

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

JUNE 25, 2014

SUMMARY MINUTES

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

June 25, 2014

Washington, D.C.

ATTENDEES

MR. TIMOTHY GREEN Director, Office of Strategic Outreach,
VETS, U.S. Department of Labor, ACVETEO
DFO

MR. ERIC EVERSOLE ACVETEO Vice Chairman, V.P., Executive
Director, Hiring Our Heroes, U.S. Chamber
of Commerce

MR. KEITH KELLY Chairman, VETS, Assistant Secretary of
Labor for Veterans' Employment and
Training, DOL

MR. RYAN GALLUCCI ACVETEO, VFW

MR. TONY CAMILLI Alternate DFO, VETS, U.S. Department of
Labor

DR. NANCY GLOWACKI U.S. Department of Labor, VETS
Deputy Under Secretary, Veterans
Administration, ACVETEO

MR. CURT COY President, Wounded Warrior Project Board,
U.S. DOD Recovering Warrior Task Force
Executive Director, Helmets to Hard Hats,
ACVETEO

MR. DARRELL ROBERTS Deputy Director, Policy Office of Federal
Relations, National Governors
Association, ACVETEO

MR. DAVID QUAM Small Business Administration, Associate
Administrator, OVBD

MR. RHETT JEPPSON Victory Media, GI Jobs

MR. BILL OFFUTT Director of Operations and Outreach,
TVPO, Office of the Secretary of Defense

MR. WAYNE BOSWELL Hire Our Heroes, U.S. Chamber of Commerce
Foundation

MR. ROSS COHEN LVER for Washington, D.C., DOES

MS. LINDA LEE DOL, ACVETEO

MR. GORDON J. BURKE, JR. National Association of State Work Force
Agencies (NASWFA)

MR. MARC KATZ Veterans Program Coordinator, D.C., DOES

MR. CHRIS ROLLINS

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Tim Green opened with welcome and thank you remarks.

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

VETS Chairman, **Keith Kelly**, remarked that due to the absence of the Chairman, Prof. Mike Haynie, that Mr. Eric Eversole would be the number two member to take over, and thanked him for his attendance on short notice. Mr. Kelly acknowledged Mr. Curt Coy's appearance on a CBS television broadcast in remembrance of the 70th anniversary of enactment of the GI. Bill.

Mr. Kelly welcomed everyone to the Department on behalf of the President and Secretary of Labor Perez and thanked them for their service to vets and their attendance, and he remarked that ACVETEO's three new subcommittees, Employer Outreach, Focus Populations and Transition For Service Members were pressing areas of concern of VETS at the Department of Labor, anticipating the subcommittees' recommendations as to how VETS and the Department can improve veteran employment outcomes in these three areas. Mr. Kelly announced **Mr. Tony Camilli** would share recent unemployment data from the DOL, which dataset VETS would relay information at the committee meetings serving as a sober reminder of the purpose of the committees. The statistics would reflect real, unemployed veterans, real stories with a unique story of the personal challenge that vets face, and the goal of the committee to help the vets find their footing.

Mr. Kelly iterated his commitment to the veterans' cause for those committed to the cause of veterans and transitioning service members, et al. **Mr. Kelly** also said "President Obama and the First Lady have been very aggressive in that," as well as Vice President and Dr. Biden and the Congress are "counterparts of the VA and DOD and across the Federal Government, and SBA as well, Commerce." Mr. Kelly then thanked the members of his staff -- **Tim Green, Tony Camilli, Mike Slater, Nancy Glowacki and Gordon Burke** -- for their work and support. He then announced the Assistant DFO Tony Camilli and presented Mr. Camilli with the Meeting Agenda.

Mr. Camilli thanked Mr. Kelly and remarked that appointees to the committee were required to submit OGE form 450, a financial

disclosure document, and reminded them to turn in their forms expeditiously. He also reminded attendees to include the executive summary of the previous meeting in their binders. **Mr. Kelly** requested **Chairman Eversole** in his role as vice chair to call a vote on the minutes and request their approval. **Mr. Camilli** iterated **Mr. Kelly's** remarks that the handout labeled "Veterans Employment Update for May of 2014" was available, and that as part of their role running the advisory committee, at beginning of every meeting some basic information would be provided to the committee as a starting point.

Mr. Camilli called attention to the fact that one of the subcommittees is unemployment, and the most recent unemployment data numbers for female veterans in the 18- to 20-year-old cohort. Highlighted in the handout are data, and the tables are not seasonally adjusted. He noted also that some of the data points did not meet BLS's criteria for publication. The monthly data were so small in numbers that negative or positive conclusions could be drawn that may or may not be useful or could be used the wrong way.

BLS strongly recommended looking at the data over a longer period of time, but was ready to provide that data on a monthly basis. **Mr. Camilli** then called for questions about the Veterans Employment Update for May of 2014. He then introduced the guest speaker, **Ms. Linda Lee**, a local veterans' employment representative.

Ms. Lee thanked the committee for inviting her to speak, then began her presentation on "Duties of Local Veterans' Employment Representative (LVER)". **Ms. Lee** said she responded to the Committee's request to give an overview of her duties and responsibilities as a LVER, that she was enabled by *U.S. Code*, Title 38, Chapters 41 and 42, and fully aware of the refocusing roles of the DVOPs and the awareness of the Wagner-Peyser staff at the American Job Center. **Ms. Lee** said that she did not service veterans with significant barriers to employers, that it was the role of the DVOP.

Ms. Lee continued that some of the duties and responsibilities as a LVER were conducting outreach to employers and noted that she facilitated employer workshops and conducted two-day job readiness workshops in conjunction with the DVOP staff. **Ms. Lee**

stated her endeavor takes her "one step further," going online to various search engines such as Career Builder, ND, and Monster. She provided referrals to training and supportive services; promoted credentialing and training opportunities; coordinated with business orgs and apprenticeship programs to promote the employment of veterans with DOES.

