

1 JET Meeting
2 July 28, 2022

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Good morning, everyone.
4 Let's go ahead and kick this meeting off. Let's get started.
5 Matt, can you call the roll please?

6 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, sir. Chairman Bryan
7 Daniel.

8 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Here.

9 UNIDENTIFIED: Mario Lozoya.

10 MARIO LOZOYA: Here.

11 UNIDENTIFIED: Scott Norman.

12 SCOTT NORMAN: Here.

13 UNIDENTIFIED: Steve Lecholop.

14 UNIDENTIFIED: Will Conley.

15 WILL CONLEY: Here.

16 UNIDENTIFIED: Jerel Booker.

17 UNIDENTIFIED: Quorum is present.

18 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Thank you very much.
19 Commissioner Alvarez has joined us. Commissioner Alvarez, any
20 opening comments?

21 COMMISSIONER ALVAREZ: Welcome, good to see
22 everybody back.

23 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Feels good, doesn't it?
24 Thank you very much. Commissioner Demerson, I think is on his
25 way. But a very able-bodied substitute has joined us.

1 UNIDENTIFIED: [Inaudible]. Appreciate the
2 time that you've been volunteering. You come into it, you get a
3 lot out, so appreciate the time that you put into it and
4 [inaudible] extend an invitation to come up here to the capitol
5 and I'll be leaving after this meeting if you all would like to
6 join us.

7 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Thank you so much. Mr.
8 Trobman, has anyone signed up for public comment?

9 MR. TROBMAN: We do two. We have two folks
10 signed up for public comment. I would like to invite Bernardo
11 Garrido.

12 BERNARDO GARRIDO: Thank you, Matt. My name
13 is Bernardo Garrido and I'm the CT director for Jubilee Academy.
14 We are an open public charter district here in the great state
15 of Texas. We serve students in Brownsville, Harlingen,
16 Kingsville, San Antonio, and Austin with a campus in the Wells
17 Branch area. First and foremost, I want to thank the board.
18 We've been hopeful in applying for these types of grants for CT
19 programs and, like I shared with Commissioner Alvarez, we talked
20 about it. He was our guest speaker at Jubilee Brownsville a
21 couple of years ago, and we were talking about, "Hey, when will
22 we get this opportunity? We service the same students as the
23 local ISDs. We're an open public charter system." I'm very
24 appreciative, I'm really excited. We've got some really young
25 programs within our organization and these are the types of

1 opportunities that are going to catapult us. By that I mean
2 giving back to our communities, preparing our students. One of
3 my visions is to make sure that our kids do develop the
4 employability skills, that we're offering programs that align
5 with the regional workforce data, and just very appreciative of
6 the support. We submitted three applications and so we're
7 excited, again. Additionally, I did want to comment, going
8 forward, something, if possible, to consider. As a young entity,
9 we are growing like I mentioned. Our programs are four or five
10 years. We just started offering industry-based certifications
11 for our students last year in '21 and '22, and so our focus is
12 going to be on workplace starting this year getting our kids out
13 into our business and industry partners, so really increasing
14 industry certifications and workplace opportunities but as a
15 small growing district, one of the struggles that I experience
16 working on this grant was not being able to allocate funds for
17 administrative support and if that's something that could be
18 considered for future grant opportunities for a district like
19 ourselves, again, we're limited in staff. Any type of support
20 that we could get would be immense. I want to thank the board
21 first and foremost. We're excited. We're doing great things. I
22 welcome you guys to visit our campuses in Brownsville,
23 Harlingen, Kingsville, San Antonio, Austin if you're ever in the
24 vicinity and again, thank you guys for everything.

1 UNIDENTIFIED: I have a question. What type
2 of industries are your programs supporting?

3 BERNARDO GARRIDO: For the application or in
4 general?

5 UNIDENTIFIED: No, in general.

6 BERNARDO GARRIDO: In general. OK. We do
7 have a nursing science program. We have a nursing science
8 program. We've got an engineering program of study that we're
9 going to roll out this year. That was one of the applications
10 that we submitted. We have a [inaudible] program [inaudible] San
11 Antonio area, and then we've got graphic design, animations.
12 We're expanding into a cybersecurity focus. We have a law
13 enforcement program as well too in the San Antonio and the RGV,
14 but I'm constantly looking at labor market reports and
15 revisiting our program of study just to ensure that whatever
16 opportunities our kiddos to participate in, these four years,
17 they dedicate four years of their time in high school and we ask
18 a lot of them, we want to make sure that they'll be able to find
19 employment in the RGV, in San Antonio. Kingsville, we're just
20 expanding. This will be our first year and so teaching and
21 training because of the need of teachers, I wanted to expand
22 that districtwide, and so now we're going to offering teaching
23 and training in Austin and in the Kingsville regions as well
24 too.

25

1 UNIDENTIFIED: Sounds great. I'll put in a
2 plug. In all those markets, there's construction jobs,
3 construction and trades in great demand across the state.

4 BERNARDO GARRIDO: Definitely. Actually, my
5 in-laws own a construction company there in RGV. We know that
6 work is available. We've got a couple of hundred students across
7 the campuses and so our focus is on our families and our kiddos,
8 but we're always revisiting our programs and definitely
9 opportunities often.

10 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Thank you.

11 BERNARDO GARRIDO: Thank you.

12 MR. TROBMAN: Next we have Linda Alaniz.

13 LINDA ALANIZ: Good morning, everyone. My
14 name is Linda Alaniz. I come with a background of working with
15 workforce so I really wanted to come and present today because I
16 help a lot of school districts, charters, and institutions all
17 over the state as a consultant. I myself have been involved with
18 workforce. I wanted to thank each of every one of you because
19 what you're doing with this JET program and what you're doing
20 with the equipment is making a significant impact on the schools
21 that we address and in the schools that we're aware of. Being
22 involved all of my career with workforce and education, I can
23 see what a program like this can do. In doing that, in working
24 with these applications, there's some things that I wanted to
25 bring up, not because I'm here to complain, but just so that I

