



Agricultural and Seasonal Workforce Services Advisory Committee

Meeting details

Date: Thursday, July 30, 2020

Time: 8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

Location: Skype meeting due to COVID-19

Committee members present

- Michele Besso
- Jonathan DeVaney
- Michael Gempler
- Rosella Mosby
- Erik Nicholson
- Ramon Torres
- Delia Peña
- Rosalinda Guillen

ESD staff

- Dan Zeitlin
- Alberto Isiordia
- Norma Chavez
- Rene Maldonado
- Craig Carroll
- Sara Crosby
- Gustavo Aviles
- Tamara Johnson

Non-voting agency representatives

- Ignacio Marquez
- Uriel Iniguez
- Todd Phillips

Committee members absent

- None

Summary

Meeting Recorded

This meeting was recorded and is available on <https://esd.wa.gov/newsroom/Ag-committee>

Welcome and Introductions

Employment Security Department (ESD) Policy Director, Dan Zeitlin, welcomed everyone and asked Tamara Johnson to take roll. All committee members were present except Ramon Torres and Mike Gempler both of which joined the meeting in progress.

Agenda

Dan Zeitlin reviewed the agenda for the meeting and asked if anyone had any questions. (See Addendum I.)

Meeting Minutes

Dan Zeitlin requested that everyone review the meeting minutes for July 2, 2020 and July 16, 2020 and provide their feedback. Jon DeVaney made a motion to approve the minutes for July 2, 2020 and July 16, 2020. Mike Gempler seconded the motion. Meeting minutes were approved.

H-2A Application Data Report

Norma Chavez reported on H-2A application data.

Status of Applications	# of Applications	# of Workers Requested/ Labor Certifications*
Received/Processed	306	28,959
Commenced	238	20,740
Withdrawn	18	2,577
Impossibilities	4	235

*The numbers reported are not reflective of the number of foreign workers that actually arrive in Washington State.

H-2A Workers in Washington State

Norma Chavez stated that the ASWS office is unable to provide actual number of H-2A workers in the state at this time but will continue to work to be able to provide data at a future meeting. Due to the busy harvest season, employers were not able to respond to our request for information.

Budget for ASWS office

Norma Chavez presented the Fiscal Note 5438 E 2S SB. (Addendum II.)

Overview of Agricultural Wage Survey cost

Gustavo Aviles presented the Ag Survey Briefing Paper. (Addendum III.)

H-2A Verification & Referral Improvement Ideas

Sara Crosby presented the H-2A Verification & Referral Improvement Ideas. (See Addendum IV.)

Action Items

- Discussion on possible virtual Town-hall for farmworkers

Agenda Items for Next Meeting

- ASWS Report to Legislature

Public Comments

None

Adjourned

Dan Zeitlin thanked everyone for their continued active participation and for their commitment to this work, then ended the meeting at 11:50 a.m.

2020 Meetings

The next Agricultural and Seasonal Workforce Services Advisory Committee meeting is on:

- **August 27th, 2020 – 8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.**
Skype meeting

ADDENDUM I



AGENDA

Agricultural and Seasonal Workforce Services (ASWS)
Advisory Committee

Thursday, July 30, 2020 | 8:30 am – 11:30 am | SKYPE

Agenda Items

TIME	TOPIC
8:30 am	Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome from Dan Zeitlin, Director, ESD Policy, Data, Performance and Integrity Division & Norma Chavez, Director – Agricultural and Seasonal Workforce Services • Agenda Review
8:40 am	Approval of Meeting Minutes for July 2 and July 16, 2020
8:50 am	Update on FLC Applications – Norma Chavez
8:55 am	Budget for ASWS office – Norma Chavez & Alberto Isiordia
9:30 am	Overview of Agricultural Wage Survey cost – Gustavo Aviles
10:00 am	Break
10:15 am	H-2A Verification and Referral Improvement Ideas – Sara Crosby
11:00 am	ASWS Meeting Future Ideas for Farmworker Access – Norma Chavez
11:05 am	Closing Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss next agenda
11:10 am	Public Comments
11:30 am	Adjourn

