

COMMITTEE ON CITY WORKFORCE ALIGNMENT: COORDINATION OF PARTNERS' PLANS AND PRIORITIES WORKING GROUP

Draft Minutes of The
July 26, 2024
Office of Economics and Workforce Development
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103

CCWA Voting Members Present	Chad Houston, OEWD Julia Ma, DHR Tiffany Jackson, Hospitality House	
CCWA Additional Members Present	Kris Sosa, Hospitality House	
CCWA Staff Present	Ken Nim, Chair Tai Seals-Jackson, Secretary Jen Hand, OEWD Miriam Palma-Trujillo, OEWD	
CCWA Members Absent	Vince Courtney Jr., Northern California District Council of Laborers Sylvia Tiongson, HSA	

Ohlone Land Acknowledgement, Announcements & Housekeeping <i>(Discussion Item)</i>	Chair Nim called the meeting to order at 9:38 a.m. Secretary Tai Seals-Jackson (OEWD) opened the meeting by reciting the Ohlone Land Acknowledgement and reviewing housekeeping rules.	
Roll Call <i>(Discussion Item)</i>	Chair Nim requested that Secretary Seals-Jackson conduct roll call. Secretary Seals-Jackson conducted roll call and announced that a quorum was present.	
Chair's Welcome <i>(Discussion Item)</i>	<p>Chair Nim welcomed Committee Members to the second Coordination of Partners' Plans and Priorities Working Group meeting. He introduced himself as the Interim Director of OEWD's Workforce Division.</p> <p>Chair Nim stated that the priority for this meeting was to review Goal #1 of the Citywide Workforce Development Plan, focusing on <i>Coordination of Partners' Plans and Priorities</i>. Specifically prioritizing high-impact actions within Outcomes 1.3 and 1.4. Time permitting, members would also begin Part 2 of the Jamboard activity to outline key components of the group's implementation plan. An action item for the session included nominating co-chairs to lead ongoing efforts and support collaboration.</p>	
Adoption of the Agenda <i>(Action Item)</i>	Chair solicited comments on the agenda from CCWA members. Seeing none, Chair Nim requested a motion to adopt the meeting agenda. Member Houston made the motion, which was seconded by Member Jackson and passed unanimously.	

<p>Citywide Workforce Development Plan- Goal #1: Coordination of Partners' Plans and Priorities <i>(Discussion Item)</i></p>	<p>Chair Nim introduced Jen Hand, Workforce Impact Manager, to present on the FY 2024-2029 Citywide Workforce Development Plan ("FY 24-29 Plan"), Goal #1: Coordination of Partners' Plans and Priorities.</p> <p>Ms. Hand explained that materials were prepared to build on the previous discussion. She noted for members of the public who had not attended that these materials were available on the Committee's website. Ms. Hand provided a brief overview of the initial slides, underscoring that today's focus was on advancing the dialogue from the last meeting.</p> <p>She recapped key points, including the purpose of the working group, rooted in legislative requirements; the Committee's 17-member composition; the community-led timeline involving six public meetings to gather input on the Five-Year Plan; and the formation of working groups to address the Five-Year Plan's priorities. Ms. Hand highlighted that this group's objective is to align strategic planning and partnerships, an integral part of the Committee's five overarching goals.</p> <p>Ms. Hand introduced the Jamboard activity designed to facilitate collaborative planning and alignment of efforts, inviting members of the public to participate. Ms. Hand confirmed board members' successful participation on the Jamboard, receiving visual acknowledgments from attendees.</p> <p>Member Jackson noted a technical issue with accessing the Jamboard and requested to submit inputs via chat. Ms. Hand agreed, offering to add Ms. Jackson's contributions directly to the Jamboard.</p> <p>Ms. Hand then introduced the activity, explaining that it was a continuation of the work completed in the previous meeting. Members were directed to assign priorities to each action within the identified outcomes on the Jamboard. Ms. Hand emphasized that high-priority actions should be marked with department names or, for public participants, organization names, allowing for clear tracking. Moderate priorities could be added as needed, though Director Houston had previously advised that ranking any action as "low priority" was not mandatory.</p> <p>Ms. Hand also outlined the process for providing comments. Participants were encouraged to use the comment section for suggestions on action consolidation or for noting if an action might align better with another group's objectives. She reminded members to approach the activity with fresh insights and adjust their priorities if necessary.</p> <p>With priorities established, Ms. Hand explained that in step two, members would transition to discussing projects derived from these actions. Key discussion points would include identifying resources, partners, stakeholders, costs, and deadlines to support effective implementation.</p> <p>Ms. Hand proposed a brief 5-minute period for members to reacquaint themselves with the Jamboard before continuing the discussion on the remaining sections. After this interval, Ms. Hand asked if members were prepared to proceed. With consensus from members, they began reviewing outcome 1.1, noting consensus around, "partnering with CBOs, labor organizations, and local educational institutions to develop career pipeline programs for San Francisco residents and displaced populations interested in entering the City's essential jobs".</p> <p>Moving to 1.2, members confirmed agreement on leveraging the annual workforce inventory as a primary project for summarizing and disseminating service information. Ms. Hand then transitioned the discussion to outcome 1.3.</p> <p>Outcome 1.3, members expressed strong consensus regarding the prioritization of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure workforce development programs and services adequately address the
---	---