1 can you aware that when some of these districts apply, it's
2 sometimes the way that the guidelines are set up, it restricts
3 them from being able to either move forward or being able to
4 gain the points necessary for them to be considered for funding,
5 high enough score for them to be considered for funding. Some of
6 those I've seen across the board. It could be small district. It
7 could be a large, a rural. The way that some of the guideline
8 restrictions are on there really limits the ability for some of
9 them and just to give you a couple of examples because I realize
10 that I only have three minutes, but to give you a couple of
11 examples, if a large district applies and they have their own
12 certified teachers, in other words, they've chosen nursing or
13 they chose a welding degree and they can graduate the students
14 there at their high school. They don't need to have that pathway
15 connected to the college so they don't establish that memorandum
16 of understanding and it becomes the problem when we are
17 requiring an application to be signed by the IHE or the college.
18 We've gone through the whole process. We've actually completed,
19 assisted the schools in completing their application, and once
20 it gets to the college, if there is no transition, meaning that
21 the student has to finish up at the college, then the college
22 has refused to sign. Here is a school that may have a lot of
23 need, the students addressing a high demand for that region, but
24 still cannot apply because they've been told no. So that's
25 happened to us in a couple of occasions. Another thing that

1 we've experienced is on the other spectrum, going from large
2 down to a small school district, a small school district will
3 face the fact that there are five letters, business letters
4 required, and let's say that they chose welding and they're in a
5 remote rural area, there are not five welding companies there,
6 or similar, where they would hire those. To get five letters of
7 support means that they may not be able to apply for that grant.
8 They have to choose another program of study even though their
9 heart was set on one particular one. If the businesses are in a
10 more populated area of that county or that region and they've
11 already committed—let's just give an example, to Corpus, which
12 is a bigger district than a small rural school in Brooks, then
13 the welding company doesn't want to feel like they're competing
14 so they don't want to give a letter of support to a smaller
15 district and so we have to look at, or the school has to look at
16 what businesses are there. That really puts a restriction on
17 them being able to apply. Those are just a couple of examples.
18 One of the things that I wanted to propose, consideration for,
19 is maybe some type of platform or an individual that could maybe
20 hear some of the concerns from the ground because again, we work
21 with the entire state in terms of schools and charters now. We
22 get to hear some of the things that happen, but I don't want it
23 to be misunderstood that I'm here complaining, just wanted to
24 alert you all of what I'm hearing and how we could maybe better
25 serve some of these schools. Thank you, everyone.

1 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Thank you very much. Any
2 questions?

3 UNIDENTIFIED: I want to make a comment. I
4 want to thank the both of you. This is the kind of feedback that
5 we need, to take note of moving forward. [Inaudible] our concern
6 is to find ways, innovative ways to improve workforce strategies
7 across Texas [inaudible] urban or [inaudible]. Obviously, for us
8 to maintain a strong workforce across Texas we find out what's
9 happening on the ground so we can [inaudible] for us because
10 it's possible for us to [inaudible] those [inaudible]. Thank you
11 both for coming forward and giving us some feedback.

12 LINDA ALANIZ: Thank you.

13 UNIDENTIFIED: I have a question. I agree
14 with him completely. We don't want procedural steps to be
15 barriers to [inaudible]. Is the letter, the MOU with the higher
16 ed, is that a point qualification or a points factor or is it an
17 absolute barrier, if you don't have it, you cannot.

18 LINDA ALANIZ: It is a statutory requirement
19 for school districts and open-enrollment charter schools.

20 UNIDENTIFIED: For their application.

21 LINDA ALANIZ: Yes. And I've said school
22 districts but I should note that there is an exception for
23 Windham School District in the statute, so it would really apply
24 to ISDs and charter schools per the statute.

25

1 UNIDENTIFIED: Just like the statute for
2 [inaudible] spending funds on administrative support.

3 LINDA ALANIZ: There is a list of items that
4 the statute allows and I can review that and respond back.

5 UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Any other public comment?

7 MR. TROBMAN: No, sir.

8 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Let's move on to Agenda
9 Item 3, data presentation for fiscal '22.

10 UNIDENTIFIED: If I could have everyone turn
11 to tab 2 in the binder. We'll go over a brief data presentation
12 for FY22. This is the first time that we've been together since
13 the 50 million dollars was approved for JET awards over the
14 biennium, the 2022-23 biennium. I wanted to just start today and
15 kind of point out some of the things that we really ramped up or
16 enhanced as far as our outreach strategies go. One of the big
17 ones is that this year for the first time we were able to
18 provide a JET toolkit. This was a resource document area on our
19 home page that allowed either first-time applicants or recurring
20 applicants to review several different documents to aid them as
21 they embarked on the journey of submitting a Jobs & Education
22 for Texans grant. One of the other large ones was I believe it
23 was in January we hosted a statewide webinar. We spoke to over
24 600 folks and delivered those materials to over 1,500 folks
25 statewide. We really have tried to ramp up our marketing

1 outreach and trying to get the word about not only the JET grant
2 but the accessible funds for this biennium to all reaches of the
3 state. As you know, we've really tried to ramp up our social
4 media presence, trying to make, again, either through LinkedIn
5 posts, I believe we had a woman at a conference posted a video
6 for us and we posted that on our LinkedIn and for that month it
7 was our most popular and most viewed video. Again, we're really
8 trying to take advantage of all the networks that we have as
9 well as all of our commissioners and Chairman Daniel attending
10 press conferences and check presentations all across the state.
11 As you'll see in a little bit, they're going to be very busy in
12 the upcoming future as they award all the check presentations
13 for this year. As you can see the next slide shows the revamped
14 home page and you can see not only through the edits and
15 revisions that we've made to the home page, but also including
16 the JET toolkit. The page views and volume of folks looking at
17 the JET website increased significantly. On that third slide if
18 you'll flip the page, there's just an example of two of those
19 documents that were found in the JET toolkit. I have to give a
20 shout-out to my manager, Lori Knight who is not with us today.
21 She's ill.

22 UNIDENTIFIED: She's listening though.

23 UNIDENTIFIED: I know she's listening so
24 we're glad that she's feeling better. She really pioneered and
25 pushed the boundaries on getting this resource document

1 available. I think this is the only RFA we offer that has a
2 resource area or document. As you see the left one is my JET
3 application ready to submit. As you move through that workflow
4 is your answer is yes, you continue on, and then to Linda's
5 point, there is a resource document for maximizing those
6 employer letters of support. Hopefully, that came in handy for
7 applicants this year as well.

8 UNIDENTIFIED: I really would like to take
9 this opportunity to commend Matt and Lori as well as the folks
10 who are behind the scenes, our communications team who helped
11 with messaging, our design team that helped lay out these
12 somewhat complicated looking flowcharts but that are actually
13 really helpful, as well as our RFA grants team who helped us to
14 streamline the application and simplify the process. Their
15 commitment to customer service was greatly appreciated. It
16 really was very much a team effort and obviously Matt's going to
17 go through the results and what came out of that. Great job,
18 Matt.

