

Governor's Workforce Board RI
Strategic Investments Committee Meeting
June 27, 2011

Meeting Minutes

Committee Members present: Joseph MarcAurele, Martin Trueb, Brandon Melton, George Nee
Committee Members absent: William McGowan
GWB Staff present: Lisa D'Agostino, Nancy Olson, Dan Brown, Maureen Mooney
DLT Staff present: Charles Fogarty, Paul Genovesi, Sean Fontes, Mary Ellen
McQueeney-Lally, David Tremblay
Others Present: Judy Jones, Poverty Institute; Paul Harden, RIEDC

Call to Order

Chair MarcAurele called the meeting to order at 7:35 a.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Minutes of 6-17-11

Chair MarcAurele asked for a review of the meeting minutes of the June 17, 2011 Strategic Investments Committee meeting. He asked if there was a motion to approve the meeting minutes.

VOTE: G. Nee moved to approve, seconded by B. Melton. All were in favor, the motion passed.

Industry Partnership RFP Awards

Chair MarcAurele stated there was confusion surrounding the vote on the Industry Partnership Awards at the 6-17-11 Strategic Investments Committee meeting. He indicated that the vote from the 6-17-11 meeting must be deemed improper and that a new vote will be taken. He explained that during the process of the last vote a committee member, without any malice or forethought, abstained from the vote but continued to participate in the discussion. He stated that as a result, item C on the agenda for the Industry Partner RFP Awards needs to be presented again and voted again.

Sean Fontes, Executive Counsel at DLT, explained that as a point of order, there was no need for a motion to rescind the vote. He stated that the Chair has the authority to rescind the vote. With this said, Chair MarcAurele stated he rescinded the vote. Chair MarcAurele asked Nancy Olson of the GWB staff to present the request for funding.

N. Olson reviewed the information relating to the Industry Partnership awards presented to the committee members in their meeting packets. The information included a summary of the proposals received, the scoring minimum to be considered responsive, membership of the Technical Review Committee, history of the GWB Industry Partnership and previous solicitations, the FY12 solicitation, proposal requirements and scoring.

More specifically to the current RFP, N. Olson stated that the total request from proposals received totaled \$1.6M. She noted Attachment A which listed the organizations that submitted proposals as well as the amount of funding requested; Attachment B which listed the proposal scores by organization; and Attachment C which provided a summary for each of the applicants that met the minimum score of 70 (out of 100) and were considered responsive. N. Olson

stated that out of 10 proposals received, 2 proposals did not meet the minimum threshold and would not be considered for funding. These proposals were submitted by the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Rhode Island (AICU RI) and New England Institute of Technology (NEIT). She noted that with these 2 proposals eliminated, the total funding request was \$1.3M. She noted there is approval from the board for up to \$1M for the Industry Partnerships based on availability of funds. She stated there was a recommendation from both review teams to bring the health care groups together to form one partnership. She cited the recent Industry Skills Development Initiative (ISDI) as a successful model for combining partnerships noting that Quality Partners of RI and the Hospital Association of RI partnered in that initiative. N. Olson stated that the Technical Review Committee felt that all 3 health care proposals had value and recommended GWB staff negotiate to combine them into one health care industry partnership. She stated GWB staff would defer to the will of the committee on this recommendation. N. Olson noted that Tech Collective submitted two separate proposals because they fund two separate industries: Bio Technology and Info Technology. She indicated that Tech Collective did note in their proposal that if both were funded that any duplication of services during contract negotiations would be eliminated. She indicated that by combining the health care proposals and by eliminating any duplication in the Tech Collective proposals, there would be progress towards the \$1M in approved funding.

L. D'Agostino stated that traditionally the GWB staff work with each of the partnerships to review the key elements and refine them with the end result of creating new initiatives that are meaningful and provide a return on investment. She noted that to move forward with 3 separate health care partnerships would not provide the focus and collaboration that would exist by creating a true partnership by combining the three proposals. She noted that the Technical Review Committee was well-versed, and consisted of representation from education and other workforce development areas. She commented that they brought forth a good recommendation.

