

COMMITTEE ON CITY WORKFORCE ALIGNMENT:

ENABLE DATA-SHARING FOR BETTER COORDINATION BETWEEN WORKFORCE & OTHER SYSTEMS WORKING GROUP

Draft Minutes of The

January 23, 2025

Office of Economics and Workforce Development

1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103

CCWA Voting Members Present	Chad Houston, OEWD Rose Johns, HSA (remote) Aumijo Gomes, DCYF (remote) Christina Robinson, DHR
--	--

CCWA Staff Present	Jen Hand, Chair Tai Seals-Jackson, Secretary Miriam Palma-Trujillo, OEWD
-------------------------------	--

CCWA Members Absent	Brittini Chicuata, HRC
------------------------------------	------------------------

Ohlone Land Acknowled gement, Announce- ments & Housekeepi ng (Discussion Item)	Chair Hand called the meeting to order at 09:32 a.m. Secretary Tai Seals-Jackson (OEWD) opened the meeting by reciting the Ohlone Land Acknowledgement and reviewing housekeeping rules.
--	--

Roll Call (Discussion Item)	Chair Hand requested that Secretary Seals-Jackson conduct roll call. Secretary Seals-Jackson conducted roll call and announced that a quorum was present.
--	---

Chair's Welcome (Discussion Item)	Chair Hand confirmed quorum and thanked the members and the public for attending today's meeting as well as the previous meeting of the Enabled Data Sharing for Better Coordination Between Workforce and Other Systems working group that took place on October 16, 2024. Members present at the meeting participated both in person and via Zoom.
--	--

She introduced herself as the Workforce Impact Manager at OEWD and noted that lowayna Peña joined OEWD on January 6, 2025 as the new Director of Workforce Development. Chair Hand emphasized that the priority today is to complete the strategic plan for Goal Five in materials distributed to members. She thanked members who sent over corrections and suggestions for goal five.

Chair Hand stated that the primary focus of the meeting was to finalize goals so that updates discussed in the working group meeting would be included in the plan passed before the Committee on City Workforce Alignment (CCWA) at the full board meeting next week. Chair Hand noted that the revised Citywide Workforce Development Plan would be provided to the Board for approval next week.

Chair Hand concluded by acknowledging the leadership team and volunteers.

Adoption of the Agenda

(Action Item)

Chair Hand solicited comments on the agenda from CCWA members. Seeing none, Chair Hand requested a motion to adopt the meeting agenda. Member Robinson made the motion, which was seconded by Member Houston and passed unanimously.

Approval of the Minutes from October 16, 2024 Meeting

(Action Item)

Chair Hand solicited comments on the minutes from October 16, 2024. Seeing none, Chair Hand requested a motion to approve the minutes. Member Gomes made the motion which was seconded by Member Johns. The motion passed unanimously.

Review of Citywide Workforce Development Plan-Goal 5: Enable Data-Sharing for Better Coordination Between Workforce & Other Systems

(Discussion Item)

Chair Hand introduced Miriam Palma-Trujillo, Workforce Impact Specialist, to lead the discussion on Item six on the agenda, which is the review of the updated Citywide Workforce Development Plan (CWDP).

Ms. Palma-Trujillo began by mentioning the legislation that mandates this work, stating that CCWA is a 17-member body made up of 11 City departments, 4 community-based organizations, and 2 labor partners. Ms. Palma-Trujillo provided a timeline of work related to the development of the Citywide Workforce Development Plan (CWDP), which was approved in June. She stated that the CCWA will be submitting the annual update to the plan in March to the Board of Supervisors and the Workforce Investment Board.

Ms. Palma-Trujillo stated that within the plan, there were five goals outlined, which include coordination of partners, plans and priorities; equitably investing in our most vulnerable communities; investing in workforce development across the life course; enhancing apprenticeship and apprenticeship programs, and, with today's group, focus on enabling data sharing for better coordination between workforce and others.