19 UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you. It does take a
20 village so I echo all your sentiments. Let's dive into some of
21 the numbers from this last round of funding. You'll see FY22 IHE
22 applications by the numbers. I will remind the board that last
23 year you all recommended that 100 percent of the general revenue
24 funds be available for our IHE applicants. It was also a really
25 big moment for our IHE folks as well because they had access to

1 full GR funds which was 7.52 million. We did see numbers
2 increase all across the board. In total, we received 48 IHE
3 applications, 10 of those were disqualified and so we had 38
4 responsive applications and I will note, of those 38, 34 of
5 those met the minimum 50-point requirement. It was a very strong
6 year for our IHE applicants. I don't have this information in
7 front of you but I did want to note just some of the occupations
8 we saw. It was a pretty even split across the board but the
9 three largest that we saw applied for, we had five welding
10 applications, four vocational nursing applications, and four
11 applications for EMTs. Those were the three big categories. I
12 will note this was also the first year that we allowed
13 applicants more than one submission, so nine IHE applications
14 took advantage of that and submitted two applications. We had a
15 first-time applicant, which on the IHE side was a pleasant
16 surprise with doing this since 2016. We did have a first-time
17 IHE application this year. Eighteen WDAs out of the 28 were
18 represented in those 38 responsive applications, and we did not
19 alter the maximum grant amount for IHEs so the parameters of
20 40,000 and 350,000 remained the same, but their average request
21 for these applications was 289,272. By all means, as I'm going
22 through this data, if there is a datapoint that's not included
23 and you would like us to look at in the future, we can either
24 address that in the interim or at the next JET Advisory Board
25 meeting.

1 UNIDENTIFIED: Any questions on these?

2 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes. [Inaudible].

3 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, absolutely.

4 UNIDENTIFIED: I have a question. Forty-
5 eight total IHE applications. If I recall, is it a 54 IHE
6 districts [inaudible] what was the max?

7 UNIDENTIFIED: I'm sorry. What was the
8 question?

9 UNIDENTIFIED: How many higher ed districts
10 are there in Texas?

11 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Community college
12 districts he's asking. What's the total number?

13 UNIDENTIFIED: It's around 53.

14 UNIDENTIFIED: It's a little bit higher.

15 UNIDENTIFIED: I thought it was a little
16 higher.

17 UNIDENTIFIED: I just [inaudible] percent.

18 UNIDENTIFIED: And if you will flip the
19 page, you'll see ISD numbers. This is where it really was
20 exciting with—I say 50 million. I do want to remind the board
21 that there was a five percent admin fee or admin accessible
22 funds for TWC so we are really talking about 47 and a half
23 million. That's still a phenomenal opportunity for our open-
24 enrollment charter schools and school districts across the
25 state. Overwhelmingly, we received the most applications any TWC

1 RFA has ever received with 207 total applications. There were 49
2 disqualifications and 158 responsive applications and 139 of
3 those met the 50-point threshold.

4 UNIDENTIFIED: What's the normal number, 207
5 in years gone by [inaudible]?

6 UNIDENTIFIED: If you look under tab 3,
7 there's kind of a historical breakdown but over the past few
8 years for responsive applications, 58 in '20, 62 in '18, 74 in
9 '17 would have been.

10 UNIDENTIFIED: [Inaudible].

11 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, sir. Again, I'm sorry I
12 don't have this included but I'll give you a quick breakdown of
13 some of the occupations we saw applied for. Welding is typically
14 a very popular one and that trend continued. We had 48 welding
15 applications submitted. Then we had 10 AC mechanics and
16 installers, 10 automotive service technicians, and then eight in
17 vocational nursing, and eight for medical assistants. This was
18 also the first year for our open-enrollment charter schools and
19 school district partners that we allowed them up to three
20 applications per eligible applicant, so we had 18 individual
21 applicants or entities who submitted the maximum three
22 applications. We had an additional 16 applicants submit two
23 applications. I think this is the big one. We had 63 first-time
24 applicants. I think a combination of the funding available and
25 the amount of projects that we'll be able to award and then the

1 enhanced strategic outreach that we covered earlier really
2 pushed the word about the JET program all across the state.
3 Twenty-two of the WDAs were represented on those 158
4 applications and the average request was 351. I do want to note
5 that we did raise the maximum value to 750,000, and as we look
6 through the masked list in a little bit, you'll see that there
7 were quite a few applications nearing that maximum value, but
8 there were still a lot of lower-value requests that I think
9 ended up kind of averaging it out to 351,000.

10 UNIDENTIFIED: Question on the 63, by any
11 chance do you have an idea, what's percent urban versus rural
12 [inaudible] from the new ones?

13 UNIDENTIFIED: I don't, for those 63. I can
14 circle back with you about that information, but ironically, we
15 are going to move into an urban, rural breakdown next.

16 UNIDENTIFIED: [Inaudible].

17 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes. Sixty-four total with
18 the one IHE. Moving forward, we wanted to do a deeper breakdown
19 of rural versus urban awards. Here you'll see a comparison
20 between what was awarded in '21. We also had a little bit more
21 money in '21. We had two million additional dollars versus what
22 we were able to award in FY22. Looking at FY21, you'll see that
23 we had a total of 15 awards for IHEs, four of them were rural,
24 11 urban. For our ISD partners, the breakdown was eight and 18.
25 So 31 percent of our awarded applicants in FY21 fell in that

1 rural category. If you jump down to this year for the projected
2 awardees, we had 11 rural and 15 urban, making a grand total of
3 26 for our IHE partners and then for our school districts we had
4 46 rural and 75 urban leading us to that 121 possible
5 application number. While the numbers are maybe a little lower
6 on the rural side, we are encouraged by the fact that they were
7 up seven percent again, even with so many more applicants coming
8 in this year.

9 UNIDENTIFIED: [Inaudible] I think that's a
10 great balance seeing the rural start to balance out the urban. I
11 think that's a good percentage and good direction where we're
12 going. Very quickly [inaudible] 49 disqualified. Generally, what
13 is the disqualification, we just send them a letter or email to
14 say they're disqualified or do we try to explain to them why and
15 help them understand that maybe it was [inaudible] program or
16 whatever it may be. Can you just give a quick analysis?