She added that questions to be asked of prospective employers are: Can I contact you once a month for updates and feedback; and does your company offer any type of training as part of her employer assessment. After sending a job announcement to the DVOP team she would ask them "Will you canvass your case log to see whether you have a job-ready veteran." The Wagner-Peyser staff have quality veterans who are job ready. **Ms. Lee** stated that her LVER tool kit contains resources that keep her on track: assessment forms, activities, employers/ veterans referral lists -- the American Job Center Job Ready Veterans List. The VEVRAA list consists of individuals employers who supposedly hire veterans. She noted that **Mr. Rollins** is the program manager for VEVRAA. She then provides potential employers with "The Benefits Of Hiring a Veteran" pamphlet.

Ms. Lee stated that contacting veteran employment program officers and requesting Schedule A job announcements, if they're 30 percent or greater, allows the LVER to try to fill that position first. Sending a list of the VPO to be contacted, requesting their Schedule H of announcements -- thinking outside of the box. Promote the eBenefits website to encourage employers to hire or make a commitment to hire veterans, requesting that they make a commitment to hire a veteran.

Ms. Lee maintained that one of the things that **Mr. Rollins** suggested she do is conduct a federal contract veteran employer hiring fair, and said that she was definitely scheduled to go to the NVTI training in August.

Mr. Coy asked how many veterans were in her portfolio that she was working with. **Ms. Lee** replied she was not working with the veterans, unless they were job ready, and her duty was to only match them with the employers that were already onboard. The number of

veterans she was not sure. **Mr. Jeppson** inquired how many connections would Ms. Lee make in a month, to which **Ms. Lee** answered at least two or three job fairs a week. **Mr. Coy** asked how many employers were in the portfolio. **Ms. Lee** responded she did not have the information, as requested, but the first handout she gave showed three for the month of January.

Mr. Jeppson asked **Ms. Lee** when she got a report back as to how they did on their interview, how many of those interactions would she see in a month, to which she responded as far as referral was concerned, maybe about 20 or 30 a month, 20 or 30 qualified individuals.

Mr. Boswell asked whether that was the prescreening, review the resume, her analysis and assessment. **Ms. Lee** affirmed that it was.

Mr. Coy asked when talking to these employers, and some of the jobs require some level of training or skill set, did she find that out because there's a lot of veterans -- particularly those post-9/11 veterans -- that had GI Bill benefits available to them and they could match up their benefits with particular opportunity, and how did she make that match. **Ms. Lee** answered that it was a part of her employer assessment.

Mr. Jeppson inquired how much she knew about the VOP Rehab Program. Ms. Lee responded that she knew about the VOP Rehab Program. **Mr. Jeppson** said the SBA had a group as big as the DVOP at SBA, and he found that some don't know about it.

Mr. Coy asked Ms. Lee when she spoke with veterans about the eBenefits website and employment center and when she talked to employers, did they tell her to send them a vet that has all the qualifications they want, whatever those things were; or, if they were making commitments to hiring veterans and they want to hire 2, 3, 4, 5 million a month or a year. **Ms. Lee** said she just came onboard with the eBenefits and getting the employers to go to that site and make a commitment.

Mr. Roberts noted that his thoughts were the NVTI training every LVER receives, and asked how different was her flow chart or the

work she did as opposed to what she trained for as LVER. **Ms. Lee** responded that she had not received the refocusing training as far as the LVER was concerned. **Mr. Rollins** stated that with regard to the NVTI question, NVTI was currently revising their curriculum because of the new rules and responsibilities, specifically for the LVER.

Mr. Rollins added that those are to LVER-specific classes that they've developed a curriculum. **Ms. Lee** is scheduled to attend two classes in August. All the other DVOPs are scheduled to go between now and September because of the refocus classes and new careers.

Mr. Coy asked **Mr. Green** and **Mr. Kelly**, whether there was a way to work with them to ensure that eBenefits was included so that it became part of the curriculum. **Mr. Kelly** thought that it absolutely would be made part of it. **Mr. Coy** remarked that rather than reaching out to them, if they're all going through the training academy, it should be one, consistent message. **Mr. Green** stated that **Mr. Dennis Johnson**, was in the office and they would be able to work on it. There is a course and it's a unit that's available online that covers all of the established benefits through the VA through the VEC.

Mr. Boswell asked "How can we help you?" Having redesigned the Transition Assistance Program, they have a better informed service member that comes out today on their benefits in connection to the VA and DOL. He asked from what she had seen from her population in serving them, how could TVPO do a better job of making the veterans aware of all of these resources and capabilities.

Ms. Lee iterated that she thought as far as marketing was concerned, the more a veteran sees something over and over and over again, then they're going to get on board; and the reason why they don't know is because it's not enough information that's being put out. **Ms. Lee** inquired that as far as literature, the LVER demonstrating the benefit of the employer hiring a veteran, if you were an employer, what would you want. The tax credit is no longer available for employers hiring veterans with a significant barrier to employment. Marketing materials and advertisement would help.

Mr. Gallucci said as far as one of the problems the VFW has

had is when an employer reaches out to us, they've been largely unaware of what LVERs are. **Mr. Gallucci** inquired of **Ms. Lee** whether when she interacted with potential employers or partnerships were they familiar with what an LVER is supposed to do or what the scope of those services were, to which she responded "No."

Mr. Kelly said how do you help get the word out to help drive the public information. **Ms. Lee** added that because once the veterans got ahold of anything they would pass it on to their fellows, come up with some type of slogan that drives them to us.

Mr. Jeppson suggested the importance of synergy and coordination across the agencies and asked whether they were grants to the states or to organizations. **Mr. Kelly** responded to the state government, e.g., NASWFA, National Association of State Work Force Agencies. **Mr. Jeppson** stated there are veterans' business outreach centers.

Mr. Kelly stated if it wasn't the margin money, it was to pay salaries as they're given the money. He said he didn't know how many disabled veterans reps she had in there, but they're doing the hiring. **Mr. Jeppson** agreed, stating "When you put the grant in there, they were all called."