specific needs of economically vulnerable populations, such as unemployed, underemployed, and historically excluded workers.

- Providers with lived experience are developed into higher wage and leadership positions within the social service and public administration sector.

Ms. Hand prompted discussion on priority actions within outcome 1.3, inviting Member Jackson to start by sharing her perspective on the importance of elevating individuals with lived experience into higher-wage, leadership roles within social service and public administration sectors. Member Jackson emphasized that many job-seekers face educational barriers despite extensive field experience. She highlighted that individuals often have equivalent knowledge to those with formal degrees due to their lived experience, underscoring that some skills simply cannot be taught in traditional educational settings but require hands-on experience.

Ms. Hand then acknowledged Member Jackson's insights, confirming that advancing individuals with lived experience into leadership roles aligned with the outcome's objective. Ms. Hand also noted comments on the Jamboard regarding educational barriers and asked the group for potential projects that could address these challenges.

Member Ma shared an ongoing initiative by the Department of Human Resources (DHR) aimed at broadening job qualifications across San Francisco's City workforce. This includes revising minimum qualifications to recognize equivalent work experience as a substitute for formal educational degrees. She explained that DHR's Classification and Compensation Division is actively incorporating substitution language, such as allowing relevant work experience in lieu of a bachelor's degree where feasible. This policy requires careful negotiation with labor unions but demonstrates progress in making City job opportunities more accessible.

Ms. Hand expressed appreciation for DHR's efforts and noted the relevance of this best practice for other sectors. She emphasized that the goal extended beyond educational qualifications, also encompassing the advancement of individuals with lived experience into leadership roles, thereby suggesting a potential secondary project within this outcome. Member Jackson supported this approach, adding that to truly expand opportunities, local employers beyond City departments should adopt similar hiring practices. She proposed that the business services team involved with Workforce Link could engage with employers on updating job descriptions to value lived experience and equivalent work skills. Ms. Hand noted this as a potential project, emphasizing the need for a coordinated policy to provide technical assistance to employers in revising hiring practices.

Ms. Hand then transitioned to the second priority within outcome 1.3, "ensuring workforce development programs and services adequately address the needs of economically vulnerable populations." She invited OEWD, DHR, and Hospitality House to share their perspectives.

Member Jackson emphasized the importance of addressing the needs of historically excluded workers, specifically highlighting undocumented individuals who face unique challenges due to limited program support. She noted that without appropriate services, these individuals might be forced into precarious situations to secure basic needs like housing and income. Member Jackson underscored the need to develop programs that cater to these workers, focusing on legal pathways such as co-op models and entrepreneurship that allow undocumented individuals to work without formal right-to-work authorization.

Ms. Hand acknowledged Member Jackson's insights and highlighted the importance of crafting targeted strategies to address the unique needs of undocumented workers. She then invited Member Ma to share DHR's perspective on supporting this population.

Member Ma shared that the City Career Center, is facing challenges in serving clients with varying levels of employment readiness. The Career Center, primarily focused on preparing candidates for City jobs, has limited capacity to support individuals who require foundational pre-employment skills, such as resume-building or basic computer skills. Recognizing this gap, DHR is identifying potential partner organizations, like Goodwill, that specialize in these foundational services. Member Ma explained the intent to establish informal cross-referral relationships, allowing the Career Center to direct clients needing pre-employment support to suitable providers and, conversely, to accept referrals from these providers when clients are ready to pursue City employment opportunities. This approach aims to create smoother transitions for clients and foster warm handoffs between organizations to better meet individual needs.

Ms. Hand reiterated the value of having a robust awareness of available programs across partner organizations, particularly for vulnerable populations. She then asked the group for feedback on which project should take priority for Outcome 1.3. With nods of agreement from members, the consensus leaned toward prioritizing the development of cross-referral networks and collaboration among organizations to create a seamless support system for historically excluded workers.