17 UNIDENTIFIED: I think one reason that
18 number is a little higher than previous years is we did, this
19 was the first window for charter schools and for Windham. If I
20 recall, Mary, the majority of that 49 were folks who were
21 partnering with an ineligible partner or did not turn in that
22 form period, which would be an automatic disqualification.

23 UNIDENTIFIED: There were several in there
24 also and it's a shame that they count towards the
25 disqualification number. They submitted the same application

1 twice. Like literally, we received it at 4:59 and 4:50 and we
2 looked at the applications and they were the same. So one
3 counted as disqualified because we couldn't accept two of the
4 same application and then as Matt indicated, there is a form
5 that is required to be submitted from the local Workforce
6 Development Board and if that form was either not submitted or
7 not signed, that was an automatic disqualification. I think
8 between a couple of those things, we saw more disqualifications.
9 We also had maybe one or two where there may have been the same
10 SOC code submitted, although an ISD could submit multiple
11 applications, they couldn't submit the same SOC code in multiple
12 applications.

13 UNIDENTIFIED: It's a good thing they have
14 another year of our increase, giving folks the staff and
15 [inaudible].

16 UNIDENTIFIED: We will definitely be
17 following up with anyone who was disqualified to ensure that
18 they understand especially whenever it comes down to some
19 technical aspects that otherwise they would have been able to
20 move forward in the evaluation.

21 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: So duplicate application
22 is really not a disqualification. They participate. How many of
23 those do you think there were?

24
25

1 UNIDENTIFIED: I would need to go back and
2 look at the list. [inaudible] Six of those so six really would
3 be subtracted.

4 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: So that's 43.

5 UNIDENTIFIED: So they might have even
6 gotten awarded possibly.

7 UNIDENTIFIED: It is very possible.

8 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: And then how many were due
9 to a bad partnership?

10 UNIDENTIFIED: Or the lack of a form?

11 UNIDENTIFIED: [inaudible] 23.

12 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: So that seems to be the
13 [inaudible].

14 UNIDENTIFIED: A comment on the SOC code,
15 let's say I'm a school district, San Antonio ISD [inaudible] but
16 in my same school district I cannot do nursing, nursing,
17 nursing. Is that what you're saying, that would be disqualified
18 as they're similar topics?

19 UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, one of the stipulations
20 for this past RFA was that the SOC code had to be unique per
21 application so in what you just described, they would not be
22 able to submit three nursing applications. We would essentially
23 take the first nursing application that we received.

24 UNIDENTIFIED: I'm thinking of those public
25 charters that have a campus in Austin, a campus in San Antonio,

1 a campus somewhere else, that's a little different setting in
2 that it might be the same program but in different [inaudible]
3 you know what I mean? So I don't know—I know we're not going to
4 do this in the years to come, right? More than one application
5 per district, and this is like—

6 UNIDENTIFIED: That will be based on the
7 recommendation of the advisory board and the commission's
8 action.

9 UNIDENTIFIED: This is so we know—

10 UNIDENTIFIED: It is unique. We haven't had
11 this experience in the past because previously only one
12 application was allowable so it wasn't something that had come
13 up before. And Mr. Lozoya, to your question earlier from a quick
14 review of the number of community colleges, it does appear that
15 there are about 53 if I remove all the duplicates accurately but
16 keep in mind state colleges are also eligible to participate so
17 we've got a few more eligible applicants in there as well.

18 UNIDENTIFIED: Then continuing on that same
19 trend, I wanted to go back and look at how many of the
20 applicants who we're potentially awarding did not receive
21 maximum points for their unduplicated student numbers so maybe
22 more rural schools or smaller programs or newer programs, and so
23 for the first one we're looking at IHEs and I included a
24 breakdown of how we score those different metrics. For 50 to 75,
25 that's worth five points, 76 to 125 is worth 15, and then

1 anything more than 125 unduplicated students is worth the
2 maximum. So of the 26 possible awards, 14, 54 percent, did not
3 receive maximum points for their student count with five of
4 those applications receiving the minimum point value.

5 UNIDENTIFIED: It doesn't matter if they're
6 rural or-

7 UNIDENTIFIED: I don't have a split there. I
8 apologize. I can look deeper.

9 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: But in terms of the
10 unduplicated student count, it's a count of students. It's not a
11 percentage of students who would participate as a percentage of
12 your student population, it's just the total.

13 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: So rural schools are at a
15 disadvantage from the get-go.

16 UNIDENTIFIED: If you have a smaller student
17 population, you're not going to-

18 UNIDENTIFIED: Right. I will note that there
19 is a little bit of checks and balances built in to the RFA so
20 whereas an urban school would only receive half the points for
21 their community value, a rural school would receive maximum
22 points in that specific category. We tried to do our-

23 UNIDENTIFIED: [inaudible]

24 UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, we try to-

25

1 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: What's the total number of
2 points for community value?

3 UNIDENTIFIED: I want to say for—it is at 16
4 percent of the total application. Is that correct, Carol? 16.67
5 percent.

6 UNIDENTIFIED: And I think you're going to
7 see on the next slide as it relates to school districts and
8 open-enrollment charter schools in terms of the number of
9 schools that are potentially going to be funded through this
10 round, that a significant number of those did receive a lower
11 number of points, and in some cases no points at all for their
12 students.

13 UNIDENTIFIED: And still might—

14 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, sir.

15 UNIDENTIFIED: And still are being
16 recommended for award, and that is because of that probably,
17 because of that rural-urban offset.

18 UNIDENTIFIED: The 26 possible awards and
19 the 121 possible awards are the potential awardees that we'll
20 review in the masked list.

21 UNIDENTIFIED: However, going back to your
22 initial question or your initial comment, Mr. Chairman, if you
23 wanted staff to look at whether this could be done as a
24 percentage of the total student population for a school, I think
25 we could look at that. It might be challenging in an initial

1 year to figure out what those appropriate percentages are until
2 we have a good understanding of the percentage of overall CTE
3 students within a school.

4 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: That's certainly the
5 prerogative of the budget board but what I would say is that
6 clear the deck on this. Let's get this moved. Let's get the next
7 round out when it's ready to get that out. What I might suggest
8 is that from this very large pool that we pull some
9 representative sample and we try to understand whether or not it
10 would have made a difference doing a percentage of the total
11 student population versus the way we think we've offset it in
12 terms of community value and student numbers. I do inherently
13 understand why you want higher student numbers but, in some
14 schools, 10 students is a huge part of the student body.

