



## Region 8 Prosperity Committee Meeting Agenda

**MEETING DATE:** July 7, 2016  
**MEETING TIME:** 2:30 pm  
**MEETING LOCATION:** Branch County Administration Building and Courthouse  
31 Division St, Coldwater, MI 49036

1. **Call to Order & Introductions**
2. **Action:** Approval of the Agenda
3. **Action:** Approval of the Minutes
4. **Citizen Comments**
5. **Discussion:** Monthly Financial Report
6. **Discussion:** Long-Term Vision for Prosperity Committee/Organization
  - a. Facilitation through Don Edgerly
  - b. Discussion of Tier Two
7. **Discussion:** Regional Initiatives
  - a. Updates on state projects with RPI involvement
  - b. Update on RPI funding in the state budget
8. **Discussion/Action:** Project Selection
  - a. Update on the submitted projects
  - b. Discuss grant review process
9. **Discussion:** Project Updates
  - a. Review progress made by grantees
10. **Committee Member Comments**
11. **Action:** Adjournment

***Next Meeting: August 4, 2016 at the W.E. Upjohn Institute  
300 S Westnedge Ave – Kalamazoo, MI 49007***

# Southwest Michigan RPI Collaborative Committee

---

June 2, 2016 Meeting Minutes

**Committee Members Present:** Jill Bland (phone), Barbara Craig, Ben Damerow (phone), Michael Evans, Grant Fletcher (phone), Luann Harden, Bridgette Jones, Pat Karr (phone), Jason Latham, Deb Miller, Ron Reid, Richard Remus, Jon Start, Rachel Wade

**Committee Members Absent:** Dennis Berkebile, Therese Cody, Kenneth High, Lynn Johnson, Ken Jones, Jan Karazim, Shelley Klug, Juanita Miller, Dan Peat, David Reid, Barbara Rose, Sandy Standish

**Also Present:** John Egelhaaf, Lee Adams, Rebecca Harvey

## Call to Order

Chair Evans called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m.

## Introduction of Members

Introductions of Committee members and guests were made.

## Approval of Agenda

**Motion** by Start, **supported** by Remus, to approve the agenda as presented. The motion **carried unanimously**.

## Approval of Minutes

**Motion** by Remus, **supported** by Start, to approve the May 5, 2016 minutes as presented. The motion **carried unanimously**.

## Citizen Comments

No citizen comment was offered.

# Southwest Michigan RPI Collaborative Committee

---

June 2, 2016 Meeting Minutes

## Monthly Financial Report

Egelhaaf referenced the 2016 Financial Report provided in the meeting packet. He noted that the status reports/invoices for the 2015 project awards are only current through April and that he will make contact with the recipients to get them brought up to date. Egelhaaf stated that the report reflects that the RPI is operating within budget. **Motion** by Reid, supported by **Start**, to accept the Financial Report as presented. **Motion carried unanimously.**

## Long-Term Vision for Prosperity Committee/Organization

Don Edgerly, Administrator with the Upjohn Institute, was present to continue facilitation of the RPI's strategic planning session initiated in May. He reiterated that the goal of the session is to define what the future of the RPI will look like and to take that idea and make it tactical with established measures of success. He then provided an overview of the planning process and gave a recap of the work accomplished at the May RPI meeting.

He proceeded to lead the Committee through the remaining visioning questions.

*Question 3:* What are the greatest assets of the RPI?

Responses:

- Diversity of membership.
- The RPI has a solid Plan that has been adopted . . (we are a structured group; not unguided).
- The work of the RPI is funded.
- The RPI partners are clearly identified.
- The RPI is not just a 'thinking' group . . good work is already being done consistent with the goals/objectives set forth in the (Prosperity) Plan.
- The RPI effort is politically-supported at the State level.
- The RPI has staff . . which allows for follow-through and consistency.
- The RPI membership represents a high level of expertise in the sectors represented; leadership is present.

*Question 4:* How can the RPI leverage those assets to impact prosperity?

# Southwest Michigan RPI Collaborative Committee

---

June 2, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Responses:

- Recognize the work already being done . . . deputize that effort. (e.g. economic development efforts . . . take the work and move it along; collaborate)
- Don't duplicate current efforts.
- Improve visibility of the RPI. Employ a marketing strategy of work being done by the RPI.
- Get RPI representation on current functioning groups. (i.e. an RPI update could become a standard agenda item)
- Use RPI to empower/strengthen existing efforts. (some work may need just a little extra push to succeed)
- Report out to other organizations . . . may find unreached organizations.
- Continuity of messaging.
- Better leverage of resources to grow the 'collective pie'.
- Improve interagency interaction. (an unmet opportunity - - willingness is there)

*Question 5:* How can the RPI bring value to all sectors over time?