Mr. Kelly remarked that the States are very proud of branding when he speaks with the National Governor's Council.

Mr. Jeppson stated the problem was that there weren't too few programs up there, that they got lost in all the targets that are out there. Start to build some traction.

Mr. Boswell added that "We've got to get out of our scope. So when they come in to see Curt's team, we are talking about VA. And when they come in DOD, establishing the connection between the installation commander and the local job center. We've got to utilize that to ensure that the veteran knows those key connection points and resources based on the requirements of the agency."

Mr. Coy asked if there was a list of all the DVOPs that are serving as there were 2600 of them, to which **Mr. Kelly** responded there were. **Mr. Coy** asked was there a way to hold this somewhat close, but to get information out.

Mr. Jeppson stated that when you have that message, you don't know we've got hundreds of thousands of small businesses on our list here. And we've got the new portal that we built, we tell them how they interact with that message. **Mr. Boswell** added that it's also on the VSOs who make that community connection, because they're another entry point for those veterans in the community to get resources for support.

Mr. Kelly remarked that working with the ETA in the Department, which has 2500 aid locations of the American Job Centers, in most cases that's where the DVOPs and LVERs are located. **Mr. Green** noted the NVTI was keeping a list, but weren't maintaining it because it was not part of the contract. They're going to go back and check with NVTI and see if it can be updated. **Mr. Kelly** agreed. **Mr. Katz** said he would also check.

Mr. Offutt cited the *GI Jobs* article on the 50 top cities for veterans in America, and Washington, D.C. was ranked number 17. **Mr. Gallucci** said the transition subcommittee had begun to consider that.

Mr. Green announced the next item on the agenda.

OUTREACH SUBCOMMITTEE BRIEFING AND DISCUSSION

Chairman Eversole began by stating that outreach was a critical focus of what can be done as a group. The committee had three basic recommendations: How do we agree upon federal outreach efforts as a whole; how do we develop basic performance measures to ensure that we have good quality across all our efforts; and then how do we improve our efforts to focus on small- and medium-sized employers for veterans hiring. How do we coordinate among the various federal agencies that have a role in reaching out to veterans? How do we make sure that there is a consistent message across, and what are the core messages? What are the core functions that we should really be reaching out to with veterans? From the subcommittee's perspective it's one of those issues that's absolutely critical to understand from a basic, core perspective: how do we reach out to veterans and what is that message personally.

Chairman Eversole noted the National Governor's Association

had agreed to work to map and look at agencies that are involved in this space and doing outreach to employers -- both in the private and federal sectors. The cause of our problem is that we have a thousand flowers out there, and someone's got to start tending the garden.

From a National Governor's Association perspective 55 CDOs who come in believe they're all boss.

Mr. Boswell added that they're now engaged with DOL, VA and DOD, collectively. They also own to a certain degree the work force shaping nationally, based on agenda where that industry or market is going.

Two real organizations would be Department of Transportation and Department of Energy that we're currently working with. We want to get access to employers in that industry and also training opportunities.

Mr. Quam remarked that involvement of the First Lady and the White House is a unifying point at the present level. **Chairman Eversole** added that they had been invited, and **COL Parker**. **Mr. Coy** said the Veterans Employment Center needed to come up with strategies pretty quickly, as it developed a site and now needs to generate some success. He set a deadline of August and maintained the VEC needed good strategies on how to grow those numbers quickly.

Chairman Eversole said it was absolutely critical when showing a unified front they get behind providing basic level services and bring together services. But part of the concern is having a discussion about what basic services are needed for the veteran.

Mr. Kelly remarked that with the portal and the Veteran's Employment Initiative, there are three or four key things we're looking at in employment. There's 40,000 some groups out there, non-profits, that are using veterans somewhere in their title to do something.

Mr. Quam stated "Ask our federal partners a straight-up, basic question: what do you need to do that. What could this committee say to all departments, okay, this is a barrier to us getting this done? What do we need to tell all of our federal partners?"

Mr. Kelly said he would simplify it and look at NASA a little bit.

Mr. Boswell agreed stating that it was unclear in his message, but TVPO is focused on delivering what it has to keep them voting to delivery, but it's also about capturing, serving and then referring.

Mr. Roberts added that the task force had no people and no money individually for the interagency task force, so not super effective.

Mr. Coy agreed, adding that "We need an overarching mass pitch-in. We need a sort of single commitment."

Chairman Eversole added that from his perspective, they're facing one of the single largest transitions that our military is going to face since the end of the Cold War. Service members should make decisions from an economic point of view as to the best economic opportunity for that service member. He stated that 60 or 70 percent of new jobs are created out of small business, and that in small- and medium-sized business communities, the veteran hiring now is very happenstance.

Chairman Eversole continued, saying the committee would launch a virtual best practices tool August 12th geared towards small- and medium-sized businesses. **Mr. Coy** added that as a group recognizing those small and medium employers for some of their efforts could help; a showcase ACVETEO award or a joint Chamber, NGA, VA, Labor award, SBA or DOD award for best practice, a trophy.

Mr. Jeppson said the opportunity existed for the National Small Business Week can partner with the Chamber to recognize their focus is on the business itself. **Mr. Coy** suggested the Chamber could approach companies regarding the awards program and cocktail party. **Mr. Roberts** added that he'd been doing something similar for many years by "Keeping the Promise Award" handouts. **Mr. Jeppson** said that with SBA they nominate at the local level, the district level, and the state level.

Mr. Boswell reminded the committee that ESGR has their freedom award, publicity for five, large-, small- and medium-sized

companies. **Mr. Jeppson** iterated that ESGR did a good job recognizing employers who took care of their veterans, especially when they mobilized. **Chairman Eversole** said from his perspective there was an award for small- and medium-sized businesses, and another program had been launched on that stage to provide resources on the state level. **Mr. Quam** stated that hearing directly what works, what do they need, would help in crafting recommendations. Mr. Boswell said they were providing support.