GROUND RULES

No side conversations | Phones on silent | Let people speak without interruption | Respect the opinion of others | Strive for understanding | Speak your mind | Strive for common ground | Assume good intent | Stay focused on task at hand and be willing to come back to the topic | Make sure everyone understands | Look out for each other | Take care of your own comfort | Ask for what you need

ADDENDUM II

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 5438 E 2S SB AMH APP H2885.1	Title: Ag & seasonal workforce srv	Agency: 540-Employment Security Department
--	---	--

Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

Estimated Cash Receipts to:

NONE

Estimated Operating Expenditures from:

	FY 2020	FY 2021	2019-21	2021-23	2023-25
FTE Staff Years	14.1	13.9	14.0	13.9	13.9
Account					
Employment Service Administrative Account-State 134-1	1,758,437	1,728,995	3,487,432	3,457,990	3,457,990
Total \$	1,758,437	1,728,995	3,487,432	3,457,990	3,457,990

Estimated Capital Budget Impact:

NONE

The cash receipts and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Factors impacting the precision of these estimates, and alternate ranges (if appropriate), are explained in Part II.

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

- If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.
- If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).
- Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.
- Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

Legislative Contact: Jessica Van Horne	Phone: 360-786-7288	Date: 04/15/2019
Agency Preparation: Dan Phillips	Phone: 360 902-9448	Date: 04/19/2019
Agency Approval: Sondra Walsh	Phone: 360 902-0023	Date: 04/19/2019
OFM Review: Anna Minor	Phone: (360) 902-0541	Date: 04/19/2019

Part II: Narrative Explanation

II. A - Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact

Briefly describe by section number, the significant provisions of the bill, and any related workload or policy assumptions, that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency.

The House Appropriations Committee amendment to E2SSB 5438 does the following:
Section 3, 5 and 6 which related to the collection and disposition of a fee has been removed. In addition, section 6 and 7 of the prior version of the bill relating to a new H-2A enforcement account is deleted. Lastly, the agency will be required to do a major rulemaking - the prior version required an annual rulemaking to set fees.

This version of the bill continues to have fiscal impact to implement this new program. Though this bill does not specify a funding source the Employment Security Department anticipates the use of it's Employment Service Administrative Account - Fund 134, replacing the fee setting authority in prior versions of the bill.

II. B - Cash receipts Impact

Briefly describe and quantify the cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency, identifying the cash receipts provisions by section number and when appropriate the detail of the revenue sources. Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

This version of the bill removes the language that provided the agency the ability to collect a fee.

II. C - Expenditures

Briefly describe the agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), identifying by section number the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings). Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

This version of the bill continues to require the agency to process and adjudicate H-2A applications, process complaints, conduct field checks, training, and outreach, therefore there are no changes to the fiscal impact. The workload to implement this bill is at 13.9 FTEs. ESD's cost assumes that the office will conduct field checks and visits each year which represents the majority of the expenditures including staffing needs. The cost also entails cost to process applications, compliance activities, and fund the work associated with administering the agricultural wage and prevailing practice surveys.

This version of the bill does not identify a funding source, ESD anticipates the use of funds from the Employment Service Administrative Account - Fund 134 to administer this new program.

The cost and FTE's are as follows:

FY 2020	FY 2021 and on
\$1,758,437	\$1,728,995

The engrossed substitute bill changes the 4.1 new FTE's since the intent continues to request that field checks are conducted per year, as provided for in the original bill. Those FTEs are broken out as follows:

EMS3 (30%),
WMS2(100%)
WMS3(20%)

- 9 WSS5 (100%)
- AA3 (100%)
- 2 EA3 (80%)
- RA1 (80%)

The contract amount of \$95,000 is the balance required to conduct the annual survey. The actual cost is \$395,000 where \$300,000 will be expended from the current federal grant funding.

Section 5 of the bill states that the commissioner shall appoint an advisory committee composed of eight voting members and four ex-officio members. The committee members shall serve without compensation, but are entitled to reimbursement for travel expense. All expenses for the committee are entitled to reimbursement for travel expenses as provided in RCW 43.03.050 and 43.03.060. The committee must also prepare a report for the governor and legislature by October 31 every even year.