- Reduce duplication of efforts.
- Improve efficiency through collaboration.
- Achieve an understanding as to what brings value to each sector.
- Trust RPI as an entity . . . and help establish trust between sectors and between the people 'around the table'.
- Find synergy between partners; collaborate because it makes sense and achieves results . . . not just for the sake of collaboration.
- Have made a difference when the RPI endorsement matters.
- Provide not just support . . . but validation. (where partners feel there is a benefit provided by the RPI)

*Question 6:* How can you insure geographic equity within the RPI? What does it look like?

- Change the conversation from 1 county; 3 counties; 5 counties - - to a 7-county view.
- Support initiatives that speak to the Region.
- Be strategic about deployment of resources.

# Southwest Michigan RPI Collaborative Committee

---

June 2, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Lengthy discussion ensued regarding how to focus on all areas of the Region with limited funding. It was again noted that investment is already being done consistent with the Prosperity Plan. The RPI has an opportunity to impact regional prosperity by facilitating collaboration and bringing the right groups together to achieve efficiencies and results.

Due to time constraints, it was agreed that discussion of the final two questions (Questions 7. & 8.) would be scheduled for the July meeting.

## Regional Initiatives

Harden: WMU students in social work program are working with Habitat for Humanity in devising systems to help reduce defaults.

Evans: Workforce Development and Educational Career Success grant calendars may trigger requests for letters of support; be prepared to respond.

Remus: Future discussions should focus on the use of local harbors for commercial shipping (St Joseph, Benton Harbor, Berrien County . . . all own property in the area) – truly regional assets.

Jones: Missile defense system in Battle Creek is gaining momentum. Will advise RPI if further support would be helpful.

## Resolution of Support for Continued RPI Funding

Adams reported that RPI funding was recently restored by the State for 2017. He noted that the language in the budget bill has been altered to include reference to the ‘private sector’.

Egelhaaf stated that the ‘eyes’ of the State are on the Region to perform. Evans added that the RPI needs to be effective in order to stand out and inspire future funding. He stated that the RPI has the resources, the expertise, and the partnerships needed to create predictable positive results.

Adams advised that a vote on the budget bill is pending and that a letter of support from the RPI is still timely. He referenced the draft Resolution of Support provided in the meeting material.

**Motion** by Reid, **supported** by Jones, to adopt the Resolution of Support for continued State funding of the Regional Prosperity Initiative and to authorize the Chair (Evans) to sign the resolution for distribution to the Region’s State Representatives. Motion **carried unanimously, with one abstention (Start).**

# Southwest Michigan RPI Collaborative Committee

---

June 2, 2016 Meeting Minutes

## Project Selection

Adams referenced the draft RFP provided in the meeting material. He explained that a different approach than previously discussed is proposed. Specifically, the process is proposed to entail the following:

- A single review panel will be established by the Committee.
- A June 24, 2016 proposal deadline would be established.
- The panel would exercise assigned review tasks (per handout).
- The scoring rubric developed last year would be applied to the project proposals.
- The panel would identify the Tier 1 proposals.
- The Committee would consider the Tier 1 proposals for grant awards.

Evans stated that this is a process commonly used in proposal reviews/funding. He noted that the process generally increases engagement and allows for expertise to be present on the review panel.

In general Committee discussion, it was agreed that the panel selection would occur in the next couple of weeks and would include a combination of Committee members and volunteers.

**Motion** by Craig, **supported** by Start, to approve the proposed project selection process as outlined and to move forward with the panel selection. Motion **carried unanimously**.

## Bylaw Updates

Due to the lateness of the hour, the Committee agreed to postpone discussion of this agenda item to the July meeting. General support of allowing 'virtual attendance' at Committee meetings was expressed.

## Reporting Structure from RPI Partners

Due to the lateness of the hour, the Committee agreed to postpone discussion of this agenda item to the July meeting.

# **Southwest Michigan RPI Collaborative Committee**

---

June 2, 2016 Meeting Minutes

## **Committee Member Comments**

Start encouraged the discussion of Tier 2 status of the RPI on future agendas. He noted that having these conversations now may be prudent given the funding-related discussions.