15 UNIDENTIFIED: Might be the graduating
16 class.

17 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It could be, yeah, and so
18 it's probably not something to hang us up. We're actually in a
19 little bit of a hurry to move this one out and get the new one
20 kind of posted and operating but I actually think it might be
21 worthwhile for us to do a little research and at a future date
22 come back and talk about this. I mean to revamp this for the
23 next round of funding would mean weeks, not anything other than
24 that but I think this is more of a-

25

1 UNIDENTIFIED: After we get through this
2 tranche of funding, something to look into.

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Something to look at,
4 that's my thoughts on it. I remain concerned about the rural
5 schools, and then, of course given my background, I classify
6 rural schools on the basis of their rurality but it's actually
7 the exurban schools. It's the ones that are still rural but
8 they're bumped up against a rapidly growing area. They are the
9 ones that are going to be at the greatest disadvantage. They're
10 also the ones that would get the greatest use out of this, and
11 so I actually appreciate the data. I don't think it's anything
12 to hang us up right now. I think it's worth a closer look, and I
13 think we've got the capability to crunch the numbers and know
14 the answers but not—I'm not so—I don't think it's such a problem
15 that it would somehow change the outcome of even the next round
16 of funding. I just think we have some time.

17 UNIDENTIFIED: To piggyback on what Mary was
18 saying, of those 121 school district and charter school
19 awardees, 50 percent did not receive their maximum point
20 threshold for student count, and 25 percent received the
21 minimum, and as Mary stated, eight possible awardees, their
22 program number was under 25 students so in that 10 to 20 range.
23 That concludes the data presentation.

24 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: OK, are there questions
25 before we move on? No? Move to Agenda Item 4, discussion,

1 consideration, possible action regarding grants to public junior
2 colleges, public technical institutes, public state colleges,
3 open-enrollment charter schools, and school districts.

4 UNIDENTIFIED: So it may help if you want to
5 remove the chart from tab 3, and then we can compare those
6 numbers and flip through the unmasked list under tab 4. OK, so
7 the first masked list that we are looking at is for our IHE
8 partners. Again, I know we ran through some of those numbers but
9 we'll briefly discuss them again. We had 34 applications meet
10 the minimum threshold, and as we flip through our unmasked list
11 here, that very back page—I'm sorry, the second page, you will
12 see the bolded amount at 331,000 so that is where our funding
13 for these applications actually ran out so we would be able to
14 potentially fund 26 IHE applications this year but I will note
15 that 34 of them actually met the minimum 50-point threshold so
16 again a very strong year for our IHE applicants.

17 UNIDENTIFIED: By design in my opinion
18 [inaudible] is always a lag behind a bit from what realities are
19 in the market. I think there's just some inherence there but
20 it's [inaudible] efficient ways of doing it and effective ways
21 of doing it. As far as the categories of specialty [inaudible],
22 for example, welders and nursing, law enforcement and some of
23 the other things that are addressed here, how do we try our best
24 to reflect what is currently or ideally what we believe based
25 off of the best information we have is going to be forecasted

1 those needs in our state from different employment sectors. For
2 example, oil and gas industry, it's up and down in the state,
3 right? [inaudible] There's going to be a different need. I'm not
4 say that's all welders do. There could be different needs at
5 different times in our state. We have labor challenges all over
6 our nation, particularly in our state. In my back yard, central
7 Texas, it's a real desperate situation [inaudible] unemployment
8 [inaudible] everybody's fighting for those people but something
9 that is of concern that is just kind of part of a lot of
10 different little hats I wear on the school board in Wimberley,
11 Texas, similar kind of type of community the chairman was just
12 talking about, and trying to recruit good teachers to that
13 community is [inaudible] effort. Law enforcement [inaudible] in
14 this region [inaudible] Louisiana and Oklahoma just to meet
15 [inaudible] jail standards because they don't have correction
16 officers. We're pulling law enforcement officers [inaudible] off
17 the street, putting them in the jails to meet the state
18 standards, and it's just one big massive circle. Add to that the
19 difficulty of probably who wants to be a teacher or a cop with
20 all these challenges that come with that but my point to this
21 is, and I just don't understand this process enough [inaudible]
22 so I'm asking the question. To say it plainly, do we try to
23 reflect what's going on in the market to the best of our ability
24 in order to meet the needs of Texas and not fund things that may

25

1 be outdated or we have reached a good standing [inaudible]
2 beyond the labor market. Does that make sense?

3 UNIDENTIFIED: It does, and so one of the
4 statutory requirements of this program is that the application
5 or occupation that they're applying for, the SOC code, is
6 confirmed to be high demand by their local workforce board so
7 they are in communication with their local workforce board to
8 not only identify those different high-demand and target
9 occupations, and I think we were hopeful that coming out of the
10 pandemic we would see maybe a wider variety of occupations
11 applied for. I'll remind you that last year I believe for our
12 ISD applicants, we awarded I think it was 75 percent welding
13 occupations, and this year we saw a much wider variety of
14 occupations, not only applied for but potentially awarded so
15 they are constantly up to date with what is in high demand in
16 their specific communities.

17 UNIDENTIFIED: I would just tack on to that
18 the statute requires that these be occupations in demand by
19 local businesses so we have to have documented evidence that
20 local businesses need these positions to be filled, and I know
21 we have used welding as an example but I think that there are
22 increasingly advanced forms of welding. We have been as an
23 agency working very closely for example with SpaceX, and they
24 are really doing some sort of cutting-edge, no pun intended, but
25 cutting-edge work for welding so things that we may not

1 necessarily always think of when we think of a shop class,
2 right?

3 UNIDENTIFIED: That's a great point. I have
4 nothing against welders. I grew up [inaudible].

5 UNIDENTIFIED: No, I understand.

6 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: You make a good point
7 because there's often conflict between the statewide list for
8 in-demand jobs and remarkably central Texas really at this point
9 resembles the statewide list for jobs that are in demand.
10 Another way you can look at it is jobs for which we see a high
11 number of vacancies, unfilled jobs, or we see jobs where the
12 number of unfilled jobs is growing. Interestingly, the statewide
13 list looks a lot like it did pre-pandemic. I'm talking 2019,
14 2018, early 2020. When we recovered just the number of jobs back
15 in November, we go through—what's our most recent numbers? June,
16 I guess. If we look at all the way through June jobs, nursing,
17 health care professions top the list, has for a while. Customer
18 service reps, general sales reps, customer support roles, IT,
19 truck drivers kind of get on the top 10 list, and they kind of
20 perpetually [inaudible]. What's interesting to me though is, and
21 I wonder if you'd be interested in it, I'd love to get the LMCI
22 guys to draw this up for it, you take the statewide list and you
23 run the 28 workforce board lists, you'll have regions in the
24 state where truck driver is like, there's never going to be
25 enough truck drivers, and it might rank sixth or seventh on the