The department must conduct a major rulemaking, to create new rules, and to establish the new office. A new chapter will be written and incorporated into WAC title 192.

The House Appropriations Committee amendment removes all funding sources from the bill.

Part III: Expenditure Detail

III. A - Operating Budget Expenditures

Account	Account Title	Type	FY 2020	FY 2021	2019-21	2021-23	2023-25
134-1	Employment Service Administrative Account	State	1,758,437	1,728,995	3,487,432	3,457,990	3,457,990
Total \$			1,758,437	1,728,995	3,487,432	3,457,990	3,457,990

III. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

	FY 2020	FY 2021	2019-21	2021-23	2023-25
FTE Staff Years	14.1	13.9	14.0	13.9	13.9
A-Salaries and Wages	884,233	869,518	1,753,751	1,739,036	1,739,036
B-Employee Benefits	309,482	304,332	613,814	608,664	608,664
C-Professional Service Contracts	95,000	95,000	190,000	190,000	190,000
E-Goods and Other Services	189,286	179,709	368,995	359,418	359,418
G-Travel	17,819	17,819	35,638	35,638	35,638
J-Capital Outlays					
M-Inter Agency/Fund Transfers					
N-Grants, Benefits & Client Services					
P-Debt Service					
S-Interagency Reimbursements					
T-Intra-Agency Reimbursements	262,617	262,617	525,234	525,234	525,234
9-					
Total \$	1,758,437	1,728,995	3,487,432	3,457,990	3,457,990

III. C - Operating FTE Detail: *List FTEs by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals need to agree with total FTEs in Part I and Part IIIA*

Job Classification	Salary	FY 2020	FY 2021	2019-21	2021-23	2023-25
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT 3	45,096	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
ECONOMIC ANALYST 3	77,616	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
EMS BAND 3	91,116	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
MANAGEMENT ANALYST 5	77,616	0.2		0.1		
RESEARCH ANALYST 1	46,188	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
WMS BAND 2	84,072	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
WMS BAND 3	95,664	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
WORKSOURCE SPECIALIST 5	59,148	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0
Total FTEs		14.1	13.9	14.0	13.9	13.9

III. D - Expenditures By Program (optional)

NONE

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

IV. A - Capital Budget Expenditures

NONE

IV. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

NONE

IV. C - Capital Budget Breakout

Identify acquisition and construction costs not reflected elsewhere on the fiscal note and describe potential financing methods

NONE

IV. D - Capital FTE Detail: *List FTEs by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals need to agree with total FTEs in Part IVB*

NONE

N/A

Part V: New Rule Making Required

Identify provisions of the measure that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

The department must conduct a major rulemaking, to create new rules, and to establish the new office. A new chapter will be written and incorporated into WAC title 192.

ADDENDUM III

BRIEFING PAPER



**Employment
Security
Department**
WASHINGTON STATE

**Agricultural Wage and Employment Practice
Surveys – regulations, cost and other states
that conducted surveys recently**

July 30, 2020

Are the agricultural surveys required?

Regulation, guidance and directives

The agriculture wage survey is intended to protect the wages of domestic farmworkers by ensuring they are not adversely impacted by an employer’s use of the H-2A program.

Figure 1 lists federal statutes (CFRs), U.S. Department of Labor/Employment and Training Administration (USDOL/ETA) handbooks and USDOL/ETA Training and Employment Guidance Letters (TEGLs) that directly or indirectly direct the Employment Security Department (ESD) as the Washington State Workforce Agency, to identify using surveys, prevailing hourly wages or piece rates, prevailing practices, and normal or common employment qualifications and requirements.