Mr. Jeppson thought people who were going to be brought in to do that, were people who got it right. **Mr. Coy** agreed, commenting that the outreach piece was clearly a challenge.

Chairman Eversole added that once again folks have long been on the small-, medium-sized basis, and the other program they're getting ready to launch would be small-, medium-sized businesses that could take advantage of it, because it's launching a new, virtual platform free for all businesses. **Mr. Quam** stated the subcommittee had done a great job of focusing on the report recommendations.

Chairman Eversole agreed and announced that the committee would take a break, after which Mr. Kelly announced the next subcommittee "Focused Populations."

Dr. Glowacki iterated that **Mike Haynie** was not there and had requested her to brief on his behalf for the subcommittee. **Gordon Burke** and she had brought some materials to be handed out and briefed. There were two areas that were considered as possible recommendations that ultimately it was decided were a better fit for the other two subcommittees.

Dr. Glowacki began with how the Women's Bureau had done a contracted literature review. While those products were not intended for public distribution, it allowed her to pull everything that is true lit review into her own document and add missing pieces. She also added her findings from the 2012 annual averages for the unemployment statistics and added a breakdown on racial categories and trends seen there.

Dr. Glowacki's advice to the committee making recommendation was to have more statistically significant monthly data. **Dr. Glowacki**

asked the committee to consider that. There were some key findings she pointed out shown in the gaps in the back, specifically pages 71 and 79, and asked the committee to please read the disclaimers on the front.

The three key findings were women serving in the military could be doing jobs similar to military men, but women veterans were doing jobs similar to other women, which she believed was very significant, because there's currently a presidential level focus on increasing non-traditional careers for women, which include STEM. They're not limited to STEM, but the non-traditional careers are usually those that have 70 percent men or greater. And those are typically the jobs that pay better, have greater benefits packages. **Dr. Glowacki** was unsure as to whether it was the area to mimic other women rather than male veteran peers.

Dr. Glowacki acknowledged that women veterans who were there would go to her and say "I never knew about this. Why didn't I know about this," and she did not know the answer.

Dr. Glowacki's next document was a VA document, a full report from its most recent advisory committee report in 2012.

Dr. Glowacki continued with items currently under consideration as recommendations for the subcommittee: "Consolidation of public and non-public or unpublished data available to DOL, produced by DOL, or accessible to DOL by other agencies on the employment and career status, earnings, education." Consider requesting information on public perceptions of women veterans and impact on their career selection opportunities, a great recommendation. **Dr. Glowacki** stated "What we know and what we have is in the literature review that I handed out for the woman veterans."

Dr. Glowacki said she had requested the subcommittee look at what she had, take a look at the gaps for that focus population, and then determine were there any ideas they'd like to look at for all three focus populations, and then how it should be done; a six-month to a two-year contract to do something like that.

Dr. Glowacki said her question to them was take a look at what we know here. She noted the committee didn't want to spend all

its time researching, analyzing, and not helping the veterans today. Her next point went to helping current veterans: "Review of and corrective action taken on messaging related to veterans and all DOL services." She believed it was a very good idea and cited as an example the women veteran piece, using one of her three populations.

Dr. Glowacki stated there were "lots of ways to attack that". She had a number of women go to her afterwards and tell her it was the first time they'd been in an event where the panel actually included a woman veteran.

Dr. Glowacki mentioned that **Ms. Lee** submitted her research showing women veterans have particular challenges in transition. They'd also like to receive a briefing on the NVTI training for DVOPs and LVERs, particularly on entrepreneurship, career choices, pathways from service to career, including education, then on to careers.

Dr. Glowacki stated that while she thought that would benefit all of their veterans, there was a particular need for some of our focus populations. And the last point, "Any available information on industry sector choice of Women Veterans, Wounded Warriors, Native Americans, any differences or similarities," what is known on the women's piece is in the lit review.

Dr. Glowacki thought that one certainly deserved some careful consideration. And then "Considerations for other subcommittees," there were two areas where the committee came up with some very good ideas for recommendations. So to the Outreach Committee, "Examine the strategy for outreach from ACVETEO to provide private sector employment consortia" tied into some of the earlier discussions.

Dr. Glowacki requested the outreach committee to please read through it and give it careful consideration, and connect with Mr. Haynie to inform them whether it was something to be added to the committees' tool box, or if they wanted to throw it back into theirs.

Dr. Glowacki asked the committee to give careful consideration to their focus populations when they were doing things like that. Should it belong to her and Mr. Haynie, let them know that.

Mr. Boswell asked was that included in that education, to which **Dr. Glowacki** replied it was.

Mr. Boswell stated apprenticeship was covered in the VA's career technical training track and there were two tracks: one that focuses just on accessing higher education, community college and college editors; and one that's directly on CTT, the Career Technical Training Track offered by the VA. **Mr. Coy** added that the Labor Department was part of the TAP curriculum. Their data populated the training for TAP.

Dr. Glowacki asked **Mr. Coy** whether he was talking outside of the employment workshop or about the other tracks, to which **Mr. Coy** responded he was speaking generically. **Dr. Glowacki** asked whether it was during the employment workshop or during the other tracks. Was that happening during the rest of the week? **Mr. Coy** said it was happening right up front in the DOD's portion of their program.

Dr. Glowacki agreed that was happening but it wasn't happening sufficiently. **Mr. Coy** then said it was happening in the work book and that they are provided that information in the work book. **Dr. Glowacki** asked if there were any questions from the committee. **Mr. Roberts** said he had a statement on construction in their contract, that there was a huge push for them. The biggest issue they faced as a non-profit was after finding them, how to get to them to tell them to take a look at apprenticeship in the building trades, to look at contractors.

Mr. Roberts further added that once they started apprenticeship there, they had a job and they were earning middle class wages. Their biggest issue was how do we find them.

Dr. Glowacki asked him how he worked with the American Job Center, to which **Mr. Roberts** replied "Locally, if we can't fulfill our data, then we reach out to Heroes To Hire."