1 statewide list, and so some of this gets driven by, depending on
2 what workforce boards they're in, in their community, that's,
3 you know. Here it's everything. In their community, it's the one
4 thing, right? I do watch this pretty carefully because I think
5 we want to—I'm like you, I want to make sure we're putting
6 equipment in place. Yes, we need tomorrow's employees but we
7 actually need next year's employees and the year after that.
8 Then we look at sectors of the economy that have recovered their
9 pre-COVID jobs, and the three that haven't are actually pretty
10 surprising to me. Mineral extraction is one, that would be oil
11 and gas, mining, that sort of thing. Construction was down in
12 June, down below their pre-COVID number. They've been up and
13 down. They kind of hover right around the line. The third one
14 was public sector employees which includes the police, the fire,
15 teachers, government employees, state government employees,
16 municipal government employees. There's different reasons for
17 that but I would tell you that if you just take an informal look
18 at the last 30 years of the state's economy when salaries have
19 risen and when it becomes a little bit of a worker's market, we
20 often have teacher, police, firefighter challenges because they
21 can take the skills that make them great at what they do and
22 make significantly more money elsewhere. The economy is always
23 on a cycle. We'll see what's going to happen but it's actually a
24 really valid point. The statute covers it but it does sort of
25 tell me we should probably communicate with you guys more about

1 kind of what's happening on the list and what's happening by
2 workforce board. It's very easy to get. We already have the
3 data. It's no burden to prepare that for you, and if you're
4 interested, I'll have them pull that together and get that to
5 you.

6 UNIDENTIFIED: [inaudible] Appreciate your
7 comments and not 100 percent [inaudible] I was just asking the
8 question.

9 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's a good question.

10 UNIDENTIFIED: Want to see what I see on the
11 ground every day working around this community, and particularly
12 get just a [inaudible] that community, what they're dealing
13 with, the big picture that's [inaudible] so it's a big help
14 [inaudible].

15 UNIDENTIFIED: Before we move on to look at
16 the other masked list, I did want to note that in 2020, the last
17 time we did a big data deep dive, we identified that there were
18 five WDA areas who had never received a JET grant. Most of them
19 had had applications submitted. After these potential awards,
20 that number would just be down to two workforce boards as three
21 of those five would have potential awards in these masked lists.
22 OK, so if you flip behind tab 5, and I'm sorry this packet is a
23 little bigger. There is not a great way of organizing 121
24 potential awardees. Very similar situation, and Mr. Norman, I
25 know you mentioned the-

1 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Just to clarify, we're
2 moving away from the IHEs now? We're going to talk about ISDs,
3 charter schools and Windham?

4 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, sir.

5 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Just so everybody gets it.

6 UNIDENTIFIED: It's a great problem to have
7 but from the 47.5 million dollars, with the applications we
8 received we would be able to exhaust that funding entirely with
9 the 121 potential awardees. So while this funding was available
10 for the biennium, we would have the opportunity to award the
11 full allotment this year.

12 UNIDENTIFIED: Did you all's communications
13 stress one way or the other how that was going to be handled?
14 You all didn't get into the amounts that were available?

15 UNIDENTIFIED: The IAC transferred over the
16 full allotment of the 50 million. I don't think originally, we-
17 we didn't have much heartburn to get the money out over a two-
18 year period. I don't think we expected to get it out over a one-
19 year period.

20 UNIDENTIFIED: I didn't think you would have
21 [inaudible].

22 UNIDENTIFIED: I think the fact that we are
23 still going to have eligible projects that we cannot fund even
24 with a historic amount of funding available says something about
25

1 the demand for this type of program within our local
2 communities.

3 UNIDENTIFIED: And just to be clear, these
4 masked lists show all applicants who met the 50-point threshold
5 so you'll see 139 applicants in this packet. As we award the
6 funding down, that would leave us with 18 applicants who
7 wouldn't be funded just because we ran out of funding but they
8 did meet the 50-point threshold.

9 UNIDENTIFIED: [inaudible]

10 UNIDENTIFIED: And I would say, you know,
11 obviously we are going to be able to fund more applications with
12 more money but whenever you view just the number of applications
13 received, that shows again the outreach efforts were incredibly
14 successful, and then the high percentage that are qualifying
15 with the 50 points or more shows that the materials that were
16 provided, the instructions provided prior to the opening of the
17 solicitation was helpful to applicants.

18 UNIDENTIFIED: And there's a large number
19 that are going for those much higher limits [inaudible].

20 UNIDENTIFIED: As you flip through you will
21 still find grant requests in the 80- to 90- to \$100,000 range
22 but then as you said, Scott, there were several that were closer
23 to that maximum request.

24 UNIDENTIFIED: The cap was what?

25 UNIDENTIFIED: 350,000 with a minimum of 40.

1 UNIDENTIFIED: Mr. Chairman, would you like
2 a motion on these recommendations?

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Is there any discussion or
4 are we ready for a motion? We can discuss [inaudible].

5 UNIDENTIFIED: I'd be happy to make a motion
6 to take staff recommendation to approve the [inaudible].

7 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right.

8 UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's been moved and
10 seconded. We also have item number 4 that's pending there. Is
11 that correct? [inaudible]

12 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Do you want to take them
14 separate or—

15 UNIDENTIFIED: I think so.

16 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Take them separate? OK,
17 his motion had simply the ISD, charter school.

18 UNIDENTIFIED: That's where the discussion
19 was.

20 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Let's take it. We've got a
21 motion, we have a second so that's open for discussion.

22 UNIDENTIFIED: I guess my question is do we
23 want to spend it all now and be done? I mean that's the question
24 or cut it off and have some for next time. I'm not of an opinion

25

1 either way. I'd love to hear the board's thoughts and staff's
2 thoughts on that.

3 UNIDENTIFIED: I think you asked a question
4 about the communication regarding the amount of funds available.
5 I know we indicated in the RFA that we would have approximately
6 50 million dollars available for awards as it relates to the
7 school districts and IHEs approximately 7.5 million with the
8 idea that we knew that some of those funds were going to have to
9 go towards administrative costs and there may be some latitude
10 needed there.