Figure 1. Regulations or directives related to the annual agricultural wage and employment practices surveys United States and Washington state
Source: Code of Federal Regulations (CFRs), U.S. Department of Labor ETA Handbooks 385 and 398, and TEGLs

Regulation, Guidance or Directive	Brief description
20 CFR 655.121	Prior to filing an H-2A Application for Temporary Employment Certification (Form ETA9142A), the employer must submit a job order to the State Workforce Agency (SWA)
20 CFR 653 Subpart F	ETA 790 All employers seeking agricultural U.S. workers on a temporary basis must submit a completed job clearance order to the SWA for placement on its intrastate and interstate job clearance systems
20 CFR 653.501(c)(2)	Assigns responsibility to the SWAs to ensure that wages and working conditions offered in the job order are not less than the prevailing wages and working conditions among similarly employed farmworkers in the area of intended employment or the applicable Federal or State minimum wage, whichever is higher.
20 CFR §655.120	An employer using the H-2A program must offer, advertise in its recruitment, and pay a wage that is the highest of the Adverse Effect Wage Rate (AEWR), the prevailing hourly wage or piece rate, the agreed-upon collective bargaining wage, or the Federal or State minimum wage
20 CFR §655.1300	Prevailing hourly wage means the hourly wage determined by the SWA to be prevailing in the area in accordance with State-based wage surveys.
20 CFR §655.1300	Prevailing piece rate means that amount that is typically paid to an agricultural worker per piece, determined by the SWA according to ETA handbook 385 , a methodology published by the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL).
20 CFR §655.1300	Prevailing means, with respect to practices engaged in by employers and benefits other than wages provided by employers, that: (1) Fifty percent or more of employers in an area and for an occupation engage in the practice or offer the benefit, but only if

Employment Security Department • Labor Market and Economic Analysis

BRIEFING PAPER

	(2) This 50 percent or more of employers also employs in aggregate 50 percent or more of U.S. workers in the occupation and area (including H-2A and non-H-2A employers for purposes of determinations concerning the provision of family housing, frequency of wage payments, and workers supplying their own bedding, but non-H-2A employers only for determinations concerning the provision of advance transportation).
ETA handbook 385	USDOL methodology for identifying prevailing hourly wages and piece rates.
20 CFR §655.122 (b)	Each job qualification and requirement listed in the job offer must be bona fide and consistent with the normal and accepted qualifications required by employers that do not use H-2A workers in the same or comparable occupations and crops.
20 CFR §655.122 (d)(5)	When it is the prevailing practice in the area of intended employment and the occupation to provide family housing, it must be provided to workers with families who request it.
ETA Handbook 398, pp II-5 - II-14	Guidance to determine prevailing, normal or common employment practices.
ETA Advisories	Directives and advisories published by the USDOL to provide guidance to the SWAs, including for the use and administration of federal funds or grants.
TEGL 14-19	Guidance to SWAs regarding FY 2020 annual grant allocations for foreign labor certification activities.

BRIEFING PAPER

Type and number of agricultural surveys conducted in Washington state

ESD conducts four types of agricultural surveys annually. *Figure 2* lists the types of surveys and the reference for conducting them and their methods. ESD conducts the worker survey following guidance stated in ETA Handbook 385, which advises that “[d]ata supplied by employers must be verified through workers interviews. An average of 10 percent of the workers included in the sample for each wage survey must be interviewed.”

Figure 3 lists the survey modes the University of Washington uses to achieve expected response rates. Survey best practices include at least three contact attempts, preferably different modes, to reach the desired responses.

Figure 2. Agricultural surveys conducted in Washington state
United States and Washington state

Source: Code of Federal Regulations (CFRs), U.S. Department of Labor ETA Handbooks 385 and 398, and TEGLs

	Employer	Worker
State-based wage survey	ETA Handbook 385; 20 CFR 653.501(c)(2); Annual OFLC TEGL (e.g., TEGL 14-19)	ETA Handbook 385; 20 CFR 653.501(c)(2); Annual OFLC TEGL (e.g., TEGL 14-19)
State-based survey to identify prevailing practices, and normal or common employment qualifications and requirements	ETA Handbook 398; 20 CFR 653.501(c)(2); Annual OFLC TEGL (e.g., TEGL 14-19)	ETA Handbook 398; 20 CFR 653.501(c)(2); Annual OFLC TEGL (e.g., TEGL 14-19)

Figure 3. Survey modes of the Washington agricultural surveys
Washington state, 2020

Source: Employment Security Department/LMEA

	Employer	Worker*
State-based wage survey	Web, phone and mail (paper)	Field interviews (paper), web and phone
State-based survey to identify prevailing practices, and normal or common employment qualifications and requirements	Web, phone and mail (paper)	Field interviews (paper), web and phone

* UW will not conduct 2020 worker field surveys.