Mr. Roberts said that it had always been a marketing issue since back in '07 when he took it over. He noted they were trying to find ways to subidentify all veterans, women veterans and put together panels with women veterans that they had already helped place.

When **Dr. Glowacki** asked **Mr. Roberts** were they also

targeting working women or just women veterans, **Mr. Roberts** said they hadn't looked over working women, meaning the women trades. **Dr. Glowacki** said she wondered if they would see similarities or differences in the success rate of different approaches, because there's a tendency to be veteran trends and gender trends. **Mr. Roberts** agreed stating that there are employed and underemployed.

Mr. Boswell remarked that from the DOD perspective, before they transition, there really are no special populations. When TVPO engaged with women veterans, a lot of them didn't even identify as women veterans after they separate from the service. TVPO had a database of about 153,000 factored.

Dr. Glowacki asked how he saw that being done and would that be a consolidation from Fed to Fed and then filter up and filter down, and **Mr. Boswell** said he thought it would be a distribution out through installations running those programs and they were trying to do the same thing on a second committee called the employment working group identifying national job fairs, employment fairs to get the information out. He stated they would provide that information down to their installations as well.. **Dr. Glowacki** said she thought it was a great idea.

Dr. Glowacki continued that per discussion with the SAC committee she had to agree with him that there are considerations still under development with the broader working women community.

Mr. Boswell noted there were several populations they thought had some issues or challenges as they separated 18 to 24 retired women service members, that the challenge was how to target specific information for all of those service members in a way that was targeted just for them in a class where they all want to be seen as being together as a team. **Dr. Glowacki** said to keep it brief, because it was a lot of information at one time.

Mr. Gallucci asked about educational attainment for women versus male veterans. He asked **Dr. Glowacki** had she anything indicating whether skills attainment was possibly skewing some of the data on female veteran employment, especially for younger female veterans.

Dr. Glowacki responded that, number one, it was an area of two populations overlapping. Women are more likely than men to obtain a college degree; veterans are more likely than non-veterans to obtain a college degree. Number two -- two stats that just don't agree. She continued saying that when looking at the age groups under 35, the highest rates of unemployment were those with college degrees.

Mr. Gallucci inquired whether that's what she meant by focusing on growth industries, and **Dr. Glowacki** responded, "Yes."

Dr. Glowacki added that they just didn't know, but the stats didn't make sense under the age of 35. There were trends that the trends match the trends of non-veterans and the female to female.

Dr. Glowacki then turned to Mr. Burke who had brought information on the Native American population.

Mr. Burke began by saying Congress had requested VETS to do a study in 2009 to determine what the employment needs were of Native American veterans living on tribal lands, and so they commissioned a study. They reported to congress in 2010 after completion of the study, and in 2011 Congress inquired what we had been doing on this through GAO. The first recommendation was "boost economic development."

Mr. Burke then began a slide presentation and briefing on services available for Native American veterans. He continued that the size of the Native American veterans population who are not mixed with any other race, but who may be mixed with another Native American tribes -- the group called Native Americans alone or in combination with another Native American tribe -- total veterans 154,000. Now, that 21 million plus veterans, the size of the population they're dealing with in relationship to 21 million, is very, very small; however, the percentage is larger than the population at large, per capita, more Native Americans served than any other population.

Mr. Burke stated that Native Americans in combination with white, black, Hispanic or some other race, this 154,000 goes up into the two million. Then it gets into problems with how much Native American blood do they have; and to be registered with a tribe, they have to meet some number of blood content. So they say "I'm Native

American," but they may be also in combination with another race. To capture only Native Americans who live on tribal lands, Mr. Burke remarked he had to go to the census data and actually do the number-crunching himself. What they know is there are about 41,000 Native Americans alone that live on tribal lands -- veterans. Those who are mixed with somebody else, it numbers about 55,000.

The female population was pretty small, though increasing at a faster rate than males. And density of veterans on tribal lands, Mr. Burke went to census data and looked at 314 tribes having reservations, and looked at 314 reservations. He noted the approved number was about 326, but the 314 were the largest of that group, which included 100 out of Alaska alone. Looking at the density, the number of reservations with less than 100, that is American Indiana/Alaska Native, about 80 percent of the reservations have less than 100 veterans. There are 12 states that account for about 85 percent of all Native American veterans that live on tribal lands, all of them West of Mississippi, except for North Carolina. North Carolina has the Cherokee and the Lumbee Tribe there. The state with the largest number is Oklahoma, followed by Arizona, and then, of course, Alaska, New Mexico, and South Dakota.

There are 12 places where we have American jobs on tribal lands -- American Job Centers on tribal lands. Most of those are in one state -- Arizona. Arizona is very, very progressive. The Arizona Diamondbacks practice facility for spring training is leased from Native American tribes.

Mr. Burke stated the next two slides talked about serving Indian and Native American veterans through WIA programs. He remarked that the Section 166 program that was run by ETA there had given about \$58 million to reservations and recognized tribes in all 50 states. 42 million of that was for adults; the other 12 was for children youth programs. So that 40 some odd million was for providing services to adults. The slide shows that's in terms of the amount of money and the number of grantees about 175. They're in all 50 states; but, the number of participants in program year 2012, which ended in 2013, in June of 2013 the number of veteran participants, out of 377,000 adult

participants, 176 were veteran.

Mr. Camilli asked whether for the slide titled "WIA Section 166," it was the program 2012 data, and Mr. Burke replied it was. Mr. Camilli then asked whether if there were 377,000 adult participants, 377,000 participated in this Native American program and were funded by WEA, and 2500 got jobs. **Mr. Burke** replied that it was correct.

Mr. Camilli asked whether it was that 176 of the 2500 got jobs, or 176 veterans of the 376. **Mr. Burke** replied that it was participants. Of those 2500 or so that got jobs -- the entrant employment rate of that 2500 -- 62 percent was the unemployment rate. The 62.11 is the employment rate that the program reported for program year 2012 -- not to be mixed with the 377,000 participants.