Outcome 1.4, members expressed strong consensus regarding the prioritization of:

- Hold quarterly consortiums that bring together workforce providers, community organizations, and other stakeholders to facilitate collaboration, share insights, and coordinate efforts.

Member Houston described a successful internal initiative, “Coffee and Connections,” aimed at fostering collaboration among program teams, community organizations, and unions. This initiative breaks down organizational silos, allowing participants to exchange insights on available programs, departmental needs, and hiring practices. Director Houston emphasized the value of this networking approach in creating strong partnerships and a better-coordinated response to community needs.

Member Houston further emphasized that gathering stakeholders quarterly could break down silos and allow different departments to better understand each other's career pipeline offerings. Such meetings, he noted, would provide essential opportunities for organizations to connect and ensure clients benefit from a more coordinated system.

Member Jackson echoed support, emphasizing that collaboration could begin within this working group. She highlighted the value of unstructured conversations where attendees could discuss available services, enabling deeper collaboration. Member Jackson referenced Coffee and Connections as a successful example, noting it has fostered strong connections among providers by allowing open sharing of resources.

Ms. Hand proposed that a quarterly consortium could resemble a job fair, but tailored to providers and stakeholders to facilitate networking. Member Ma supported the idea, adding that a consortium could benefit from structured mapping of each organization's expertise. This would enable stakeholders to identify their primary focus areas and avoid duplicative efforts, particularly when clients have varied pre-employment needs. She emphasized that mapping could reveal each organization's “sweet spot” in supporting clients at different points in their employment journey.

Ms. Hand acknowledged the importance of Member Ma's suggestion, noting that the structure of these consortiums—whether formal or informal—would evolve based on stakeholder input. She encouraged members to consider ways to incorporate both structured activities and informal networking to balance the needs of different stakeholders.

Director Houston reiterated the importance of balance, highlighting the logistical challenges of mapping every organization comprehensively. He recommended maintaining a realistic scope for the consortium's structure and goals, ensuring it aligns with the working group's broader objectives.

Concluding the discussion, Ms. Hand observed a strong consensus on implementing the quarterly consortiums with an initial focus on stakeholder mapping. She moved the group to part two of the activity.

Chair Nim opened the floor for public comment. Secretary Seals-Jackson then invited public comment, limiting remarks to three minutes per speaker.

Kris Sosa, representing Hospitality House, provided input, noting alignment with the Committee's priorities, especially the focus on supporting undocumented workers. Sosa highlighted challenges Hospitality House faces in aiding undocumented community members, such as limited resources for work permits. Sosa emphasized the importance of collaboration among providers to strengthen referral pathways, particularly to City jobs, and expressed gratitude for being part of the group.

With no further public comments, Secretary Seals-Jackson turned it back to Chair Nim, who then confirmed moving to Part 2 of the activity, handing it back to Ms. Hand to lead the next section.

Jamboard Activity Part 2 (Implementation Plans):

Outcome 1.1

Ms. Hand explained that Part 2 would involve a live discussion on identifying resources, partnerships, stakeholders, and potential projects under Outcome 1.1. This outcome focuses on partnering with CBOs, labor organizations, and educational institutions to develop career pipelines for San Francisco residents and displaced populations.

Member Ma suggested that before creating new pipeline programs, a needs assessment based on Labor Market Information (LMI) data should be conducted to understand industry demands. Ms. Hand acknowledged the need for LMI data.

Member Jackson proposed the idea of co-locating employment services with housing providers at Access Point centers. Drawing from the positive impact of similar services at Hospitality House, she suggested that co-location could create a "one-stop shop" environment for clients seeking both housing and employment assistance. This approach would streamline referrals, as Access Point providers already inquire about clients' interest in increasing their income. By placing employment services directly on site, clients could receive immediate support, helping to build a more effective career pipeline for those entering housing services.

Ms. Hand clarified that Access Points are HSH (Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing) service hubs, confirming this setup could facilitate targeted career pathways. She inquired if Jackson viewed co-location as a project or a resource. Member Jackson noted it could function as both—serving as a project that benefits both housing and employment providers and as a resource for clients.

Member Houston suggested that before advancing partnerships, the group should review what resources and plans are already in place, such as current workforce inventories or departmental workforce development plans. This preliminary review would create a

foundation for effective coordination.

Ms. Ma then suggested conducting a landscape and gap analysis to identify any unmet needs, which Director Houston agreed could be valuable. He acknowledged, however, that while some foundational work exists, completing a full landscape analysis would require significant effort.

Ms. Hand added that a needs assessment using landscape and gap analysis methods would be a resource to support this action. She highlighted that OEWD already has access to robust LMI (Labor Market Information) tools and partnerships with EDD, enabling minimal-cost access to monthly data updates. This data could inform career pathway needs effectively.