BRIEFING PAPER

Agricultural survey costs: fiscal year 2019 and 2020

Figures 4 and 5 list the 2019 and 2020 agricultural survey costs by funding sources and ESD and UW expenditures. The UW and ESD will not conduct a worker field survey in 2020. The 2020 worker survey will only include web and phone survey modes.

Surveys cost of 2020 appear significantly more than 2019 mostly for the following reasons:

1. Determination of ESD cost of the 2019 survey has not been finalized. For example, 2019 cost does not include June and July 2020, which is the period when ESD staff conducted the analyses of the 2019 survey.
2. From October 2019 through June 2020, the lead researcher position of the agricultural surveys (supervisor) was vacant. The workload of this vacant was covered mostly by the Econometrics and Actuarial Analysis Manager (WMS2). Because this position is overtime exempt there were no additional charges to the surveys. However, the resulting workload for this manager during that period increased significantly, which lead to delaying USDOL submissions by two months.

Figure 4. Cost of the 2019 agricultural wage and employment practices surveys Washington state, 2019 and 2020
Source: Employment Security Department/LMEA and Budget

Funding source	UW-employer ¹	UW-worker ¹	LMEA staff ²	Attorney General - Legal fee	Sum
OFLC	\$46,522	\$33,478	\$0	\$0	\$80,000
WP90%	\$0	\$0	\$88,492	\$0	\$88,492
PI	\$154,952	\$111,504	\$0	\$0	\$266,456
CPP (ESSB 5438)	\$0	\$0	\$80,000	\$0	\$80,000
CPP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$112,040	\$112,040
Sum	\$201,475	\$144,981	\$168,492	\$112,040	\$626,988

¹Estimated distribution of cost based on 2019 UW proposal. UW total cost was \$346,456.
²Staff cost determination for the 2019 surveys has not been finalized.

Figure 5. Expected cost of the 2020 agricultural wage and employment practices surveys Washington state, 2020
Source: Employment Security Department/LMEA and Budget

Funding source	UW-employer ¹	UW-worker ¹	LMEA staff	Attorney General - Legal fee	Sum
OFLC	\$50,721	\$29,279	\$0	\$0	\$80,000
WP90%	\$0	\$0	\$220,991	\$0	\$220,991
PI	\$185,416	\$107,030	\$0	\$0	\$292,446
CPP (ESSB 5438)	\$0	\$0	\$95,000	\$0	\$95,000
CPP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000
Sum	\$236,137	\$136,309	\$315,991	\$10,000	\$698,437

¹Estimated distribution of cost based on 2020 ESD and UW survey interagency agreement. Estimated UW 2020 total cost is \$372,446.

BRIEFING PAPER

Figure 6 lists expected ESD staff costs for the 2020 agricultural surveys.

Figure 6. ESD's expected staffing cost to conduct the 2020 agricultural surveys
Washington state, 2020
Source: ESD/LMEA and ESD/Budget office

Job class	Position title	Salaries	Benefits	Indirect cost	Goods and Services	Travel cost	Sum
EMS	Policy, Data, Performance & Integrity Director	\$1,464	\$586	\$394	\$225		\$2,669
EMS	LMEA director	\$1,253	\$501	\$338	\$225	\$1,415	\$3,732
WMS3	Program Evaluation, Research and Analysis Manager	\$11,178	\$4,471	\$3,022	\$2,250	\$1,415	\$22,336
WMS2	Econometrics and Actuarial Analysis Manager	\$13,905	\$5,562	\$3,746	\$3,375	\$2,830	\$29,418
ORS	Surveys and Agricultural Analysis Supervisor	\$52,157	\$20,863	\$14,051	\$13,500	\$5,080	\$105,651
EA3	Research Economist	\$75,995	\$30,398	\$20,462	\$20,250	\$5,080	\$152,185
Sum		\$155,952	\$62,381	\$42,013	\$39,825	\$15,820	\$315,991