Mr. Camilli said he would have thought, the number of placements would have been close to 180,000. **Mr. Burke** replied, "Well you would think, but the INIT employment definition is pretty complicated. No." **Mr. Camilli** asked were average earnings a six-month or a 12-month, and **Mr. Burke** answered it was a six-month. The average earnings was always a six-month.

Mr. Boswell asked about the grant screening. **Mr. Burke** answered that a lot of the Workforce Investment Programs, the spirit of the law was to provide an intervention for someone you really, really thought would not get employed without some type of intervention. The WIP was really meant for the more difficult to serve.

Mr. Boswell added that that was key. When they looked at VETS, they did USERA investigations; they didn't close them. They closed investigations but did not levy fines and adjudicate. They also did investigations for government, people seeking government employment through the veterans preference.

Mr. Boswell stated consideration was about some of the successes they have demonstrated in the past to some of their other grant programs that they no longer have that could appeal to any number of focus groups: formerly incarcerated, wounded and injured, severely wounded and injured, Gulf War veterans, Vietnam era veterans.

Mr. Camilli asked whether the WIA funding coming to fund

the grants for the Native American population was coming through NETA. **Mr. Burke** replied it was. **Mr. Camilli** said it was Department of Labor money and the group advised the Secretary of Labor, not just key the Secretary. He asked **Mr. Burke** whether he and **Mr. Haynie** thought there was any hypothesis or belief that ETA programs were not robust enough to address this population, or were the moneys not enough or whether there was the necessity of statutory change. **Mr. Burke** replied that yes, the program receives 42 million for those, or 50 some-odd million to serve Native Americans on tribal lands of recognized much smaller population.

After the lunch break, **Mr. Green** introduced **Mr. Gallucci** to present the Transition Subcommittee briefing and discussion. **Mr. Gallucci** began a slide presentation on the ACVETEO Subcommittee on Transition, giving a brief overview of what they believed their marching orders were.

Mr. Gallucci continued that members who were assigned to the Subcommittee on Transition were Mr. Gallucci, chairman of the subcommittee; Mr. Green from Helmets to Hardhats was assisting him; Dave Linn from the business roundtable and Hank Jackson from SHRM. The group met on June 16th and identified potential areas of interest, focusing on the military's implementation of TAP, the off base TAP pilot program that was authorized by Congress, Outreach for TAP resources that are now available online, information sharing between Department of Defense and Department of Labor on who's leaving the military and where they're going, and effectiveness of the JVSG grant program and how DVOPs and elders are operating within their communities.

Mr. Gallucci noted the slides would demonstrate what their focus was and what their requests were, because there were a lot of balls up in the air then. TAP was being implemented across the military. The curriculum was just updated and they were seeing the first classes of transitioning service members going through the new TAP program.

He said their first steps as a subcommittee for ACVETEO were to request an updated briefing from the DoD on implementation of

TAP across the military and preliminary feedback that they're hearing from transitioning service members.

Mr. Gallucci said that what he wanted to avoid was the same slide presentation that lays out what their vision is.

Chairman Eversole asked if he had an interest in going to the TAP, or had he been through the TAP program, and **Mr. Gallucci** responded that he had been to an early iteration of it. **Mr. Gallucci** stated they had seen the new employment briefing in person and had seen VA benefits 1 and 2 in person as they tracked curricula. **Mr. Green** asked **Mr. Roberts** had he seen a demonstration of the tracked curricula, and Mr. Roberts answered "No". **Mr. Green** said DOD, if you work with **Mr. Boswell**, he could get him access to the class, because DOD has to approve that.

Mr. Camilli added that if **Mr. Gallucci's** group was interested in doing that in person, they kept a calendar of TAP briefings being conducted worldwide, because they supplied the workshop, which was part of it. **Mr. Camilli** said they needed to know everywhere DOD was conducting TAP, and that it was a regular, ongoing dialog they had with DOD.

Mr. Gallucci said that, from a personal perspective he wanted to take off the ACVETEO hat and put on the VFW hat as they have organizational interest in how TAP was being implemented beyond the scope of ACVETEO. **Mr. Green** suggested that one thing he could do, was a virtual online curriculum that was on their website. **Mr. Gallucci** said he'd gone through that and he was going to give **Mr. Green** credit for that. A major initiative was the Off-base TAP Pilot Program that veteran service organizations pushed for a couple of years back.

Mr. Gallucci said Outreach for Online TAP Resources, organizationally, the VFW had asked for online availability of TAP resources external to ACVETEO as they'd been pleased with the recent progress.

Mr. Gallucci stated that DOD-DOL Information Sharing was something they've heard from vets for a couple of years about improving direct outreach to transitioning, recently transitioned veterans.

Mr. Gallucci said that information should be readily available. So there were Heat Maps the Chamber has worked on and resources like My Next Move for veterans.

Finally, Effectiveness of the JVSG Grant Program: they're all familiar with the DVOP and LVER refocusing, and there was some disagreement within the veterans' community about whether that was a refocusing on what's in Code, or a strict redefining of their roles. There were concerns from State Workforce Agencies as to how it would affect their ability to deliver resources to veterans or the flexibility in using JVSG grants to deliver services that would meet the needs of that state's workforce. A potential concern arose from their discussions that DVOPs and LVERs might not be able to provide consistent, quality service under current compensation and workflow models.

Mr. Gallucci asserted the concern was that employers didn't know those resources were available, and veterans might not know that those resources were available or what they did.

Mr. Camilli added that sitting as the VETS liaison for the subcommittee, the message was loud and clear.

Mr. Gallucci noted that one of the issues they discussed with the Transition Subcommittee was they didn't want to make concrete recommendations right out of the gate, because there were many programs that were in flux then.

Chairman Eversole remarked he thought some points **Mr. Gallucci** raised on compensation and high turnover rate was a similar issue to the outreach staff as to the standards and measures by which they required local reps to go out and contact businesses to help connect veterans' businesses.