To further clarify, Ms. Ma suggested utilizing the workforce inventory report as baseline data, while Member Houston noted that departmental plans outlining workforce development goals could also serve as a key resource for coordinating efforts.

Ms. Hand introduced the need of building shared service resources, specifically focusing on co-location efforts, and asked members what key elements or partnerships would be necessary to make co-location effective.

Member Jackson suggested that involvement from both HSA and OEWD would be crucial. Member Ma raised a question about existing co-location efforts, asking whether services are currently being provided at housing access points. Member Jackson shared that Hospitality House participates in a pilot project at Dolores Street, providing employment services as a part of the co-location initiative.

Member Ma suggested that a broader analysis of existing co-location services might help clarify gaps and identify effective strategies before committing to expanded co-location projects. She recommended that the landscape and gap analyses could help to reveal which programs are already successful, allowing the working group to consider amplifying these efforts through cross-referrals and enhanced collaboration.

Ms. Hand agreed, noting that focusing on awareness and mapping of shared service resources could support strategic planning without excessive initial costs. She explained that many existing job centers, such as those hosted by HSA, Goodwill, and EDD, already include co-located services. Ms. Jackson's point regarding access points serving vulnerable populations highlighted a potential gap that could guide future co-location initiatives.

Ms. Hand observed consensus around utilizing LMI data, the workforce inventory, and departmental plans to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment and landscape analysis. She noted that while the data collection might involve considerable staff time, it would provide a foundation for targeted action.

Director Houston raised a question about staff costs associated with conducting the needs assessment and landscape analysis. He suggested that the group consider two aspects: first, estimating the total hours required, and second, determining which job classifications would be appropriate to handle this work across different departments. Director Houston emphasized the importance of finding the most effective way to calculate these staff costs without delving too deeply into granular details, proposing an initial focus on estimating hours.

Member Ma inquired about the depth and availability of data in the workforce inventory report, asking whether sufficient information exists to conduct a meaningful needs assessment and gap analysis. She suggested that, if the data is available, an analyst-level staff member could organize it to identify service gaps and assess which vulnerable populations are currently

underserved. However, if the necessary data is not already collected, additional time and resources would be required to gather it.

Ms. Hand responded, asking Member Ma to elaborate on the specific types of data that would be useful for this analysis. Member Ma explained that data on pre-employment readiness skills, basic life support services, job application support, and career development services would help in assessing which providers serve specific vulnerable populations. She added that mapping these services would highlight areas where workforce development providers are unable to support individuals as they move from entry-level roles to higher positions, addressing potential service gaps.

Ms. Hand acknowledged that while some of this data exists at the program level in the workforce inventory, provider-level details are not available. She noted that Member Ma's input helps clarify the desired outcomes from the data, which can guide the use of available tools. Director Houston added that conducting this analysis would likely require a combination of existing data and new data collection, involving both a review of current information and outreach to the workforce development system to fill in data gaps.

Outcome 1.2

Ms. Hand moved the discussion to item 1.2, focusing on conducting research to identify and compile workforce development best practices, ultimately developing a best practices guide. She asked members to consider both the existing resources needed for this work and a potential "wish list" for additional resources. She identified the workforce inventory as an essential starting point, as it catalogs over 300 workforce programs in the City.

Director Houston observed that, similar to the previous item, having access to departments' plans could be valuable, though he was uncertain if these plans detailed specific programming or success metrics. Ms. Hand confirmed that while most departments do not provide extensive information on best practices, updating and leveraging existing research could be useful. She noted that OEWD conducts ongoing research, which might support this initiative, but expressed interest in identifying other resources that might be beneficial.

Member Ma suggested enhancing the workforce inventory report by adding specific questions aimed at capturing best practices directly from providers. She proposed including a question about where providers could share examples of practices, they consider effective, which could enrich the information collected without creating additional burdens. She acknowledged that defining "best practice" could vary across providers but suggested that even subjective input could provide valuable insights into the practices that organizations find beneficial. Additionally, she recommended that minor adjustments to the workforce inventory survey questions might help capture more nuanced information about where each organization focuses its efforts along the employment readiness and career development spectrum.

Ms. Hand agreed that these modifications could enhance the workforce inventory's usefulness for both the best practices guide and the broader landscape analysis discussed previously.

Ms. Hand highlighted the need to gather best practices from service providers, questioning whether resources from the provider ecosystem itself could be utilized for this purpose. She suggested enhancing the assessment for providers, especially those working on the ground, to identify effective practices.

