

2016

## Institute of Museum and Library Services Act (1996): Conference Proceeding 12

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell\\_neh\\_I\\_37](http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_37)

---

### Recommended Citation

"Institute of Museum and Library Services Act (1996): Conference Proceeding 12" (2016). *Institute of Museum and Library Services Act (1996)*. Paper 34.  
[http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell\\_neh\\_I\\_37/34](http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_37/34)

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Institute of Museum and Library Services Act (1996) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu).

**OVERVIEW OF TENTATIVE PROPOSAL ON STRUCTURE:  
MAJOR AREAS OF COMPROMISE**

**Federal:**

- ✓ House agrees to Senate's basic process for collaboration between Departments, if the Senate agrees not to require a "Federal Partnership" or National Board.

**Authorization Levels:**

- ✓ House agrees to Senate's single authorization, and reflect Senate's total FY1995 (pre-rescission) funding levels for programs included under the Act, with the exception of the inclusion of FUTA funds.

**State Block Grant/Funding Distribution/Planning Requirements:**

- ✓ House agrees to Senate's single State grant as opposed to three separate funding streams (as under the House bill), however we cannot agree to the inclusion of FUTA funds in such a single block to States.
- ✓ House agrees to ensure that at least 25% of funds be spent on education.
- ✓ House agrees that at least 75% of funds be controlled by the Governor and the collaborative process, more where State law permits.
- ✓ House agrees to the inclusion of a "flex account" for Governors.
- ✓ House is willing to consider a more defined federal formula to local areas for in-school education programs.
- ✓ House agrees to move toward the Senate's "incentive approach" to ensure a coordinated State planning process, with the assurance of a single State plan.

**Local Workforce Development Boards:**

- ✓ House agrees to increase flexibility of provisions pertaining to local workforce development boards (while still maintaining certain basic functions), in exchange for required local boards.

**Vouchers/Career Grants:**

- ✓ House agrees to strengthen accountability in the voucher system, in exchange for a voucher-driven adult training system, with a 3-year phase-in.

## 2/23/96 TENTATIVE PROPOSAL ON STRUCTURE

### 1) Federal Role.

- House would agree to Senate's basic process for collaboration between the Departments of Education and Labor for administration of programs under the Act, taking as much of the Senate process language as possible.

The Senate, in exchange, would not require the establishment of a "federal partnership" or a "national board".

- Refer to earlier House proposal on collaboration between the Departments of Education and Labor for administration of programs under the Act.

### 2) Authorization Levels.

- Take the Senate's single authorization, and reflect the Senate's total FY95 (pre-rescission) funding levels for programs to be included in the block grant (with the exception of Job Corps and FUTA as noted below).
- Take Senate's separate authorization for Job Corps.
- Leave FUTA funds separate -- pending meeting with Ways and Means.

### 3) Single Block Funding Distribution/Single State Planning Process.

- Take the Senate's single funding stream to the States, with State law determining the administering agency for all funds.
- At least 75% of the funds would be controlled by the Governor and the collaborative process, more where State law permits.
- Like the Senate, ensures that at least 25% of funds be spent on education.

✓ 40% of non-FUTA funds would be allocated for Employment and Training Activities that would flow locally by a State-determined formula to local workforce boards.

✓ 40% of non-FUTA funds for Youth Activities

-- 1/2 of the youth funds, or 20% of total funding for in-school; and

-- 1/2 of the youth funds, or 20% of total funding for at-risk youth.

*still  
difficult to  
handle  
levels*

*Secondary + post-secondary  
(voc. ed)*

*How more emphasis on academics  
keeping kids in school*

*FY 1995 - needs  
model*

Youth funding would flow locally to: schools (both secondary and postsecondary) for in-school; and to local workforce boards for at-risk youth.

Local partnerships between schools and local workforce boards would be required for joint planning of in-school and at-risk programs -- with education and the workforce boards coming equally to the table, and each having the authority to sign-off on the plan.

The House is willing to move toward the Senate bill, by considering a more defined Federal formula for in-school programs.

*if use does not recede - They have formulas, we have formula - House thinks this is huge concern*

✓ 5% or a hold-harmless at the FY95 pre-rescission level (whichever is higher) for adult education and literacy, for distribution to local entities through competitive grants. Most programmatic and coordination requirements from the House bill would apply.

