



# KWIB Sector Strategies Workgroup Meeting

**Meeting Minutes**  
**May 21, 2024**  
**10:00 am – 11:30 am EDT**

---

**Committee Members Present:** Sam Keathley, Becky Gilpatrick, Shellie Snowball-Baker, Kim Menke, Lindsey Trent, Steve Rudolf

**Staff:** Alisher Burikhanov, Elishah Taylor, LaChrista Ellis, Debbie Dennison

### **Call to Order at 10:00 am**

**Alisher Burikhanov, Executive Director, Kentucky Workforce Innovation Board (KWIB)**, provided an update on information reviewed in previous meetings. In a recap he talked about the importance of the key occupations being a part of sector discussions and the importance of the support available for individuals pursuing related degrees. He emphasized that this information will be compiled into a comprehensive package for the Employer Engagement Committee and KWIB review.

Alisher mentioned that a deeper analysis of occupations that was requested has been conducted by **Kentucky Center for Statistics (KYSTATS)**, as detailed in the pre-read materials. He added that this meeting provides a platform to answer any questions and to utilize quantitative insights into various sectors. The group is tasked with examining the occupations and methodology, as requested. Sam Keathley will provide additional insights into occupations driving key sectors for the group's review.

Alisher asked **Sam Keathley, Senior Workforce Analyst at KYSTATS** to share updates.

### **Key Industries/Sectors/ Occupation Overview**

**Sam Keathley** shared current methodology and added data point updates to the occupational data analyzed. He highlighted the importance of understanding aspects such as wages, demand, and growth rate. He explained that occupations are assigned decile scores based on three key metrics, combined into a weighted composite score from zero to ten. Occupations with above-average scores are considered more favorable, and KYSTATS has compiled a list of key occupations meeting these criteria.

Sam walked through his spreadsheet, including the ranking sectors input tab containing all qualifying occupations. For May, he introduced two new tabs: "top\_25\_within\_sectors," listing the top ten sectors and the 25 occupations with the highest composite scores within those sectors, and "top\_25\_by\_ed," which groups occupations by educational attainment levels and lists the top 25 occupations by composite score within each bin. He noted that more than 25 occupations might be listed due to ties in composite scores.

### **Data Discussion**

Discussions began with questions about the first tab, specifically regarding wages that dropped off. The suggestion was made to create a list identifying those occupations that "fell off" for feedback to businesses to provide potential adjustments in pay to ensure sustainability. It was noted that the list was limited to occupations meeting certain criteria.

Another point raised was the consideration of scholarship dollars in relation to living wages. An example was given of occupations providing additional skills that could lead to further favorable opportunities. A new tab was introduced, with reference to previous meetings requests to identify key occupations within sectors. The method involved ranking occupations based on educational requirements and composite scores, with only the top 25 considered.

Continued discussion was had about occupational alignment within top industries. Requests to include expansion of occupations for societal need in the analysis was raised (e.g. if nurses are needed, then educators for nurses programs are also needed). The discussion concluded examining which occupations fell off and their prevalence within each sector, aiming to address any discrepancies.

Alisher wrapped up the meeting by recapping and highlighting the next steps. He emphasized the group's request to review the third factor of the methodology focused on living wages to determine what occupations have fallen off. He also reviewed the discussion on examining the top 25 occupations within each sector to understand their prevalence and narrowing down the analysis. Additionally, Alisher mentioned the discussion on the importance of the "top\_25\_by\_ed" tab, and the need to cross-reference occupations with education attainment. This helps identify occupations that don't appear in the top sectors but are still significant.

Clarification was provided that for sectors like healthcare requiring an associate degree or less, only about five occupations are listed, indicating that most occupations in these sectors require higher education levels. It was clarified that there is a need to identify entry-level jobs that lead into these pipelines and top industries that accept associate degrees or less, as these are currently underrepresented.

Regarding graduate degrees, there was requested clarification on the agreed approach, suggesting the use of a filter to identify how many entry-level occupations require these degrees.

Sam agreed and acknowledged these requests and will have the material ready for the next meeting.

Next meeting date: June 20, 11am EDT

#### **Action Items:**

- Identify what occupations fall off when living wage filter is applied – this research can inform employers on wages in those occupations.
- Narrow down the top 25 occupations in each sector, removing repeats and continuing to narrow down the view of occupations.
- Identify educational requirement by occupation and cross walk those with the top sectors for review.
- Identify a living wage flag for all occupations listed with “yes” or “no” flag.
- KWIB staff to identify employer contacts within each identified “top sector” and include in future meetings.

**Adjournment 11:30 AM EDT**