She reiterated the mission statement for the group and mentioned the opportunity to make revisions to the statement in order to better align with the work. Ms. Palma-Trujillo stated that in the last three meetings, the working group worked through an activity of reviewing what was initially provided within CWDP. This information represented an accumulation of member feedback, as well as contributions made in two community engagement stakeholder meetings. Ms. Palma-Trujillo

Ms. Palma-Trujillo shared a visual, which outlined the work occurring within all five working groups, noting overlap for this group in particular. She mentioned that there are three projects that this group would lead, including client use cases, unified metrics and definitions, and a unified data system integration plan. Ms. Palma-Trujillo asked for any comments or feedback on all of the projects discussed.

Chair Hand asked for any insights from the other groups that people might want to share.

Member Johns asked OEWD to share a little bit about what the client matching projects look like for working groups two and three.

Ms. Palma-Trujillo responded that it was decided that this work would be led by working group five because of the associated data component. She stated that she believes this project is already happening with the help of HSA. She noted that this information would be covered in this next slide and also, that OEWD is attempting to secure additional funding for this project. Ms. Palma-Trujillo stated that having unique, un-duplicated clients within the workforce system is something that has been in the works for a while.

Chair Hand responded that the members of working groups two and three identified that as priority for them, but the project would be led by this working group.

Chair Johns responded that since it has been a focus of discussion, she was curious if there are expectations. She noted that conversations are early and ongoing, but asked Chair Hand if there are expectations or desires from the other work groups that could impact the approach or framing of their effort.

Ms. Palma-Trujillo reiterated that OEWD applied for a competitive grant under the California Workforce Development Board. All five projects, which include digitizing the Workforce Inventory, developing the workforce development best practice toolkit, developing a workforce system communication plan, developing the employer engagement plan, and developing a client deduplication plan were included in the grant application. Ms. Palma-Trujillo noted that we are still awaiting notification regarding this grant. She also said that OEWD could share the application with working group members if they are interested in how the projects were outlined. Member Johns expressed an interest in reviewing the application and thanked OEWD for their efforts in trying to secure additional resources to support the work.

Chair Hand initiated the conversation around the preliminary Workforce Inventory, stating that DCYF is assisting with the creation of a Workforce Inventory dashboard. She asked members to contribute to generating a “wish list” of what they would like included in the first iteration of that dashboard, acknowledging the limitations of an initial draft. Therefore, the focus should be on deciding what the initial components of this first iteration should look like. Ms. Palma-Trujillo noted that the dashboard will be shared with CCWA partners and the 24 City departments that provide data.

Chair Hand solicited feedback on this item asking members if there are certain data points they are interested in seeing. She mentioned some of the data that may already be in the report such as how many clients are served by each department and how much money is being spent by each department.

Member Robinson expressed a desire to see how much money is being spent by each department, how many clients are being served, how many full staff there are for each

program/how many staff are attributed to those services. She expressed interest in seeing how our services compare to other cities who are providing comparable services, noting that this is an inquiry unassociated with the inventory.

Member Gomes stated that the data that is currently in the Inventory would be great on a dashboard. He mentioned that he would like visual representation of geographic location, such as a map, that would allow users to see the distribution of the programming. This would provide a better sense of access points.

Member Johns said that she has long admired DCYF's dashboarding resources and is thrilled to hear that they will be assisting with creating a dashboard for the Inventory. Member Johns said she likes how users can quickly filter between different programs and see how information changes in a dynamic way.

Chair Hand recognized Member Johns' suggestion of filtering by program.

Director Houston noted that he would like to see race/ethnicity and gender outlined in the dashboard. He also mentioned the challenges of outlining costs, as programs are structured and funded differently.

Chair Hand asked members to describe their target audiences.

Director Houston spoke to the internal City departments audience and how the dashboard could highlight what departments are charged with, who they are serving, and what services they are providing. He also acknowledged that those outside of the workforce development sphere may not understand everything in the Inventory, which is why the dashboard is helpful. He also underscored the value of a dashboard when collaborating with other departments and also in articulating to the board and current administration the workforce services landscape. Director Houston also stated that the dashboard would be helpful when it comes to discussing which programs to advocate for in a budget cycle. From an external perspective, he recognized that there is an opportunity to make information accessible and tell the story of workforce development to people who may be accessing the inventory from the public.