BRIEFING PAPER

States that conducted agricultural surveys in the last seven months

Figure 7 shows the states and OFLC funding levels that have conducted agricultural surveys in the past seven months as of July 7, 2020, according to USDOL/ETA.

Figure 7. States that conduct agricultural wage surveys and USDOL H-2A activities funding United State, from December through June 2020

Source: United State Department of Labor and [TEGL 14-19, Attachment VI](#)

State	FY 2020 funding levels ¹	20 percent of FY 2020 funding ²	
WA	Washington	\$400,000	\$80,000
CA	California	\$1,500,000	\$300,000
CT	Connecticut	\$250,000	\$50,000
GA	Georgia	480,000	\$96,000
MD	Maryland	\$433,424	\$86,685
MI	Michigan	\$320,000	\$64,000
NB	Nebraska	\$100,000	\$20,000
NJ	New Jersey	400,000	\$80,000
NY	New York	\$1,400,000	\$280,000
OH	Ohio	\$275,000	\$55,000
PA	Pennsylvania	\$400,000	\$80,000
VT	Vermont	\$130,000	\$26,000
WY	Wyoming	\$88,437	\$17,687

¹ FY 2020 Actual Funding Levels as listed in [TEGL 14-19, Attachment VI](#).

² "SWAs must not spend more than 20% of the OFLC grant funds conducting prevailing wage and prevailing practice surveys and performing field checks or visits in accordance with [20 CFR Part 653](#)."

Contact

Gustavo Aviles, Program Evaluation, Research and Analysis Manager
360-480-9078, gaviles@esd.wa.gov

ADDENDUM IV

Improvement ideas with 2+ votes

ESD recruitment processes/systems				VM	ALL	Scope	Additional information needed/ questions
6	Faster connection of workers and employers	3.0	5.0			Could ESD directly inform an employer that a worker had applied? Allow workers opportunity to apply directly. Facilitate direct connection. ESD to continue to evaluate ESD processes/procedures for most effective way. Dept of labor website and they post H2A job orders with contact info (unsuppressed job order) but ESD still under rule to list suppressed job orders - can we get a waiver to list unsuppressed job orders with direct contact info. Worker to call employer directly from WS Office when customer is in office (currently does happen already, but majority of applicants are online). Find ways to make process more Lean (possibly Lean workshop/project). More push from WS/better relationship than just posting info regarding rights/terms/conditions on website - include in local areas/posters/booths, social media). Workers most commonly use texting and whats app - how can we use technology workers are currently using to facilitate this process. Text alert concept - most people have phones - people can opt in to text alert that employment is available. Ganaz app is used by farmworkers as a job match app - can we look into this/learn from this?	What staffing would be required for staff to spend time in person with farm workers? What would it take to request waiver/what does that look like? What would it look like to have more out there like seasonal jobs website? If customers see employer info online, how will they learn about rights/terms/conditions (videos, links, posters in local areas, booths, social media regarding H2A jobs)? How can we know whether changes are having an impact? How do we track/monitor/account for more informal activities that are resulting in referrals? Implementing some of these ideas might make it challenging to track data. How do we measure whether new tools are being used? Note: H2A field checks are tied to referral placements
18	Communication with workers in process	3.0*	5.0			Explain to customers next steps in the process after they applied - more information about hiring process they are in. More thorough follow up with customers regarding why they did/didn't take a job. Education around process (workshops on getting jobs - what opportunities are there to educate on the process?). Re-design so it's as barrier-free as possible for workers. Note - don't just refer to/rely on seasonal jobs website.	How to reconcile information shared regarding agriculture jobs vs other jobs? Why is there a discrepancy and how easy is it to resolve info on federal site vs WS site regarding H2A jobs?
8	Referral Tracking & Follow up	3.0*	6.0*			ESD outreach by phone to customer who have been referred - ask about outcome of referral - phone follow ups with log. Employers to possibly provide copy of recruitment report to ESD to compare to referrals and determine outcomes. Track degree to which workers are reaching out to ESD and how can ESD incentivize relationships with workers to encourage reporting to ESD. Can we use an app or text so that workers can respond quickly and easily regarding referral tracking. Allow short registrations and allow staff to create short registrations on behalf of customers.	What is staffing/budget impact/need for staff to reach out to referrals for follow up? What is the volume of referrals from Work Source? What would this cost?
3	WorkSource WA	2.0	2.0			More contact with applicants, understanding applicants, short registrations - will increase relevance and improve reputation. Could work better with more outreach work. More direct contact with people and continue to improve WS WA. Make ESD services more accessible - study how to improve access to workers. Need to build system up from where workers are - there's an active flow of information within worker communities. Workers sign up for daily whats app message with list of new/available agriculture jobs. Note - a lot of this is already covered in the ideas above.	Information about difficulty of implementing these ideas

