

YOUTH OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

NOVEMBER 9, 2016

8:15 A.M.

PARK FOUNDATION CONFERENCE ROOM

PRESENT: A. Hendrix, S. Kittel, I. Burbank, V. Zeppelin

EXCUSED: S. Peake

STAFF: J. Mattick, J. Luu, C. Weems

GUESTS: Marty Gold, Melissa Mann, Challenge Workforce Solutions; Bev Stokes, City of Ithaca Youth Services; Diane Bradac, Amy Brown, Tompkins County Office of Employment and Training

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hendrix called the meeting to order at 8:17 a.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was Moved by Ms. Zeppelin, seconded by Ms. Burbank and with Ms. Zeppelin abstaining from voting, adopted by voice vote to approve the Minutes of October 12, 2016 as submitted.

SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM – PROVIDER DISCUSSION

The summer program providers were given a list of questions for discussion prior to the meeting.

How effective you believe workshops and other types of educational activities are as opposed to just work experience?

Ms. Gold stated their program focused on serving individuals with disabilities. There were five weeks of workshop on work readiness skills, which was practical based and useful with the skills focused on being able to carry over into youth's school experience such as the customer service skills that were learned. Orientation went well and provided a consistent message.

Ms. Stokes reported that the first orientation at YES is highly valuable and provides a unified message. YES has a training day and this has been more effective in getting youth to attend. They are looking at moving the trainings to Fridays in the future. This year the trainings coincided with payroll, but it became very staff intensive providing both functions on the same day. She reported they are looking at having the AFCU training earlier in the program to get information out sooner and they are also looking at getting trainings onsite at worksites to get greater participation.

Ms. Hendrix stated that the youth farm has participants from multiple programs and asked if those participants who are outside the YES program can attend. Ms. Mattick noted the RFP is written with a tone for collaboration.

Ms. Stokes reported the educational activities are very beneficial and helps get teens engaged with other teens.

Successes and barriers each of the providers experienced in their SYEP program this year.

Ms. Gold stated that CWS had a lot of individual placements and worksites this year. She stated they have youth whose experience has extended beyond the summer program. They use employability profiles with each participant which can be shared with the youth's school when they return classes. The program is also getting youth connected with Access VR services sooner and this helps to close gaps sooner.

Ms. Gold stated getting through the application process and gaining an understanding of the program is the program is very time intensive along with the extra job coaching that is provided onsite.

Ms. Stokes reported that 96% of participants successfully completed the YES program, 94% reported they felt supported throughout their experience. She stated transportation is the biggest barrier for their program, especially this summer the TCAT route changes. She reported a parental contract is being

considered. There were both good and bad instances involving “helicopter parents.” A contract will help to establish boundary that the youth is an employee and needs to be accountable to their employment.

Ms. Brown stated OET’s program experienced a really strong connection between their youth and their supervisors. The adults genuinely cared about their workers. Ms. Mattick stated there is a fine line between being a supervisor and mentor and being a counselor and it’s encouraging when they can find that balance.

How do you define success for your summer youth employment program?

Ms. Mann stated that success for CWS participants could mean those who go on to unsubsidized employment in those community or those individuals who learn interpersonal skills and want to better within the program. Success is also seen in those individuals who have obtained the tools to access services in the community that they may not have been aware of previously.

Ms. Stokes and Ms. Brown both stated success is measured by the number of youth who successfully complete the program, those who have improved throughout the program and through feedback in the exit surveys.

What other eligible youth populations do you have difficulty in reaching with the SYEP Program?

There was consensus among the providers that finding placements for 14 year olds is a real challenge as well as the amount of time spent educating school districts on youth permits.

What else would providers need in order to engage more rural youth in the SYEP Program?

Ms. Mattick asked if additional requirements are added to the RFP to serve more rural youth, what would the providers need in order to be able to serve them. Ms. Mann stated that CWS has found that a lot of the youth in rural Tompkins County that they could be serving are actually residents of other counties. Ms. Brown stated that forming working groups within rural youth areas to do work within the community that would be ideal. Ms. Mattick asked why this isn’t already occurring. Ms. Stokes stated that workgroups are very expensive and then it becomes a program versus employment for the individual. Ms. Kittel asked how providers know which youth aren’t being served. Ms. Stokes stated you don’t know what you don’t know.

How many youth were turned away or placed on an official waiting list?

Ms. Stokes stated that it is difficult to have formal waiting list because youth are referred to other providers. YES has a total of 12 youth who were referred out.

Ms. Mattick stated that it is not possible to advocate for additional funding if there isn’t a clear picture of how many youth are not being served. More data is needed.

Ms. Gold stated that there is also the challenge of 21 year olds who are still in school, but who are aging out for the program.

Ms. Kittel asked if there would be interest in having a larger discussion prior to the creation of the RFP to see if there are ways to get more creative and stretch the boundaries of the program. There was consensus that it would be beneficial to have a couple hours of facilitated discussion. It was also suggested that a list of individuals who operate programs in the contiguous counties be included in the RFP as resources. There was also a suggestion of placing an “innovation bonus” within the RFP.

YOUTH DATA PROJECT UPDATE

Work has begun with Cornell University to get interns to help with the project.

COUNTY BUDGET OVERTARGET REQUEST UPDATE

The over target request was not recommended by the County Administrator, but was advanced by a legislator and is now included in the recommended budget. If approved in the final budget, the funding will allow for additional hours for Ms. Weems to work on developing career ladder pathways.

DIRECTOR'S UPDATE

Ms. Mattick stated that Ms. Pollack has left the committee. She asked members to think of individuals who would be interested in participating on the committee, but noted those individuals cannot be someone who might respond to the RFPs.

Ms. Mattick reported that the youth monitoring reports were sent out. A formal response was received from Challenge Workforce Solutions, a quick note relating to working permits was received from the Ithaca Youth Bureau, and the Office of Employment and Training hasn't responded yet.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:47 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 14th at 8:15 a.m. in WIB conference room.

DRAFT