Member Jackson agreed, noting that discussions around workforce best practices are limited, with most focus placed on industry data and supportive services. She recommended actively engaging providers to share their best practices, acknowledging that this could be a key step

forward.

Ms. Hand asked if members felt this initiative would be low, medium, or high cost. Member Ma responded, noting that the primary cost would likely stem from staffing—specifically, the research and development needed to enhance the workforce inventory survey and collect and analyze responses. Member Ma inquired whether City Departments or service providers complete the Workforce Inventory, and who is doing the reporting.

Ms. Hand clarified that City departments, rather than individual providers, currently complete the workforce inventory report. While some information on provider-funded programs and outcomes is available, the data does not dive deeply into provider-level inputs and outputs.

Member Ma proposed that providers funded by City departments could complete a short survey or contribute a brief paragraph on their best practices in workforce development.

Ms. Hand acknowledged that a direct survey could be one method for gathering more detailed insights, particularly around co-location and other best practices. She noted that the Alignment Committee could decide if this survey should be part of the annual inventory or conducted separately.

Member Ma questioned if City departments' existing provider surveys were standardized. Ms. Hand explained that while consistency is lacking, some departments are making strides toward standardizing provider surveys. For example, DYCD's Data Working Group is working to streamline data requests to prevent providers from receiving multiple overlapping surveys.

Ms. Hand offered to discuss offline some of the challenges encountered when departments asked providers directly to complete the inventory, rather than through the department, suggesting that greater consistency could help alleviate the reporting burden while ensuring accountability. Member Ma expressed agreement, adding that accountability mechanisms should be effective without creating excessive demands on providers already stretched thin. Ms. Hand clarified that the Workforce Inventory currently functions as an accountability tool for City departments in terms of grant-making outcomes rather than directly assessing the accountability of individual service providers or the 300 programs involved. She acknowledged that while the inventory has operated in this way for the past decade, its scope and purpose could be revisited if the Committee decides to adopt a more comprehensive approach.

Member Ma added that if the Committee considers surveying providers, it need not be strictly for accountability. Instead, she proposed framing it as an effort to uplift the field, identify gaps, and highlight best practices, thereby supporting a broader understanding of workforce development across the City.

Ms. Hand observed nodding and general agreement with Member Ma's suggestion, noting that using the survey to share best practices aligns with the Committee's objectives.

Member Jackson offered a final suggestion, noting that OEWD already distributes surveys to clients and employers. She proposed that this distribution could also include providers, allowing them to share valuable feedback.

Ms. Hand transitioned to Outcome 1.3 but, due to time constraints and the absence of key participants for co-chair nominations, suggested moving directly to Outcome 1.4 and postponing the co-chair discussion to the next meeting. Director Houston agreed, emphasizing the importance of addressing co-chair nominations soon to continue progress.

Chair Nim then opened the floor for input on the next meeting schedule. Member Jackson

	<p>suggested maintaining a monthly meeting cadence to encourage participation. Member Ma supported this, recommending more frequent meetings initially for clarity and momentum. Director Houston noted the logistical challenges and suggested balancing frequency with engagement, particularly for OEWD staff managing multiple groups.</p> <p>Ms. Hand acknowledged the substantial progress made on Outcomes 1.1, 1.2, and 1.4, suggesting the group focus on advancing these projects rather than holding additional brainstorming sessions. Chair Nim proposed consulting with the full Committee on scheduling at the upcoming meeting. Member Ma suggested aiming for September, with flexibility around August due to vacations, and Member Jackson expressed openness to either timeframe.</p> <p>With agreement to aim for September, Chair Nim thanked members for their contributions and moved to agenda item #8.</p>
<p>Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items <i>(Discussion Item)</i></p>	<p>Chair Nim opened the meeting for public comment on any agenda or non-agenda items.</p> <p>Secretary Seals-Jackson provided guidance on the public comment process.</p> <p>Kris Sosa from Hospitality House offered input, emphasizing the importance of collecting data that fully represents all vulnerable populations. Sosa suggested categorizing the data by specific vulnerable groups—such as single homeless adults, homeless families, and veterans—to ensure inclusivity and relevance. Sosa recommended structuring surveys to allow providers to indicate best practices within these categories.</p> <p>Seeing no additional comments in the chat or in person, Chair Nim closed public comment.</p>
<p>Adjournment <i>(Action Item)</i></p>	<p>Chair Nim thanked Members and the public for attending and reminded members that the next meeting would be held at One South Van Ness, with logistics to be coordinated for the next meeting.</p> <p>Chair Nim called for a motion to adjourn. Member Houston offered a motion to adjourn which was seconded by Member Jackson. The vote was unanimous, and the meeting adjourned at 11:10 A.M.</p>