

ACVETEO - ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT,
TRAINING AND EMPLOYER OUTREACH

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Thursday, December 18, 2014

SUMMARY MINUTES

THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING, AND
EMPLOYER OUTREACH (ACVETEO)

Frances Perkins Building
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Suite N-3437C
Washington, D.C.

ATTENDEES

Wayne Boswell, Director of Operations and Outreach
for TVP, OSD

Ross Cohen

Ryan Gallucci, ACVETEO, VFW

Nancy Glowacki

Gregory Green

Karis Gutter

Bob Simoneau, ACVETEO

Mike Haynie, ACVETEO

Richard Jones, ACVETEO

Keith Kelly, Chairman, VETS,
Assistant Secretary of Labor for
Veterans' Employment and Training, DOL

Mike Slater

Justin Stevens, National Governors Association

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Nancy Glowacki filled in for **Tim Green**, and opened by introducing Assistant Secretary **Keith Kelly**, who thanked a number of individuals, in particular **Mike Haynie** and **Bud Buchanan**. He introduced **Karis Gutter**, who detailed his expertise and responsibilities at USDA, and indicated his desire to partner with board members to assist in employing veterans in the agricultural arena.

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

Nancy Glowacki reviewed some housekeeping notes, including the location of the bathrooms, the cafeteria, and the coffee in the meeting room, which was made by **Mike Slater**.

At **Ms. Glowacki's** invitation, participants introduced themselves.

Mr. Mike Haynie made a motion to approve the minutes from the last board meeting. This was seconded, and all voted in favor of the motion.

DISCUSSION REGARDING FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULING

Mr. Haynie began by suggesting that there might be better attendance at future meetings if a greater amount of notice was given to committee members. He suggested that dates for the entire calendar year be determined within the next month. There was general agreement, and the feeling that two proposed dates for each quarter should be sent to all board members, and a consensus should be reached by the end of January. Suggested meeting dates were: March 3 through 5 and 10 through 12; June 9 through 11 and 16 through 18; and September 1 through 3 and 9 through 10.

Mr. Haynie explained that he thought they might be very flexible with the agenda, as there were really only two matters that needed discussion: the status of the committee's 2014 report, and the goals of the committee for calendar year 2015.

Regarding the latter, he thought it would be important to

identify, based on what the committee learned this year, and focusing on the 2014 report, what was learned in the subcommittees as a consequence of the work actually done in 2014, and how they might become areas of focus for 2015.

STATUS OF 2014 REPORT

Mr. Haynie indicated that the report was not finished in its entirety, but that it was nearing completion. At this point there is significant work being done to reformat input from the various committees to make it consistent throughout the report. He was hopeful that the following Monday everyone would have an electronic copy of the report.

Mr. Haynie went on to describe the substance of the report. The first section of the report details all of the recommendations. The second section of the report breaks down the recommendations by focus area, and also provides a narrative for each recommendation. The concluding section basically describes the process, and summarizes the substantive findings of the report.

The committee was tasked by **Mr. Haynie** to consider whether there were any exhibits that they wished to include in the appendices of the report that might support the committee's recommendations.

Mr. Haynie reiterated that the only thing left to do during today's meeting was to have a discussion regarding the goals and objectives of the committee for 2015.

DISCUSSION OF COMMITTEE'S GOALS FOR 2015

Mr. Haynie suggested the board come up with themes that they can use to focus their activities in 2015.

Gregory Green took this opportunity to remind all participants that their phones needed to be off the table so that they didn't interfere with the court reporter's equipment. Bob Simoneau suggested that the committee members be given contact information for everyone. **Mr. Haynie** said that he would be certain they were given that information.

Mr. Green indicated that Vietnam Veterans of America

had been invited to nominate a replacement for **Bud Buchanan**, who was leaving the committee. He promised to keep the committee informed as to any response by Vietnam Veterans of America.

Mr. Haynie suggested that the discussion begin with the outreach committee activities.

Ross Cohen described some of the activities and discussion that had been ongoing, particularly in terms of efforts to reach out to employers. Two-day educational summits have been held, where hiring agencies are able to speak directly with transitioning service members.

Mr. Haynie commented that he felt it was necessary to include the public-private sector at the table, recognizing those companies as potential employers, as well. Also important, he emphasized, was embedding these programs into the community infrastructures.

Wayne Boswell questioned how the committee might better integrate skill-based training into the communities.

Richard Jones mentioned that the job centers were key to this effort, and stressed the importance of noting best practices in the field.

Ryan Gallucci noted that many veterans are tapping into their education benefits after discharge, and that typical transition programs aren't necessarily set up to assist the student veteran in the same way they are to help the job-seeking veteran.