11 UNIDENTIFIED: But the communication
12 [inaudible] talk about the timeframe of this, talk about the two
13 years handed out-

14 UNIDENTIFIED: It did not but it was
15 specific to that RFA so I want to be up front about the idea
16 that the applicants for this believed that there was a certain
17 pool, approximate pool available.

18 UNIDENTIFIED: [inaudible] No objection.

19 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I find myself in the same
20 [inaudible]. If we funded the very last one, I'd say we could
21 push a little but we're leaving how many on the table here
22 unfunded?

23 UNIDENTIFIED: Eighteen.

24 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Qualified applicants.

25

1 UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, who met the 50 point,
2 wouldn't meet the-

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: My inclination is that
4 kind of demand-

5 UNIDENTIFIED: [inaudible] it will be back
6 to your normal appropriation next year? We'll have the seven to
7 decide how we want to spend?

8 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It will be about 7.5 and
9 then we'll have to decide how to split it.

10 UNIDENTIFIED: Well, [inaudible] an argument
11 to go to the legislature and talk about how successful this
12 program is.

13 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I agree with that at this
14 point.

15 UNIDENTIFIED: [inaudible]

16 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Any further comment?

17 UNIDENTIFIED: So this would be for those
18 that-all the way down to the cutoff.

19 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: The motion was to
20 [inaudible] staff's recommendation to fund through the entirety
21 of the money.

22 UNIDENTIFIED: To recommend to the
23 commission?

24 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: That's correct.

25

1 UNIDENTIFIED: Technically I would
2 [inaudible] would be happy [inaudible].

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Let's just pick up five.
4 We can come back [inaudible]. That's the motion. All in favor
5 say aye. All opposed. It's unanimous.

6 UNIDENTIFIED: Do we need a motion on-

7 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Let's pick up a motion on-

8 UNIDENTIFIED: I move to approve staff's
9 recommendation on the IHEs as presented.

10 UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's been moved and
12 seconded. Any discussion? All in favor say aye. All opposed.
13 It's unanimous.

14 UNIDENTIFIED: OK, the last thing we will
15 look at is behind tab 6. This will be for FY23 JET RFA program
16 parameters so as we just discussed, it does not appear that any
17 of the 50 million dollars will be remaining for next year so we
18 would be back to the 7.52 million of general revenue funds to
19 split amongst IHEs and open-enrollment charter schools and
20 school districts so that's the first piece that we'll discuss,
21 is how that funding should be split. In the past, FY21, we did
22 40-60 in favor of ISDs. Last year as we stated, IHEs received
23 100 percent because they were not eligible for the 50 million,
24 and that brings us to FY23.

25

1 UNIDENTIFIED: I think since the legislature
2 has expanded the ISD budget, open-enrollment, Windham, 40-60
3 probably makes more sense to me. I'll just throw that out there.

4 UNIDENTIFIED: Did you say it makes sense?
5 If I can add to that comment, I think years ago we bounced
6 around the idea of changing these percent and I think the data
7 has shown that it's a good percent going forward so I agree with
8 that.

9 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: At this point a
10 clarification to help my memory. My memory is that when an ISD
11 applies, they have to work in conjunction with the IHE, is that
12 still correct?

13 UNIDENTIFIED: By statute we require that
14 they--

15 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Does that apply to charter
16 schools as well?

17 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, it applies to charter
18 schools but not Windham School District.

19 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Windham kind of works
20 independently, and that was a separate bill but my point is even
21 when ISDs are working, IHEs to some great extent are
22 participating?

23 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, sir.

24 UNIDENTIFIED: And which pot of money do we
25 consider Windham, the ISD pot?

1 UNIDENTIFIED: The school districts.

2 UNIDENTIFIED: I'll move 40-60 for FY23, 40
3 percent IHEs, 60 percent open-enrollment charter schools and
4 school districts.

5 UNIDENTIFIED: I second.

6 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's been moved and
7 seconded. Is there any objection? No objection.

8 UNIDENTIFIED: The next parameter will be
9 the minimum-maximum grant amount. In FY21 the minimum was
10 40,000, maximum 350,000. In FY22 we kept that value the same for
11 IHEs but expanded open-enrollment charter schools and school
12 districts to a maximum amount of 750,000, and obviously without
13 that funding.

14 UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, I think we've got to
15 come back down if we want to spread this around. Do you all
16 have—does staff have a recommendation on the top end of 300
17 versus 350?

18 UNIDENTIFIED: Staff would recommend the
19 FY21 values of 40,000 and 350,000.

20 UNIDENTIFIED: Matt, do you have the—can you
21 remind us of the averages that we saw for—

22 UNIDENTIFIED: The averages for IHEs were
23 289,272 and for school districts and charter schools was
24 351,092.

25 UNIDENTIFIED: So it was still [inaudible].

1 UNIDENTIFIED: It was still in that range
2 even with the 750 cap.

3 UNIDENTIFIED: Ready for a motion? I'm fine
4 with going back to that range.

5 UNIDENTIFIED: Can I motion a staff
6 recommendation.

7 UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's been moved and
9 seconded that we accept staff's recommendation to recommend to
10 the commission a minimum of 40,000 and maximum application of
11 350,000. Is there any objection? Hearing no objection, the
12 motion carries.

13 UNIDENTIFIED: If you would flip that page
14 over, we have two more parameters to discuss. The next one is
15 number of applications per eligible applicant. Last year was the
16 first time that we had adjusted that to allow IHEs two
17 applications per eligible applicant while open-enrollment
18 charter schools and school districts were allowed three
19 applications per eligible applicant. Again, with the funding not
20 being available, staff would recommend that these values go back
21 to one application per eligible applicant.

22 UNIDENTIFIED: I'll make that motion.

23 UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's been moved and
25 seconded that the applications be limited to one application per

1 eligible applicant. Is there any objection to the motion?

2 Hearing no objection, the motion carries.

3 UNIDENTIFIED: OK, and then the last
4 parameter is minimum threshold. From FY16 to 20 we had judged
5 that at 60 points and then from FY21 on we have utilized the 50-
6 point threshold.

7 UNIDENTIFIED: This one raises the question
8 if the higher number of applications continues going forward, we
9 don't want to disappoint a whole bunch that are going to reach
10 50 but might not reach 60. I don't know. I mean I would hope the
11 applications continue to come in. Is there any psychology there
12 or anything? Do you all have thoughts on that?