Member Johns responded to Director Houston saying that she believes there is both, an internal and external audience, providing a platform for monitoring good government and demonstrating what effective services look like. She also discussed opportunities to use the dashboard to compare comparable services to other cities, noting that it would be helpful in determining the appropriate amount to spend on services as well as knowing which staff to allocate to which programs. She also discussed the "macro" level, in terms of thinking about which programs to advocate for in a budget cycle.

Member Gomes highlighted the value of workforce development efforts, particularly for youth. He noted that while DCYF is the largest funder of youth workforce development, seeing the broader funding landscape helps ensure that services reach diverse sub-populations and communities. This visibility is crucial for equitable access. Additionally, the Inventory aids work groups, such as the Life Course group, by identifying gaps and guiding strategic planning. Key benefits include coordination, storytelling, and supporting strategic planning efforts.

Chair Hand moved the focus to reviewing the group's goals and also noting that the group will likely have an opportunity to review the dashboard at the next meeting.

Ms. Palma-Trujillo provided updates on the Goal 5 document, noting that it focuses on data sharing and coordination of data resources among CCWA. Over recent months, the content has been refined to detail three projects: a workforce inventory as a landscape analysis, Inventory updates for FY 23-24, and future dashboard enhancements. The document summarizes Client Use Cases and the Client Deduplication Plan. The team aims to finalize priorities, deadlines, costs, and success measures today to present at next week's Board meeting and finalize by March.

Chair Hand announced that discussion on the current item would conclude by 10:40 a.m. to allow time for public comment. She thanked Ms. Palma-Trujillo for guiding the group through the document and noted that the committee chose to retain all stakeholder priorities and maintain the defined vision of success. The committee has previously discussed shared language around workforce development, strategic alignment of plans and services, shared data systems, and tracking workforce program outcomes like enrollment, completion, and placement.

Chair Hand asked if anyone had questions or feedback. Seeing none, she proceeded after acknowledging Ms. Palma-Trujillo's work drafting this section.

Chair Hand moved on the first action, which was to conduct a comprehensive landscape analysis, to identify gaps in services, and assess existing programs noting that members had identified this as a high priority.

Member Robinson spoke on behalf of DHR stating that she agrees with the priority being high, though she was not sure about the proposed timeline.

Chair Hand acknowledged the timeline is Fall 2025 (DCYF's recommendation) and that HSA recommended that this takes one to three years. She asked members if they felt comfortable with a deadline of end of this calendar year for completion of a landscape analysis.

Member Johns highlighted that the vision for the dashboard product seemed appropriate but emphasized that identifying gaps in services goes beyond simply having a dashboard. Previous discussions touched on defining "landscape analysis" and exploring how to assess gaps, such as aligning services with local labor market needs. She suggested leveraging the Workforce Inventory and exploring client data matching as a potential project. This could involve linking OEWD and HSA client data, including public benefits and enrollment in other programs like DCYF, to identify low-income individuals not connected to workforce services. Member Johns noted that pursuing such a project would require a longer timeline, including obtaining and executing an MOU.

Member Johns suggested that the timeline depends on the project's vision. If the dashboard project meets the criteria, 11 months may be sufficient; otherwise, a longer timeline might be necessary.

Chair Hand agreed with Member Johns, emphasizing key outcomes for success: creating a dashboard, conducting a gaps analysis, and performing an LMI analysis. She suggested moving the data matching recommendation to outcome 5.3, which focuses on establishing a shared framework and implementing a unified data system, as it seems fitting for that context.

Member Johns clarified that setting up a data system differs from conducting a one-time data match to assess program performance. She acknowledged that both are valuable, with

a one-time match potentially serving as a step toward establishing a more comprehensive system. Member Johns stated she would remove HSA as a lead for 5.1, as their primary contribution would be in a supporting role as a thought partner. She emphasized that all ideas depend on capacity and expressed openness to consensus if the group agrees that a dashboard project meets the action and serves as a sufficient success measure.