Mr. Boswell asked about information regarding others' best practices, and whether that might be made available to the committee.

Richard Jones indicated frustration that employers often don't understand the unique skill set that veterans bring with them. **Mr. Haynie** explained that the VCTP was a program that provided certificates to veterans, and that these complemented the unique skills obtained in the service with something that is easily marketable to employers. These certifications can be turned easily into jobs, as evidenced by

the success of this program.

Mr. Green asked for clarification of this last discussion, and **Mr. Haynie** indicated that he felt it indicated that a "community bucket" should be developed, and further communication should be had to determine what goes into that bucket. He emphasized, too, the importance of leveraging the public-private partnerships.

Mr. Jones and **Mr. Gallucci** both expressed concern for interagency collaboration. Many other members agreed that efforts that involved all agencies would be the most successful.

Mr. Cohen stressed the importance of having one place where a transitioning veteran might find all necessary information and guidance. He mentioned eBenefits, to which he belongs, and which he felt was a great concept.

Mr. Haynie stressed again his feeling that both interagency and public-private partnerships were important, while **Mr. Boswell** pointed out that all communities were different, and opportunities were varied, depending on the relationships, capability, and capacity with the communities. **Justin Stevens** suggested that there may be three buckets to be considered. The group fleshed out the three as interagency, intra-agency, and public-private partnerships (P3). **Mr. Haynie** redefined it as one collaboration bucket, while **Mr. Cohen** added that the focus should be on the transitioning population. Further, he suggested that the earlier "match-making" approach should not be the goal, but, rather, skill-based training. He suggested that the group leverage the P3 relationships to drive apprenticeship programs and skills training for the jobs that are actually available to veterans.

Mr. Cohen reminded the committee that the non-profits also need to be engaged. Further discussion defined the buckets again as interagency, intra-agency, and P3, with the focused population being the transitioning veteran. Members contributed ideas on ways to engage various stakeholders in the community and in the services to make this successful.

Ms. Glowacki asked how this approach would be different from the current employment workshops being held. **Mr. Gallucci** suggested that the new approach start earlier, before the service member transitions, in order to help him or her determine where he or she wants to end up, and then tailoring the path to meet that goal.

Mr. Boswell suggested that the best way to begin might be to educate service members on what each sector actually does, pointing out that many people aren't even aware of what the different industries (agriculture, transportation, energy, et cetera) have available for them, in terms of careers. **Mr. Haynie** agreed that this was a valid concern, supported by the data from a report indicating that many service members leave new employment within their first year because they weren't aware of what was entailed before they were hired.

Mr. Cohen initiated a discussion on the process involved in assigning committee members to each of these subcommittees, so that individuals weren't serving on multiple committees. **Mr. Haynie** suggested that perhaps the subcommittees would operate less independently than they have done in the past. It was concluded that communication was the key to success.

Mr. Stevens suggested that the three buckets become categories of focus for the current outreach subcommittee. **Mr. Gallucci** further defined them as work groups within the subcommittee. There was agreement again that the three new groups (interagency, intra-agency, and P3) would need to communicate well among each other, rather than work in a silo, in order to be successful.

Mr. Boswell suggested that it would be helpful to know the historical context for the committee development and goal-setting. **Mr. Green** pointed out that it changed constantly with new leadership, and that the current board was responsible for determining that very context and forward focus.

Mr. Haynie believed it would be helpful to have

someone from DoL come in and debrief the committee on the agency's reactions to their recommendations. He felt this would be a good way for the committee to learn.

Mr. Haynie reiterated the need to have dates set well in advance, perhaps a full year, in order that the full body of the committee might have the best chance of attending all meetings. He further suggested that membership in each of these new subcommittees be set ahead of time to save administrative work at the next meeting, and that all members consider people to bring to the meeting who will help them determine what the specific work of each subcommittee should be for the following year.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

William Offutt from Victory Media/GI Jobs asked whether the committee might wish to look at the balance between contractors and LVRS and DVOPS. He felt as though the contractor input far outweighed that of LVRS and DVOPS. It was discussed among the committee that this question was one that should be asked when talking about collaboration in the future. **Mr. Gallucci** mentioned specifically that it would be a good area in which to query the transition managers at DoD.

Ron Drach from National Organization on Disability added to the discussion by expressing concern that the contractors who now represent the majority in these programs have not gotten the same kind of training.

Mr. Offutt offered another concern regarding the lack of control that this body has over DoD contractors in the TAP program, while there is some control over LVRS and DVOPS. There was ensuing discussion regarding the effectiveness of the current programs. **Mr. Boswell** pointed out that effectiveness measures have changed, as the process has changed over the past few years. He also indicated that there was some data that he could provide that might address these concerns further.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:11 p.m.