13 UNIDENTIFIED: I mean it's like I don't have
14 a psychology license—

15 UNIDENTIFIED: So it's not necessarily like
16 a test grade score. It's more the impact that that project will
17 have so even a 50-point score isn't a bad score. That can still
18 very much be, and most of the time is a quality project so staff
19 would recommend leaving that number at 50.

20 UNIDENTIFIED: I just don't want us to have
21 scores of projects that meet that threshold but that our funding
22 is exhausted. That's where I was getting it.

23 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: So the bottom score on the
24 IHEs, the last applicant to get funded had a 71 score, and the

25

1 last applicant to get funded on the schools, the high schools,
2 was 121, is that right?

3 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, sir.

4 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Yeah, they had a score of
5 55.5. So charter schools—no, not charter schools.

6 UNIDENTIFIED: And that was with significant
7 more funding so that they got a lot farther down the list.

8 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Yeah, honestly, the IHE
9 list is double the funding they've have access to next time.
10 Seventy-one was the cutoff but they had scores that went up all
11 the way through 51 as the cutoff point. For whatever it's worth,
12 it's actually not a bad—it's a bad situation that you can't fund
13 everybody. I'd love to fund everybody but it's strength of
14 program when you do have competitive applications that don't
15 quite place in the money. I think the key there is for staff
16 with their outreach to work with them to improve their
17 application which is something that we try to do throughout the
18 program.

19 UNIDENTIFIED: Which is demonstrating need
20 going forward for more funding actually.

21 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Yeah.

22 UNIDENTIFIED: I think also to note that at
23 this particular time we have multiple applications [inaudible]
24 that kind of skews the sampling data, right? So I recommend that
25

1 we accept the staff recommendation but with one more cycle
2 sampling to consider to look at.

3 UNIDENTIFIED: To see how our applications
4 are—the numbers. If that's a motion, I'll second.

5 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: What was the
6 recommendation? Fifty?

7 UNIDENTIFIED: Fifty, yes, sir.

8 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's been moved and
9 seconded that the minimum point threshold be at 50. Any
10 additional discussion? Any objection to the motion? Hearing no
11 objection, the motion carries. Did we conduct all our business,
12 Matt?

13 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, sir.

14 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: We did except for the last
15 thing which is discussion, consideration, and possible action on
16 future meetings for this advisory board.

17 UNIDENTIFIED: Again, if there were any data
18 points that weren't covered sufficiently or a different sector
19 that you would like us to look at, by all means we can do that
20 in the interim or address that at the next JET Advisory Board
21 meeting.

22 UNIDENTIFIED: And I would like to make sure
23 that the advisory board understands the next steps in these
24 applications as well so that might impact too what they would
25 want to hear back from us on. So these applications that have

1 been recommended would go to commission hopefully on the 9th of
2 August, and then commission has an opportunity to review those
3 and hopefully approve your recommendations. After that our
4 grants team would very quickly move to notify the eligible
5 awardees, and we would begin contract negotiations with the idea
6 that once we notify everyone and understand that they are still
7 interested in participating in the program, we would send out a
8 public notification so you would be receiving that list of
9 awardees.

10 UNIDENTIFIED: Then if for whatever reason
11 you're not able to finalize the deal, then you start going down
12 the list?

13 UNIDENTIFIED: Absolutely right, so if for
14 some reason they had already purchased the equipment that they
15 were interested in or their circumstances have changed, then we
16 would begin to move down the list. I think that the motions that
17 were made today would allow us the flexibility to do that.

18 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: So, Mary, in the same vote
19 with the commission on the 9th of August, will we at that time
20 also vote the program parameters for fiscal 23?

21 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, sir.

22 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: And then when will--
23 assuming that passes, when would the RFA for fiscal 23 be
24 issued?

25

1 UNIDENTIFIED: Well, we're unable to provide
2 that information at this time. However, I will tell you that it
3 is our hope that it would be released as soon as practical.
4 We're unable to make an announcement in terms of when an RFA
5 would be-

6 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I understand but your goal
7 would be September-ish, October-ish?

8 UNIDENTIFIED: I think as soon as we are
9 able to get an RFA together and ensure that we've addressed all
10 the comments of the advisory board, then we would move forward
11 with that.

12 UNIDENTIFIED: Based on your dates and
13 timelines, when are these funds that we recommended today and
14 hopefully by the commission soon, when are those funds actually
15 end up in the school districts?

16 UNIDENTIFIED: We have our manager over our
17 grants team here with us today. Her team has already started the
18 preliminary work hoping for the approval of these so again,
19 award letters will be going out in August. Contracting probably
20 will take another 30 days, and then they are able to begin the
21 process of procuring-

22 UNIDENTIFIED: So sometime this fall.

23 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, absolutely with the idea
24 that depending on the nature of the equipment, they may be able
25 to start training students as early as spring.

1 UNIDENTIFIED: That's great.

2 UNIDENTIFIED: I have to do a comment for
3 everybody in the room. You know, as especially when [inaudible]
4 is commenting about industries, I just want to remind everybody
5 that in the spirit of [inaudible] continuous improvement, that
6 we consider the work that we do for the greater good of
7 workforce in the state, it reminds me that in the last eight, 10
8 years, we've really come a long way in establishing policy or
9 [inaudible] for decisions that are made here that have improved
10 the workforce that is in communities. For example, I remember 18
11 years ago, it would take [inaudible] six years to create a
12 technician, robot technician or something like that. Now with
13 JET the way it is, with e-tech the way it is, we have
14 [inaudible] we can pump out a specialist or some sort of
15 certification of [inaudible] in four years, not in six years. So
16 mitigating that workforce gap by two years in that timeframe is
17 a lot. As we make decisions like we have today, we're not going
18 to save the world. We're not going to solve all problems but
19 we're going to take positive steps to mitigate the overall
20 workforce needs of Texas. I just want to remind everybody that
21 sometimes we want things done our way quickly but it's a
22 process, and I think that process has been working and has kept
23 the state viable. In talking with the economic development
24 people, companies still come here because Texas is that kind of
25 state, right? That focuses on workforce [inaudible] and doing

1 good work. Congratulations to staff. You guys always surprise me
2 and impress me with the data. I like looking at data. Matt,
3 thank you for showing me that. That's what I want to say,
4 chairman. Thank you for the time.

5 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Thank you. Anything else
6 for discussion? If there's nothing else, we'd entertain a motion
7 to adjourn.

8 UNIDENTIFIED: So moved.

9 UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's been moved and
11 seconded to adjourn. Any objection to the motion? Hearing no
12 objection, the motion carries. We're adjourned. Thank you.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25