Chair Hand solicited thoughts from other members.

Member Gomes suggested leveraging the Life Course work group as part of the gaps analysis, highlighting two approaches: assessing the labor market to see if current services align and evaluating needs at each life stage to identify service gaps. He noted that the timing of the work group might align well with this project, where the dashboard or inventory could serve as the project's output. The analysis could then be developed in collaboration with the work group, potentially making completion feasible by year-end.

Member Robinson noted a distinction between types of gap analyses, partially agreeing and disagreeing with previous points. She explained that a landscape analysis identifies existing programs, which may largely be covered by the current Inventory. However, this differs from a quality assessment, which evaluates program effectiveness and reach. She emphasized that determining whether the gap analysis focuses on program availability or effectiveness is essential.

Chair Hand proposed a solution to address differing viewpoints by suggesting the creation of two separate actions. The first would involve conducting a comprehensive landscape analysis, developing a dashboard, performing a gap analysis with input from the Life Course and Vulnerable Populations working groups, and conducting a labor market information (LMI) analysis. The second action would focus on client data matching to identify service gaps for vulnerable populations, acknowledging that this task might require a longer timeline while still fitting within the outcome framework.

Member Johns shared thoughts on the project matrix, particularly regarding the LMI analysis and expressed that the action plan might involve multiple steps. These steps could include: 1) completion of the dashboard, 2) Work Group 4 finishing the LMI analysis, and 3) a combined effort to analyze the LMI and dashboard together. Member Johns noted that the LMI analysis might be a separate but related task, not necessarily an additional action, because the goal appears to be leveraging LMI to identify gaps in the system and refine the dashboard accordingly.

Director Houston responded by asking how members envisioned the end result.

Member Johns acknowledged the difficulty of the current budget situation but emphasized the need for a product that identifies gaps in the system, offering recommendations for areas of coordination, possibly in the form of a report or findings.

Chair Hand responded by suggesting that Outcome 5.2 may not align with the current action plan. Instead of using a landscape analysis to identify specific client use cases, the focus could be on the client matching project, which involves matching client data across multiple agencies. She proposed revising the action to the client matching project, rather than a broad landscape analysis. The group expressed some alignment around revising the action.

Chair Hand redirected the group to Outcome 5.1 and asked if the group felt comfortable assigning a high priority to the project and noted that it was OEWD's responsibility. The project would involve metrics like creating a dashboard, conducting a gaps analysis using Inventory data, and assessing if current sectors match the labor market. She proposed that these goals could be realistically achieved by the March 2027 update. Chair Hand confirmed the three main objectives: the dashboard, the gaps analysis, and LMI matching; the latter would be guided by another group's work, but it would be reviewed by Work Group 5.

Members agreed on the proposed updates and timeline.

Chair Hand asked Member Johns for her thoughts on the priority for the client matching project. Member Johns considered it a medium priority, emphasizing the importance of the landscape analysis and the momentum around Outcome 5.3. Member Gomes and others agreed with the medium priority, while Member Robinson pointed out that HSA has potential to lead the project, noting that none of these tasks were assigned to DHR as a lead.

Chair Hand acknowledged the consensus around the medium priority and clarified that OEWD, HSA, and DCYF would be the project leads. She emphasized that these organizations hold large data sets that could contribute significantly. Chair Hand then asked for a volunteer to be the point person to ensure good project management.

Member Johns suggested that HSA should likely lead the data matching, especially if Medi-Cal data is involved. She proposed a joint leadership between OEWD and HSA, with strong participation from DCYF and DHR, due to the knowledge needed about City-funded workforce programs. She suggested aiming for a deadline of March 2027.

Chair Hand asked Member Johns if it is possible to share SFHSA's data set and which parts of it could be shared. Member Johns responded affirmatively, then asked about the success measure for the project. Member Johns suggested using an analysis created by the group. Chair Hand then inquired with Member Gomes about that analysis, and Gomes said that while he didn't have all the details, it should focus on findings specific to each population, though the list could become quite segmented.