✓ 15% would be allocated to a flex account (at the discretion of the Governor and the collaborative process) to be used for education, employment, and training activities described under the Act.

*not transfer - see to Senate*

### Single State Plan -- Incentives for Agreement

Follow Senate's approach of providing an incentive to States to plan for a comprehensive workforce development system.

- **Single Planning Process.** A single planning process would be established in each State, with the State plan submitted by the Governor and developed by the Governor and the collaborative process.
- **Incentive for Agreement.** If a State is able to agree on a coordinated State plan (as explained in the following paragraphs), it will receive the entire allotment awarded in the federal-to-state formula.

However, if the State is unable to agree on a coordinated plan, 20% of the State's general allotment would be placed on reserve pending agreement on such a coordinated plan. If the State is unable to come to agreement on the plan within a reasonable time period, the reserved funds would be redistributed (by formula) to States that have agreement on their State plan.

*80% would be reserved - elem. any federal authority*

Specifically, in States where State law or constitution give responsibility for programs to an official or entity other than the Governor, those officials must agree to that portion of the plan over which they have jurisdiction -- in order for the State to receive their full allotment. State law/constitutional protections would be retained from House bill.

*if don't reach agreement will set A = assumption*

*FL 7A - Separ. here not used to determine percentages*

5) **Local Workforce Development Boards.**

The House would agree to increase the flexibility of provisions concerning local workforce development boards, with the following changes:

- **Composition Requirements** -- Significantly reduced composition requirements. Majority business, and representatives of education and employees (all from nominations).
- **Selection of Board** -- Provisions that clearly provide flexibility for Governors and locally-elected officials to establish a process for the selection of local board members.
  - ✓ Governors (& collaborative process) establish criteria for selection of local boards.
  - ✓ Chief elected officials select the boards, based on the State criteria.
  - ✓ Governors certify/approve local boards every 2 years.

□ **Duties of Board:**

- ✓ Local plan (consistent with State plan); including the identification of the fiscal agent; approved by chief elected officials (with ability to submit to Governor w/out such approval, with comments); Governor approval.
- ✓ Ensure career centers (one-stops)/programs provide services and labor market information consistent with local workforce needs.
- ✓ Program oversight (joint w/ local officials) -- take Senate language (reduce).

- **Single State Workforce Boards** -- allow members of the collaborative process to act as the board in single-State workforce area.

- **Prohibit Operation of Programs by Workforce Boards, with waiver authority to Governors.**

- **Be silent on House budget, fiscal agent, and administrative (staffing, etc.) provisions.** *but, need admin. cap* *has to be in State plan + have approval of local + JGO.*

*House should oversight*

6) **Vouchers.**

- Require vouchers for adult training, with a 3-year phase-in, and with limited exceptions, as provided under House bill. *House will expand*
- Vouchers would be limited to individuals who are ineligible for grant assistance, including Pell grants. *not Title 4 - degree-granting*

*each state develops own performance standards, etc.*

*it is the program that gives a degree with the insight, not the insight, that qualifies*

*include: profit, non-profit + private (eg. IBM)*

**7) Identification of Eligible Education and Training Service Providers.**

- Additional language must be developed to protect against "fly-by-night" providers. House language to establish a performance-based information system on providers of education and training would be built upon. Language in the House bill ensuring close ties between training and occupations in demand would also be retained.

**Examples:** *re: Single State Plan*

**State A** has a general allotment of \$100 million and parties sign off on a coordinated plan.

\$ 5 million (or hold harmless ) for Adult Education;

\$ 15 million for Governor's flex fund:

\$ 40 million for Youth Activities: and

\$ 40 million for Employment and Training.

**State B** has a general allotment of \$100 million, but is unable to agree on a coordinated plan.

\$ 20 million reserved pending agreement, or if agreement is not reached within a reasonable amount of time to be redistributed to other states.

\$ 4 million (or hold harmless - 20%) for Adult Education

\$ 12 million for the Governor's flex fund

\$ 32 million for Youth Activities: and

\$ 32 million for Employment and Training.

*2/23/96  
Brian*