Mr. Green said it was an issue tied to a bigger ETA workforce staff agency as well. They could fix the DVOP, potentially, with more money, but they were only serving a percentage of the population.

Mr. Gallucci thought the build on the JVSG issue in itself, would echo what they'd heard earlier that understanding the NVIT training is going to look like is critical to their understanding of

how that program is working or how it was supposed to work moving forward. He noted that **Mr. Haynie** had mentioned the curriculum was available online, the new NVTI.

Mr. Camilli agreed and stated the NVTI managed that through a contract mechanism that's required by law. **Mr. Gallucci** said it was much like VA's benefits 1 and benefits 2.

Mr. Roberts stated that as long as the base was being met, not so much what they do. **Mr. Green** agreed, stating that getting the NVTI folks to brief them on what the core work was for a LVER and for a DVOP would be very valuable, because there is discrepancy. **Mr. Gallucci** asked could they review those resources on their own. **Mr. Quam** said for all the requests the subcommittees had made, it might make the most sense for each subcommittee to come back and say here's the ones we think everybody needs to listen to.

Mr. Green said for NVTI they should see what they could give out on curriculum electronically and by their website, and then have them brief at the next full meeting. **Mr. Camilli** suggested they could do either a VTC, having them briefed electronically, or fly someone in from the schoolhouse to sit up there and actually give them a library. **Chairman Eversole** said he thought that that would be tremendous. **Dr. Glowacki** commented that going back to some of the overlaps -- the wage cap -- the CEO, chief evaluation office, had done a study that was ongoing and had not yet been released. They had found the wage gap was smaller for the veterans that were seen by JVSG than non-veterans or Wagner-Peyser, and did not know the reason.

Chairman Eversole said he thought he was on track also. Was it briefing being sufficient, giving them enough information on the status of the lifecycle. He said he expected briefing for them would be much easier than coming out with a written document to inform him. **Mr. Camilli** agreed and said with regard to the military life cycle, he knew a lot about it because he sat in interagency work groups with **Mr. Boswell** at DOD, and DOL was not the person to answer that question. They needed to bring **Mr. Boswell's** team and they could do that briefing; they'd done that briefing.

PUBLIC FORUM

Mr. Green announced **Ron Drach**, who passed handouts to the committee. Mr. Drach thanked everyone for allowing him to speak to them on the two-minute warning. He stated he represented the National Organization on Disability, and he was their senior advisor on the Wounded Warrior Careers Project that they started in 2008. His handout included a description of the Wounded Warrior Careers Program, but also the other two documents that were not veteran-specific, but for their information. He stated that NOD had prepared documents for federal contractors, specifically to help them track their successes hiring people with disabilities under Section 503, as well as veterans under the *Vietnam Era Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act*, VEVRAA.

Mr. Drach said that the NOD project was funded by NOD. No government money was involved. They used their own resources through grants that they get from various foundations and what-not. But it was a collaborative effort with the Army's Wounded Warrior Program, AW2. So in the early stages, the only Warriors that they worked with were those that were referred to them by AW2. 75 percent of the 400 veterans served over three years were really, really hard core severe TBI and/or PTSD. They were not situations where you have a nice resume.

Mr. Drach said he was unsure whether or not NOD would perform any type of longitudinal follow-up to find out are these individuals still working. The agreement with AW2 was essentially over. They were taking referrals from AW2, but they were also taking referrals from others. The pilot was done in Colorado Springs, Dallas, Texas and Fort Bragg. All three of those sites were closed. There was a site in Pittsburgh that was proactive working a lot with the resources in Pittsburgh, including the University of Pittsburgh where there were things going on for veterans and Wounded Warriors.

Mr. Drach added that there had been ongoing collaboration with DVOPs, with University of Pittsburgh and other schools in the Pittsburgh area -- employers, any number of individuals or organizations in the Pittsburgh area that were working closely with NOD to help make that work. They were no longer totally exclusively focusing on Wounded Warriors from this generation. It was still this

generation. They've developed an intensive career transition support. The "Career Action Planning Guide For Wounded Warriors" gets kind of down into the weeds talking to the history of the program and what was occurring.

Mr. Drach said the toughest population of this generation are those with TBI and PTSD or other cognitive or mental health issues that made it difficult for them to assimilate back into society and work independently. But the supportive/intensive services that NOD had been providing were different than necessary from what a DVOP typically worked with, the wounded, ill or injured.

Dr. Glowacki asked that that being their third population, would Mr. Drach send her his materials and include his presentation in a written format that she could forward that to the subcommittee that was not present at the meeting. **Mr. Drach** answered that he could send her a couple of paragraphs. **Mr. Green** added that they would have a transcript of it. **Dr. Glowacki** said she wanted to send the subcommittee a follow-up because they had to wait for the transcript. **Mr. Drach** said he would send her the information on Friday. **Dr. Glowacki** asked what pick-a-dot meant, and **Mr. Drach** said NOD had considered how much the Hard Hats wanted to pick this up. NOD would go in and train whoever would be interested and give them the value of the experience that they had. One of the questions that he had was what kind of training did they provide to their career specialist. He spoke with most of them, either face-to-face at meetings or on conference calls. **Duane Beeson**, who was running the program in North Carolina was retired, spoke about things he brought to the table to assist his Wounded Warriors.

Mr. Roberts inquired what their budget was over that four years, and **Mr. Drach** responded that it was pretty high and he would get back to him on that. **Mr. Camilli** inquired had it been NOD's decision or the Army's decision to let MOUs expire with NOD and the AW2 program. Mr. Drach answered that it had been between the two.

Mr. Camilli remarked that based on **Mr. Drach's** comments and the success and the placement rate that he had cited in the 70 percentile or almost 80 percentile range, that led him to believe the

Army would be interested in continuing that type of relationship. **Mr. Drach** responded that he thought one of the problems was really that NOD didn't have the money to continue to go forward. It was budget-driven on their part as much as anything else and he thought their desire is still there.