Improvement ideas with 2+ votes

ESD recruitment processes/systems				VM	ALL	Scope	Additional information needed/ questions
5	Disclose referrals to employers	2.0*	3			Tell employer when we have referred a worker to them and they can expect to hear from them. Employer could call worker directly. Could help with consistency between reports to DOL and reports in ESD system (referral tracking), could help with providing info from ESD to employers regarding referrals and outcomes. Get the word out to employers that ESD can help recruit for hiring - annual letter/email/notice prior to start of season to provide info about how the system works/services.	How can ESD better connect to employers so that employers better understand services/help ESD can provide? Is it possible to expand outreach regarding H2A/agriculture to other areas? Resource impact?
14	Customer Experience Study	2.0*	4			Understand experience of customers when referred. Barriers/difficulties on accessing system? Direct feedback from farmerworkers (surveys, interviews, statistical, etc) - hear from workers themselves on barriers to accessing jobs and ESD system before we make firm conclusions on best way to fix it. Understand disconnect between number of available jobs and number of referrals. Position ESD to better connect both workers and employers	Cost estimate and study designs (options for different scenarios - survey, sending questions to constituents, and what other ways could we do this?) Approach for study needs to meet farm workers where they are at.
15	Workers self-report referral outcome	2.0*	3			How do we get workers to report from their side the outcome/experience from referral. This is closely connected to first couple ideas regarding different ways to communicate with workers. Create incentives for workers to self-report outcome of referrals.	Which would be more effective - follow up from workers vs direct outreach from ESD?

Direct/informal hiring (outside of ESD)				VM	ALL	Scope	Additional information
25	Employer resources	2.0	3.0			Resources and best practices already exist but not all H2A employers participate in those resources. How can we broaden access to those resources and make sure all employers have access to materials to prevent new participants don't make mistakes. Focus on new participating employers in program - provide them access to existing training and content already developed. Focus on areas where there have been identified issues. Include templates, interview best practices, samples of questions, focusing on qualifications of job listed in order. Best practices to streamline hiring and notifying applicants when hired. 50% rule regarding hiring local workers who qualify during that period. More resources available online (so they aren't required to go to conference to access). Provide information via email to employer at time they apply with key points, compliance tips for supervisors, things to consider as you go along (rather than big conference people must attend in person).	Fiscal impact, resource impact needed to do this. How do we measure the effectiveness of this intervention? Did it make a difference and how do we know?
21	Employer training	2.0	2.0			POC, new expectations, make sure everything is taken care of before start of new contract - make sure they know before contract starts who to talk to/clear up confusion/process. Training not just happens in a classroom. Expert point of contact for new employers to contact with questions / building relationships.	

Contact information

Dan Zeitlin, Director of Policy, Data, Performance & Integrity Division DZeitlin@ESD.WA.GOV

Employment Security Department • Policy, Data, Performance and Integrity