There was a discussion on the recusal of committee members from the vote. Brandon Melton indicated he would be recusing himself from the vote because he is on the advisory board of United Nurses & Allied Professionals (UNAP)/ RI Hospital Health Care Education Trust. S. Fontes asked George Nee if he was recusing himself. G. Nee stated that he is on the Advisory Board of Building Futures but noted that this is not a governing board, that he does not receive compensation or any personal gain. He stated he did not feel it was necessary to recuse himself based on this.

S. Fontes stated that based upon the by-laws of the GWB, provision 10 identifies what a conflict of interest is. He indicated that the language of the provision states that any board member that is voting with respect to an entity in which he has either a direct financial interest or any other interest constitutes a conflict of interest.

Chair MarcAurele asked N. Olson to summarize the motion before the committee. She stated the motion is that the recommendation of the Technical Review Committee is to combine the 3 health care industry partnerships and have them work together. N. Olson indicated that per the RFP, the GWB has the ability to negotiate all funding requests and not to fund over \$1M for all the industry partners if that is the will of the committee.

Sean Fontes stated that in his legal opinion, this motion involves an entity that presents a conflict with some committee members and that being in discussion violates the rules of bylaws. S. Fontes made the suggestion to make a motion which separates the entities so the conflict of interest issue will not present itself with respect to the entity that presents a conflict to G. Nee. He stated it is proper for the committee to make that motion, but needs to be clear in the language of the motion.

There was concern if there were enough members to vote based on recusals. S. Fontes advised that as long as there is a quorum, the votes are based on the votes cast. He stated that there are 2 committee members who are eligible to vote, and if the votes are the same, then the motion can pass.

A motion was made that GWB staff have the ability to negotiate contracts not to exceed a total of \$1M on the approved Industry Partnerships.

VOTE: M. Trueb moved to approve, seconded by J. MarcAurele. The motion passed.

G. Nee commented on combining the 3 proposals for healthcare into one Industry Partnership. He referred to the vote taken at the June 17, 2011 Strategic Investments Committee meeting to drop the lowest scorer, Quality Partners, which would decrease the \$1.3M funding request by \$168,000. He noted that the ranking of scores is a key determinate in funding for the Comprehensive Workforce Training Grants and that the same methodology should be applied in an attempt to stay within the approved funding for the Industry Partnerships. He noted that at the June 17th meeting, it was mentioned that one of the health care entities was not open to collaborating on the partnership. G. Nee noted the different approach for the vote on the Industry Partnerships in today's meeting and asked what happened in between meetings.

N. Olson responded that she was advised by legal counsel to make the same presentation to the committee as was done at the June 17th meeting. She indicated the next item to bring to the committee is the recommendation of the Technical Review Committee to combine the 3 proposals for the health care partners into one Industry Partnership. She noted the entities include the HARI, Quality Partners of RI and the UNAP/ RI Hospital Health Care Education Trust.

A discussion followed on the value of combining the healthcare partners. G. Nee stated he would stay with the earlier vote not to combine the 3 partners into one Industry Partnership. He indicated he was not sure of the outcome of grouping the 3 partners into one partnership for the amount of funding being provided to them. J. MarcAurele indicated that combining the 3 partners into one Industry Partnership is consistent with what the board has been doing over time, to elicit cooperation among stakeholders. He indicated that he felt it would be destructive to have 3 fairly similar efforts doing separate work and that it would be his recommendation to combine them into one partnership. M. Trueb stated that it makes sense to combine the health care partners and that it would assist in the process of eliminating the redundancies offered by the 3. Lisa D'Agostino noted that each health care entity has provided information on the administration of their program, defining the costs within the structure which includes staffing needs and other resources. She noted that there will need to be one entity that will be the lead organization for the partnership.

A motion was made to combine the 3 health care partners into one Industry Partnership and to cap total administrative costs at \$175,000.

VOTE: M. Trueb moved to approve, seconded by J. MarcAurele. B. Melton recused himself from the vote since he is on the Advisory Board of UNAP/RIH. G. Nee noted his opposition to this motion. The motion passed.

A motion was made to approve the remaining partners (excluding health care and the 2 entities that did not meet the minimum threshold for funding: AICU and NEIT).

VOTE: M. Trueb moved to approve, seconded by B. Melton. G. Nee recused himself from the vote because he is on the Advisory Board of Building Futures. The motion passed.

Other Business

With no further business, Chair MarcAurele asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: G. Nee moved to approve. B. Melton seconded the motion.
The vote was unanimous, the motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Mooney