Chair Hand asked if other members had ideas on what the analysis should include. Member Robinson responded by mentioning that success measures, as noted in a brainstorming session with DHR, should aim to improve efficiency, coordination, and collaboration. She added that anything that enhances accessibility across teams or departments and service agencies would be important for the analysis.

Chair Hand asked how to define and operationalize increased efficiency for services. Member Johns replied that it may emerge from the data, suggesting population segmentation to identify opportunities to improve access and utilization for eligible individuals. Chair Hand agreed, noting that service utilization and improving access are measurable outcomes that the government can track.

Director Houston shared that efficiency involves avoiding service duplication, like not offering the same training multiple times across different departments unless necessary. Chair Hand pointed out that there's limited research on service duplication and dosage in

workforce development, and there's no national agreement on how often someone should engage in a particular service, like a resume writing workshop.

Director Houston agreed that understanding this would be helpful. Member Robinson noted that service dosage varies by individual factors like age and work experience, making it a complex but important measure. Chair Hand acknowledged this as a long-term discussion, with Director Houston agreeing that it's more about general averages rather than getting too granular.

Chair Hand asked for other thoughts from the committee.

Member Johns expressed interest in the concepts discussed and noted that measuring dosage as part of the success measure was too complex and better suited for future consideration. She suggested the focus should remain on access and utilization rather than a detailed research study approach. Chair Hand acknowledged this agreement and moved on to discuss the outcome of developing unified metrics and definitions for workforce programs across departments, noting consensus on its high priority.

Member Robinson added that developing comprehensive metrics might be tied to other outcomes, and the process may require a landscape analysis before accurate comparisons can be made. Chair Hand clarified that the priority should be seen as a vision priority for the committee rather than sequential.

Member Johns emphasized that setting consistent metrics across all programs would require broad engagement and suggested leveraging the Controller's Office for project management and research. Chair Hand asked if March 2027 was an appropriate deadline, which was agreed upon by the group. Member Gomes also concurred, noting that the process would take time.

Finally, Chair Hand moved to discuss a final action for establishing a unified data system for consistent reporting and accurate tracking, with a plan to develop by the end of 2025 and implement by the end of 2026. Member Johns noted that the timeline should span years one through four (2025 – 2028).

Director Houston expressed concerns that implementing the data system might take longer than expected due to the need for other items to be in place first. He suggested extending the timeline to March 2028, as it might take that long to complete all necessary tasks. The members agreed with the revised timeline.

Chair Hand then asked who would lead the work, and Member Gomes replied that it's unclear at this stage, as developing a data system across multiple departments is complex and will involve various stakeholders. Member Robinson noted that OEWD should lead and suggested collaborating with the Controller's Office.

Director Houston asked whether the system should be contracted out or managed internally by Digital Services, noting that contracting might lead to a single point of contact, while working with Digital Services could involve more coordination.

Chair Hand summarized that the plan is for OEWD to lead, with a high priority, a target of March 2028, and involvement from the Controller's office, Digital Services, and necessary staffing. The outcomes are to create a plan and implement the system.

**Opportunities
for Partnership
and
Collaboration**
*(Discussion
Item)*

Director Houston provided an update on the WIOA regional and local plans, which are nearing completion. The plans will first be reviewed by the workforce board and then posted online in March for public comments. These plans will outline the workforce system in the city and how services are delivered by OEWD, serving as a reference for aligning the plans and services.

Member Robinson shared an update on the career center, stating that it continues to serve the public through both walk-in and appointment-based services with trained career counselors. The center offers free in-person workshops, open to both the public and city employees. Robinson encouraged others to visit or send staff to receive career coaching and explore the services offered.

**Public
Comment on
Non-Agenda
Items**
*(Discussion
Item)*

Chair Hand opened the meeting for public comments on any agenda or non-agenda items.

Ms. Palma-Trujillo provided guidance on the public comment process. Seeing none in the chat or in person, Chair Hand closed public comment.

Adjournment
(Action Item)

Chair Hand called for a motion to adjourn. Member Gomes offered a motion to adjourn which was seconded by Member Robinson. The vote was unanimous, and the meeting adjourned at 10:53 A.M.