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| Local WIA Areas | Barriers and Challenges | Basis |
| R-2 Multnomah, Washington  | * Changes in federal policy around TANF.
* \*Budget shortfalls.
 | * Inability to develop and implement strategies at local level without State agency cooperation and agreement resulting in direction to local programs.
* Differing performance measures, program eligibility requirements and information management systems that do not communicate with one another complicating integration efforts.
 |
| R-3 Marion, Polk, Yamhill | * Lack of active participating partners.
* \*Capacity.
* Declining resources/\*budget.
* \*Economy.
* \*Skill gaps.
* Businesses’ training allowance budget.
* Lack of relevant \*work experience opportunities for emerging workforce.
 | * Competing mandates and an unclear expectation of roles and contributions.
* Unfunded mandates.
* Lack of federal and state funding.
* Availability of jobs and programs.
* Unclear understanding of who needs what.
* Declining resources and low priority regarding budgets cuts.
* Local laws and businesses’ ability and willingness to hire inexperienced adult and youth.
 |
| R-4 Benton, Lincoln, Linn | * \* Budget allocation and shortfalls.
* \*Capacity.
* \* Lack of incentives to encourage collaboration.
* Difficulty in developing focused and unified strategies.
 | * Lowest budget allocation in Oregon results in limited LBL WIB resources, particularly as it relates to staff capacity.
* Facilities cost is significant problem. Reducing cost while supporting services to job seekers without creating undue transportation burden is challenging.
* Lack of incentives to collaborate--Partners and stakeholders have challenging workloads and expectations that make it difficult to consistently participate and engage in process.
* Three counties in region, each with its own unique character and economic realities, presents challenges developing focused and unified strategies.
 |
| R-5 Lane | * Eligible Training Provider List for participants accessing 40+ hour online training certificates in manufacturing and health care.
* NCRC not recognized by Department of Labor as valid certification.
* \*Common Measures Performance definitions differing among partners.
* \*No Common Measure Performance indicators related to business.
* \*Lack of computer work stations and proctors for NCRC testing.
* Inability of certain populations to participate in all aspects of sector strategies such as youth under 18 and disabled individuals.
* \*Lack of incentives to encourage collaboration.
* Shortage of long-term evaluation data to drive decision making.
* \*Siloed Funding.
* Loss of case management capacity resulting from Oregon’s integrated service delivery model.
* Manufacturer’s lack of interest in/awareness of certifications.
* Resistance to NCRC testing due to fears of labeling, unfair test practices and discomfort with computerized testing.
* Need for employer outreach method or shared database for State and Local best practices.
 | * Federal and State policies, laws and discriminatory practices.
* Local capacity.
* Lack of funds.
* Regulatory issues.
* Local practices.
* Customer fears and concerns.
 |
| R-8 Jackson, Josephine | * \*Capacity.
* Shrinking resources/\*budget.
* Facilities limitations.
* Approaching capacity for NCRC testing—

 \*lack of computer work stations and proctors for NCRC testing.* NCRC infrastructure and resultant information strategy.

  | * Need to add sectors due to importance to region’s economic vitality. Challenging due to capacity, time and funding regarding WIB staffing capacity around Sector Strategies, Work Ready Communities and System Innovation.
* Lack of dedicated resource pool to support WIB systems alignment work.
* Reduced capacity due to reduced resources.
* Reduced capacity and/or priority to participate due to capacity limitations.
* Employment Department owned facility adding to challenges in finding a cost effective solution for co-location.
* Limits to number of computer labs available for NCRC testing.
* Co-location challenged by fact that OED owns their current facility, making it more difficult to find a cost effective solution to co-location.
* Some Workforce and Education System Partners experience limitations in capacity due to budget limitations and local/state program delivery and/or performance requirements which creates friction in ability at the local level to create more seamless integrated services.
* Expected to reach NCRC capacity limitations in computer labs/classrooms to administer NCRC testing and proctor staff in near future.
* Business leaders are waiting for data on previous Oregon NCRC pilots or from other states which is critical in effort to promote benefit of NCRC.
 |
| R-15 Clackamas | * Lack of physical space.
* Agency and \*siloed funding which prevent flexibility and innovation.
* Inconsistent benchmarks and outcome goals among partners.
* \*Capacity.
* \*Work experience mismatch, or \*skill gaps and lack of experience and opportunities.
* \*Economy.
 | * Insufficient size of Employment Department building where agencies are co-located.
* Competing mandates.
* Differing assigned program goals.
* Declining resources.
* Unfunded mandates.
* Business’ ability to hire inexperienced candidates.
* Industry needs changing.
* Limited jobs and changing demands.
 |
| R-1 Tillamook, Clatsop, ColumbiaR-6 DouglasR-7 Coos, Curry R-9 Hood River, Wasco, Sherman, Gilliam,  WheelerR-10 Deschutes, Crook, JeffersonR-11 Klamath, Lake R-12 Morrow, Umatilla R-13 Union, Wallowa, BakerR-14 Grant, Harney, Malheur | * Information dissemination within State Agencies –sometimes faster than decisions, sometimes does not appear to be disseminated at all – affects inter-organizational ability to coordinate.
* Regional concurrence on Plan – Decisions made at top may not have buy-in at local level.
* Data systems not connected between public partner organizations, limits connectivity and ability to identify appropriate participants.
* \*Lack of incentives to encourage collaboration.
* \*Common Measures Performance definitions differing among partners.
* \*Siloed funding.
* \*No Common Measure Performance indicators related to business.
* Local \*Capacity and resources – staff stretched to the maximum without additional projects, smaller and fewer facilities.
* Rural \*economy, high employment, and low employer confidence in economy.
* Continued functioning of LWIBs/RWIBs, and private business participation.
* Ability to implement CWRC.
 | * Structure of state organizations and practices.
* Federal and State policies.
* Federal and State funding.
* Competing and unfunded mandates.
* Economy.
* Rural issues.
* Funding restrictions and targets outside of those restrictions.
* Local capacity.
 |

\* Represents key reoccurring themes across all areas of the state. Included are challenges in the following areas: capacity, economy, work experience, skills gaps, siloed funding, budget shortfalls, lack of incentives to encourage collaboration, lack of computer work stations and proctors for NCRC testing, Common Measures Performance definitions differing among partners, and no Common Measure Performance related to business.
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