleghany<sup>56</sup>
10. John Baker, Housing & Redevelopment, CBO, Roanoke
11. Bruce Johannessen, VEC, Roanoke<sup>57</sup>
12. Paul Paradzinski, retired, CBO, Craig<sup>58</sup>
13. Bob Sandel, VWCC, education, Roanoke<sup>59</sup>
14. TBA, public schools, education<sup>60</sup>
15. Jane Conlin, CBO, DSS, Roanoke<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> KEY POINT: Previously, the board composition was determined entirely in the reverse – the community-based members were selected and then the private sector membership needed to be +1 of the community-based members. With a large number of community-based members, this drove the requirement for private sector members to an unsustainable number and resulted in a large board.

<sup>51</sup> Chair is private sector, as required by the Bylaws, and is To Be Determined

<sup>52</sup> Vice Chair will serve as Chair of Nominating Committee

<sup>53</sup> Treasurer will serve as Chair of Finance Committee, as required by Bylaws

<sup>54</sup> Immediate Past Chair will serve as Chair of the LRP Committee

<sup>55</sup> An HR professional will serve as Chair of the WFD Resources Committee

<sup>56</sup> Secretary will serve as the Chair of the Compliance Committee

<sup>57</sup> VEC Manager will serve as Chair of the One Stop Operators Consortium

<sup>58</sup> An experienced Youth Leader will serve as Chair of the Youth Council

<sup>59</sup> The President of VWCC will serve as the Chair of the Community College Consortium

<sup>60</sup> A superintendent will serve on the Board and will Chair the K-12/Vocational Ed Advisory Council

<sup>61</sup> The Roanoke City DSS Director will Chair the Social Services Consortium

## II. Advisory Committees

Under the proposed board reduction and Advisory Committee structure, there is *unlimited potential for community participation*; all existing WIB board members (prior to the reduction of the Board) will be invited to select an Advisory Committee of their choice, subject to their willingness to continue to serve. (See Section 3 above) Note that various board members are designated to serve as Chairs of the Advisory Committees; by virtue of the positions they hold, each chair represents their peer group on the WIB Board. And, importantly, it is recommended that the practice of sending designees (proxies) to the board meeting apply only to the Advisory Committees, whereupon the designee would be another Advisory Committee member and, therefore, fully able to represent the interest of that Advisory Committee at the Board meeting.

- a. One Stop Operators Consortium
  1. Bruce Johannessen, Board Member, Chair
  2. Director, Roanoke One Stop
  3. Director, Alleghany One Stop
  4. Director, Franklin One Stop
  5. Board members and community volunteers, as determined
  
- b. Youth Council
  1. Paul Paradzinski, Board Member, Chair
  2. Board members and community volunteers, as determined
  
- c. Finance
  1. Bill Jones, Board Member, Chair
  2. Board members and community volunteers, as determined
  
- d. Nominating
  1. Wayne Flippen, Board Member, Chair
  2. Board members and community volunteers, as determined
  
- e. K-12/Vocational Ed Advisory Council
  1. TBA, Board Member, Chair
  2. Board members and community volunteers, as determined
  
- f. Compliance Committee
  1. John Mulvey, Board Member, Chair
  2. Board members and community volunteers, as determined
  
- g. WFD Resources Committee
  1. Lutheria Smith, Board Member, Chair
  2. Board members and community volunteers, as determined

- h. Social Services Consortium
  - 1. Jane Conlin, Board Member, Chair
  - 2. Board members and community volunteers, as determined
  
- i. Community College Consortium
  - 1. Bob Sandel, Board Member, Chair
  - 2. Dick Teaff, President, DLCC
  - 3. Max Wingett, President, PHCC
  - 4. Board members and community volunteers, as determined
  
- j. Long Range Planning
  - 1. Rob Glenn, Board Member, Chair
  - 2. Board members and community volunteers, as determined