Mr. Gallucci asked were there finite criteria that NOD used to identify veterans. **Mr. Drach** replied he didn't know, that it was all referrals from AW2 and that based on his perception and having visited North Carolina, AW2 scoped out the population and found those that were most at risk for failure.

Mr. Drach inquired were there any other questions. He then thanked the committee. Mr. Green then thanked Mr. Drach.

Mr. Roberts said that earlier in the meeting **Mr. Green** had brought up the fact that if they questioned what the DVOP or LVER made it ties into a bigger issue of ETA and what the other individuals made in the same office.

Mr. Green said he thought they had that data and he would pull that up to get it to the subcommittee, that he had been looking at that. **Mr. Roberts** agreed. **Mr. Green** then said the ETA would come back to them and say, "Well, you're paying your DVOP 40,000 a year, and you're only paying the other folks giving roughly the same service as 30,000. Now you have a problem within the Job Center itself, you know, because you have the haves and have-nots." **Mr. Roberts** asked was that by the state or individuals, and Mr. Green said by state and there was a big discrepancy between states, as well.

Mr. Camilli said that even in the same state a DVOP or a LVER in New York City, for example, made the same amount as a DVOP in Buffalo, and it was a big difference in their lifestyle, because Buffalo was cheap and New York was not.

Mr. Gallucci asked whether it would be a better approach for them to speak with NASWFA about what the sense of their depth and numbers were, and **Mr. Green** responded that it would be if they didn't have. **Mr. Gallucci** said they were aware of the state-by-state differences, if there were geographic areas where that was a problem, but there were also another geographic areas where they were

performing well above the standard or well above average.

Mr. Green added that the subcommittee might discuss it, but there had been talk about federalizing those positions and talk about DVOPs serving all veterans, all those type of discussions came with some kind of an Act probably on the budget. **Mr. Gallucci** said then there would probably be a lot of concern about just straight federalizing them. **Mr. Green** said that there were a lot of challenges that were state-specific in different regions, and **Mr. Gallucci** said because that was the balancing act, to meet the challenges in a state's economy versus the obligation to a former federal. **Mr. Green** agreed.

Mr. Green asked if the committee wanted to discuss the report, that each of the subcommittees should probably regather. **Mr. Green** said that he and **Mr. Camilli** would look at some of the areas where they wanted to do further briefings in either of the subcommittees, and help them form their next work.

Mr. Camilli stated he put together the agenda, initially, that he was blessed and signed-off by leadership.

Chairman Eversole said they could write the report focusing on what each subcommittee did or discuss specific programs or topics, that they had one about the American Job Center that would be a little bit from the outreach section. There may be a little bit from the transition section.

Mr. Camilli responded that the report was due to Congress by the 31st of December. **Chairman Eversole** noted that the Secretary had 60 days, and **Mr. Camilli** added that it was 60 days after they transmitted the report to Congress, to the HVAC and the SVAC, the Secretary of Labor had 60 days to review and comment on it. **Chairman Eversole** said that when he spoke to **Mr. Haynie**, his thoughts were they needed to produce a draft by sometime in October, probably mid-October, but then they wanted to push it into that first week, first full week of September after Labor Day.

Mr. Camilli stated the committee was required by statute to meet four times in a fiscal year, but the committee started off late that year, primarily due to hiccups in organizing and getting people

appointed, that at the first meeting they had laid out a roadmap of meeting planned from their perspective that they thought would be good. The concept would be they would have four committee meetings and between each meeting the subcommittees would do the work then report out of each full committee meeting. They would try and set the next meeting the first week of August, because the fourth meeting that had to happen that fiscal year needed to happen by the end of September. They thought the first week in August and the last week in September would be the final meeting.

Mr. Roberts said that some of that was going to be driven by what they could get for those follow-ups for subcommittee meetings. Then they had those subcommittee meetings that they had to get those presentations before they presented them, although they only knew when DOD could facilitate that; i.e. what are the dates they could get those people who were key to sort of do that presentation.

Mr. Camilli suggested people find the method in which he had been trying to coordinate schedules using the doodle.com tool, because then they didn't have to coordinate Outlook calendars.

Mr. Camilli noted he could zip out the calendar requestor tomorrow, and if they could get that done the next day or two, then by Friday they could get the FRN in.

Mr. Quam noted that end of July was about getting some of those big speakers in, and **Mr. Green** agreed saying "That's why if we wait 'til September and then we get all these speakers in, it's too late to affect the report." So you try to get NVTI join forces. **Mr. Quam** added that the subcommittees could meet and then they return and have a big work session. It would be a work session in September.

Mr. Camilli said that they talked about the planning for this year after having them all appointed. One of the things they recognized was the last meeting of the year would probably be a two- or three-day event, because if they wanted to crank out a report, they needed time to sit down, work around, and get all of their ideas together when they're talking to a body like theirs. They would set up and create a command center there. They would get computers in so people could write, dictate, or whatever. **Mr. Green** said that **Mr.**

Haynie might have some ideas about that so they could develop that more, how they were going to do that, but he didn't see them doing a three-day meeting.

Chairman Eversole said he would talk to **Mr. Haynie** about the structure, and that he thought if they got the basic structure down, the subcommittees could come into the full meeting and kind of break up into three rooms and we do it by section, or whatever it was that they could assign people to just start cranking out the various sections. **Mr. Green** agreed and said for the subcommittees that week and the following week they would try to work on getting those appropriate briefings lined up, and then work on a date with each of the subcommittees to get that. **Chairman Eversole** agreed and **Mr. Roberts** added that the two-week window on Doodle, they were looking at the last week of July and the first week of August.

Mr. Camilli asked whether they had reviewed the minutes from last meeting, and a motion was made by **Chairman Eversole** to approve the minutes of the last meeting. **Mr. Quam** seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved and made a part of the record.

Mr. Green thanked everyone in attendance, and the meeting was adjourned at 2:21 p.m.

* * * * *