## **Adjournment**

There being no further items for consideration, the meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

*Next Meeting:* July 7, 2016 at 2:30 p.m. – Branch County Annex Building, Coldwater

# RPI Boilerplate Language

## General Information

(1) The funds appropriated in part 1 for the regional prosperity initiative are to be used as competitive grants to eligible regional planning organizations qualifying for funding as a regional prosperity collaborative, a regional prosperity council, or a regional prosperity board. A regional planning organization may not qualify for funding under more than 1 category in the same state fiscal year. As used in this section:

- a) (a) "Eligible regional planning organization" means any of the following:
  - (i) An existing regional planning commission created pursuant to 1945 PA 281, MCL 125.11 to 125.25.
  - (ii) An existing regional economic development commission created pursuant to 1966 PA 46, MCL 125.1231 to 125.1237.
  - (iii) An existing metropolitan area council formed pursuant to the metropolitan council's act, 1989 PA 292, MCL 124.651 to 124.729.
  - (iv) A Michigan metropolitan planning organization established pursuant to the moving ahead for progress in the 21st century act, Public Law 112-141.
- b) "Freedom of information act" means the freedom of information act, 5 USC 552.
- c) "Open meetings act" means the open meetings act, 1976 PA 267, MCL 15.261 to 15.275.
- d) "Regional prosperity board" means a regional body that has a singular governing board with representation from private, public, and nonprofit entities engaged in joint decision-making practices for the purpose of creating or maintaining a phase three regional prosperity plan.
- e) "Regional prosperity collaborative" means any committee developed by a regional planning organization or a metropolitan planning organization that serves to bring organizational representation together from private, public, and nonprofit entities within a region for the purpose of creating or maintaining a phase one: regional prosperity plan.
- f) "Regional prosperity council" means a regional body with representation from private, public, and nonprofit entities with shared administrative services and an executive governing entity, as demonstrated by a formal local agreement or agreements for the purpose of creating or maintaining a phase two: regional prosperity plan.



## Tier One

(2) Regional planning organizations may qualify to receive not more than \$250,000.00 of incentive-based funding as a regional prosperity collaborative subject to meeting all of the following requirements:

- a) The regional prosperity collaborative has created a phase one: regional prosperity plan, as follows:
  - i. The regional prosperity collaborative must include regional representatives from adult education, workforce development, community development, economic development, transportation, and higher education organizations.
  - ii. The plan is required, at a minimum, to include a 5-year plan focused on economic growth and vitality for the region, as well as a performance dashboard and measurable annual goals to support the 5 -year plan.
  - iii. The 5-year plan shall address regional strategies related to adult education, workforce development, economic development, transportation, higher education, and business development.
  - iv. The regional prosperity collaborative shall adopt the plan by a minimum 2/3 majority vote of its members.
- b) The regional prosperity collaborative adheres to accountability and transparency measures required in the open meetings act and the freedom of information act.
- c) The regional prosperity collaborative convenes monthly meetings, open to the public, to consider and discuss issues leading to a common vision of economic prosperity for the region, including, but not limited to, community development, economic development, talent, and infrastructure opportunities.
- d) The regional prosperity collaborative makes available on the grant recipient's publicly accessible Internet site pertinent documents, including, but not limited to, monthly meeting agendas, minutes of monthly meetings, voting records, and the regional prosperity plan and performance dashboard.
- e) The regional prosperity collaborative keeps a status report detailing the spending associated with previous regional prosperity initiative grants. Organizations that have successfully received grant awards in previous fiscal years shall be required to make available to the department and on a publicly accessible Internet site information regarding the use of those grant dollars.

## Tier Two

(3) Regional planning organizations eligible to receive a payment as a regional prosperity collaborative under subsection (2) may qualify to receive a 1-time grant of not more than \$75,000.00 to produce a plan to transform the regional prosperity collaborative into a regional prosperity council or regional prosperity board, including necessary local formal agreements, to make recommendations that eliminate duplicative efforts and administrative functions, and to leverage resources through cooperation, collaboration, and consolidations of organizations or programs throughout the region. Plans produced to transform the regional prosperity collaborative into a regional prosperity council or regional prosperity board shall be made available on the grant recipient's publicly accessible Internet site.

(4) Regional planning organizations may qualify to receive not more than \$375,000.00 of incentive-based funding as a regional prosperity council subject to meeting all of the following requirements:

- a) A regional prosperity council has been formed and includes regional representatives from adult education, workforce development, community development, economic development, transportation, and higher education organizations.
- b) An eligible regional prosperity council will demonstrate shared administrative services between 2 public regional entities included in subdivision (a) . In addition, the council must have and maintain an executive governing entity, as demonstrated by a formal local agreement or agreements.
- c) The regional prosperity council has created a phase two regional prosperity plan, as follows:
  - i. The regional prosperity council shall identify opportunities for shared administrative services and decision- making among the private, public, and nonprofit entities within the region and shall continue collaboration with regional prosperity council members, including, but not limited to, representatives from adult education providers, workforce development agencies, community development agencies, economic development agencies, transportation service providers, and higher education institutions.
  - ii. The plan is required to include, but is not limited to all of the following:
    - A. A status report of the approved 5-year plan.
    - B. The addition of a 10-year plan for the region which builds upon prior work and is focused on economic growth and vitality in the region.
    - C. A prioritized list of regional projects.
    - D. A performance dashboard with measurable annual goals.
  - iii. The regional prosperity council shall adopt the plan by a minimum 2/3 vote of its members.
- d) The regional prosperity council adheres to accountability and transparency measures required in the open meetings act and the freedom of information act.
- e) The regional prosperity council convenes monthly meetings, open to the public, to consider and discuss issues leading to a common vision of economic prosperity for the region, including, but not limited to, community development, economic development, talent, and infrastructure opportunities.
- f) The regional prosperity council makes available on the grant recipient's publicly accessible Internet site pertinent documents, including, but not limited to, monthly meeting agendas, minutes of monthly meetings, voting records, and the regional prosperity plan and performance dashboard.
- g) The regional prosperity council keeps a status report detailing the spending associated with previous regional prosperity initiative grants. Organizations that have successfully received grant awards in previous fiscal years shall be required to make available to the department and on a publicly accessible Internet site information regarding the use of those grant dollars.

## **2016 RPI Prosperity Region 8 - Proposals for Project Funding**

### PROPOSAL #1

**Career Pathways** - The Region 8 Career Pathway Navigation Initiative (CPNI) will identify and convene providers operating within the currently established career pathway construct, with the goals of defining specific industry pathways; developing a seamless regional navigation system; building common enrollment, assessment, and data collection processes; aligning and increasing shared services that leverage existing resources and reduce redundancies; developing new credentialing opportunities and employer-driven training programs; and providing training to service delivery practitioners on the regional navigation system. Career pathway partners will include, but is not limited to, the following core career pathway partners (herein referred to as CPNI core membership): adult education providers, Michigan Works!, vocational rehabilitation agencies, adult literacy providers, community colleges, career and technical education providers, and employers. Building upon existing collaborations and defining an entry-to-exit navigation process will improve cross-agency referrals, ultimately increasing the likelihood an individual will succeed in moving from education/training to a meaningful career.

### PROPOSAL #2

**Jobs for Michigan Graduates** - Jobs for Michigan's Graduates (JMG) program is a state-based affiliate of the National Jobs for America's Graduates ("JAG") organization and one of the largest and most successful school-to-work systems for disadvantaged youth in the United States. JMG focuses on supporting students in an in-school or out-of-school context, emphasizing dropout prevention and recovery utilizing the nationally-recognized JAG Model. Core model components of programming include: a competency-based curriculum, classroom instruction, adult mentoring, advisement and support, employment training, leadership development, job placement services, postsecondary education placement services, work experiences and follow-up services.

JMG has experienced tremendous growth in a short period of time, offering one program in 2008 to 43 programs operating across the state in 2015-2016 including multiple sites in Prosperity Region 8. The funds would support JMG efforts in the continuation of existing services and expansion of services for out-of-school youth in Region 8. In partnership with Michigan Works! Southwest, JMG's goal is to provide services to 400 youth in 2016-2017 at ten sites in Berrien, Cass, Kalamazoo, St. Joseph and Van Buren counties. RPI funds will facilitate JMG's ability to seamlessly deliver services due to a budget shortfall as a result of not receiving an increase in state funding in the upcoming program year. Key performance targets for five sites implementing an in-school (multi-year) model include: 90% graduation rate; 60%

employment rate; 40% pursuit of a postsecondary education; and removal of four barriers. Performance targets for four sites delivering services through the out-of-school model include: 50% graduation rate; 60% employment rate; 30% pursuit of a postsecondary education; and removal of four barriers. Performance targets for the site using the alternative model include: 75% graduation rate; 50% employment rate; 30% pursuit of a postsecondary education; and removal of four barriers. As a result of JMG receiving the proposed RPI funding, 400 youth will have the opportunity to participate in a life-changing experience that will enable them to achieve academic and career success. Ambitious performance targets and a proven track record in meeting outcomes and providing life-changing services to disadvantaged youth are key components that uniquely position JMG to facilitate economic impact.

### PROPOSAL #3

**Talent Matching System** - This project aims to enable business and education leaders to efficiently match talent with available and potential training resources and labor demands throughout the region.

