



Summary – Third Meeting
April 25, 2022

- **Welcome and Opening Remarks:** Dan Ellzey, Executive Director, SC Department of Employment and Workforce (“SCDEW”), welcomed Task Force members and thanked SC Competes for aiding in distributing the materials to the Task Force. The Task Force has remained on the time schedule that SCDEW had hoped and is making great progress. At least one member has been recused due to possible intention to respond to the solicitations. SCDEW will be releasing all of the public data to comply with procurement laws. Media attention has continued; while not necessarily pertinent in Phase 1, this positive media attention will be helpful in Phase 2 when the help of governmental and legislative leadership will be needed.
- **Review of Scopes of Work:** Dr. Bryan Grady, Labor Market Information Director, SCDEW, reviewed the previously identified scopes of work and draft solicitations with the Task Force, as follows:

Research and Additional Labor Force Participation Trends - Please refer to the Draft Research Solicitation transmitted via email.

- **Recommendations:**
 - Calling out the specific time period, as far as divergence, may be helpful. [Relates to Question #2]
 - Look at policies or markers in different states or countries that could help SC to move forward. Clarify this approach in Questions 2, 6, and 8. [Relates to Question #2]
 - Once the data is pulled, you can make the comparisons for different time periods, looking at both SC over time and SC in comparison to other states over time. There are clearly pandemic factors – focus on this or before pandemic, or both. These decomposition exercises could clarify whether there are demographic issues or issues policies could address.
 - Need to be able to get beyond what is pandemic-related or not and get to whether there are long term impediments to returning to work.
 - Look to the duration of unemployment – what’s the magnitude of these flows from out of the labor force to into the labor force – long periods of time? Room for rewording. [Relates to Question #4]
 - Questions #5 and #9 need to be sequential but remain separate questions.

- There will be a challenge in addressing rural vs. urban when many counties encompass both demographics. There are data sets like SafeGraph that could capture or define urban vs. rural. [Relates to Questions #5 and #9]
- The resiliency factor is important to discover in regard to urban vs. rural. Rural counties often get hit the hardest when there is an economic downturn. This could be achieved by adding language to Question #2.
- Look at peer states as well, not just SC – were there policy events that put other states in better shape? Take it further and investigate the quantitative impact of those policies. Data on SNAP and other benefits offered by the Task Force. [Relates to Question #6]
- Address some of the metrics that are identified here, a rank order – cross walk this with the survey to give the metrics context. If available, provide survey results to the researcher – timing will be the biggest issue. [Relates to Question #7]
- A thorough literature review of policies may be most helpful, rather than a diagnostic review (*e.g.*, Rand Corp’s study on gun policies). This would be a huge and time-consuming scope of work – encyclopedic. Policy recommendations should not be an afterthought crammed into the conclusion but a substantial part of the findings – best practices, policies that have both direct and indirect effects on LFP. Suggestion that policy question(s) be moved to the beginning.
- Shift-share data would be important and helpful. Make Question #8 higher on the list. Several comments as far as questions implicitly asking for certain things – generally, be explicit in what is needed from the research.
- Eliminate Question #1 – unanimous agreement that an increase in LFP is needed.
- Close the loop as far as the rubric.

Survey of the Unemployed - Please refer to the Draft Survey Solicitation transmitted via email.

- **Recommendations:**

- Think of respondents and how we target and bolster the rate of return. Some say 30% is a great response rate – higher response rate when the topic is of interest or easier contact source (phone call, text, email, etc.).
- Make sure questions are asked in a creative way to actually get the information needed – potential follow-up questions that may deter dishonest responses.
- There was a question and discussion about incentives for respondents.

- **Wrap-Up and Next Steps:** Dr. Erica Von Nessen, Research Economist, SCDEW went over the next steps. Task Force members are welcome to continue to provide input and attend meetings, when available, especially in relation to crafting specific survey questions once the contractor is brought on board. Bryan and Erica will go back and reorganize and revise the research solicitation, which will be distributed to the Task Force for email review and comments. They ask that the Task Force provide responses/suggested edits by close of business Friday, April 29, if possible.
- **Adjournment:** Director Ellzey adjourned the meeting.