For southwest Michigan to remain a leader in innovation and production, it must develop, retain, and attract the talent that a modern economy demands. The purpose of this project is to assess both aspects of the local labor market, supply and demand, in an effort to assist local business and education leaders with the identification and implementation of talent matching strategies in Southwest Michigan. The basis for these strategies will include the leveraging and coordination of existing resources, identification of gaps, and forecasting future needs, all in an effort to develop, attract, and retain talent while preparing for in-demand careers. Furthermore, strategies developed through this project will endeavor to improve workforce turnover rates by improving talent identification practices utilized by businesses throughout the region. The objective of this project is to provide regional coordination and facilitation and enhance talent development, datasets, and knowledge sharing to enable employers and educators to create efficient talent matching strategies. Regional coordination will help to alleviate duplication and services gaps while providing a platform for the sharing of resources, experiences, and best practices. Regional knowledge shared by subject matter experts, business leaders, and educators will help to optimize programming and hiring practices utilized throughout the region. Regionally-based data sets will enable subject matter experts, business leaders, and educators to make defensible data-driven decisions regarding hiring practices and training programs. Talent matching strategies will allow educators and employers to enhance existing, and develop new, efforts that will result in lower turnover and unemployment rates.

The project is intended to span both the emerging workforce (ages 0-16), the incumbent workforce (ages 17 and beyond), the potential workforce within the region (unemployed, underemployed, and non-participants), and workers attracted to the region. In addition to the broad age groups, the initiative's geographic target region includes the following seven

counties: Calhoun, Branch, Kalamazoo, St. Joseph, Cass, Van Buren and Berrien. Furthermore, the project will convene business leaders throughout the seven-county region in order to facilitate greater linkages between employer talent needs and education designs and content. Depending on the level of participation among business and education partners, the project may initially operate within a subset of the seven-county region before expanding activities to all parts of the region.

Career Pathways Proposal:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-M5suW-nUaeengyRUdteWNFUIU/view?usp=sharing>

Kinexus Proposal:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-M5suW-nUaeQ3VHRTFVemhEQ0E/view?usp=sharing>

Talent Matching Proposal:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-M5suW-nUaeenZpWXR2N0g0cEU/view?usp=sharing>

## **Regional Prosperity Initiative - Funding Award Process**

1. Proposals Received (June 24)
2. Panel of Reviewers Identified by the Prosperity Committee or Executive Committee (June 2- June 24)
  - The panel should have a chair
  - What expertise should be present on the panel?
  - Connect elements of the proposals to the expertise of the panel.
3. Staff presents a packet to each panel member containing all the proposals (that meet the essential criteria for submission). (June 27)
4. All proposals are to be read by all panel members.
5. Each proposal assigned to a primary reviewer and a secondary reviewer (June 27)
6. Panel Meeting(s) (Weeks of June 27, July 4, July 11)
  - 6 a. At the panel meeting, the primary reviewer is charged with presenting a 5-10 minute summary of their assigned proposal.
    - What was specifically in the proposal?
    - What might have been gleaned from the proposal?
    - Some additional background research (by both primary & secondary) on the organization that submitted the proposal.
    - There should be limits for how many proposals they are asked to review (8 may be the maximum)
  - 6 b. The secondary reviewer provides any additional information that the primary reviewer may have missed.
  - 6 c. Questions are then invited from the rest of the panel
  - 6 d. All panel members then score the document based on the scoring rubric
    - If a panel member(s) has submitted a proposal, they cannot score their own application. They remain able to score the other proposals though.
  - 6 d. Staff logs the panel's scores during the meeting as the panel moves on to the next proposal

6 e. After all proposals are presented and scored, staff presents the summary of all scores back to the panel.

- Option - the panel can establish a cut-off line (perhaps at 80 out of 100) where the top tier of proposals reside.
- If transparency is essential, the public (and applicants) can be invited to the panel meeting. They can listen but not actively participate
- The entire process can take about 1/2 day depending on the number of applications

7. When finished, the panel passes the rankings on to the full Prosperity Committee for consideration (August 4)

- The proposals recommended for funding are presented to the prosperity committee by the primary reviewer at the prosperity committee meeting.

DRAFT



## Progress Reports for RPI Grantees

- Portage ESL
  - <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-M5suW-nUaedlZXUFREU1UzVHc/view?usp=sharing>
  - <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-M5suW-nUaebVRxN3JYclBsNHM/view?usp=sharing>
- Regional Agriculture
  - <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-M5suW-nUaeUVpZUzhRdWg3a28/view?usp=sharing>
  - <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-M5suW-nUaeNXpSYjdrS3JMSTg/view?usp=sharing>
- St. Joseh County Water Trail
  - <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-M5suW-nUaedkNGMTetbVhSQ0E/view?usp=sharing>