

**STATE OF NEVADA
GOVERNOR'S WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD**

STRATEGIC PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE

Monday, December 5, 2022 - 2:00 p.m.

**Teleconference Only
1-669-900-6833
Access code 823 3034 8355**

MINUTES OF MEETING

Present: Nancy Olsen (Chair), Michael Bolognini, David Schmidt, Brett Miller, Milt Stewart, Arianna Florence, Michael Yoder, Daniel McHatton, Edward Estipona, Drazen Elez, Thomas White, Gina Bongiovi,

Absent: Senator Roberta Lange, Robert Fink, Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Scott Black, Sherri Mantanona

Also present: Katie Gilbertson, Ken Evans, Lisa Levine, Elisa Cafferata

1. CALL TO ORDER - OPENING REMARKS

Chair Nancy Olsen called the meeting to order and welcomed participants.

2. ROLL CALL - CONFIRMATION OF A QUORUM

Per direction from Chair Olsen, **Katie Gilbertson** took roll call and confirmed the presence of a quorum.

3. VERIFICATION OF PUBLIC NOTICE POSTING

Katie Gilbertson affirmed that the agenda and notice of the Governor's Workforce Development Board (GWDB) meeting on December 5, 2022, was posted pursuant to Nevada's Open Meeting Law, NRS 241.020.

4. FIRST PUBLIC COMMENT(S) NOTICE

Chair Olsen read the notice into the record as follows: "Members of the public are invited to provide comments at this time. No action may be taken on any matters during public comment until the matter itself has been included on an agenda as an item for possible action.

Chair Olsen invited comments. There were none.

5. DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY -- Overview of Subcommittee Expectations and Goals from Full Board for 2023

Ken Evans, Vice Chair GWDB, indicated his and GWDB Chair Hugh Anderson's desires to move forward working through the subcommittee structure, along with the possible addition of a working group. Mr. Evans indicated the importance of ensuring that the GWDB makes good use of the subcommittee's time and intellectual input in terms of creating a professionally and culturally

competent workforce development system for the state of Nevada. As such, Mr. Evans discussed the importance of identifying topics and areas of concern for the members of the full Board and then working on these things efficiently and effectively through the subcommittee structure. Mr. Evans discussed the two primary objectives for the strategic planning subcommittee: to proactively provide input to the Nevada State Plan for the development of the state's workforce development system so that it is both professionally and culturally competent; through both the subcommittee and full Board structure, to come up with strategic input to some of the systemic ideas for the workforce connections system. Mr. Evans indicated the hope that the subcommittees and the full Board will be able to produce tangible results that will enable people as individuals to become employed, or for businesses to get employees in order to diversify and expand the economy.

Chair Olsen opened the floor for questions.

Ken Evans indicated that he has asked staff to put together a packet of information for the subcommittees that should be available by the full Board meeting that will provide the subcommittee with the notes as well as past objectives and goals that may be used as a starting point. Mr. Evans noted that he, as Vice Chair, has been tasked with ensuring that the subcommittee structure functions efficiently and effectively.

6. DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY – Overview of State Plan, Subcommittee Objectives, and Proposed Meeting Schedule for 2023

Chair Olsen indicated that the Nevada Plan is a unified state plan that includes the following core partners: Title I, adult dislocated worker and youth; Title II, Adult Education; Title III, Wagner Peyser, more commonly known in Nevada as Job Connect; Title IV, Vocational Rehabilitation; and the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services, specifically TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families). Chair Olsen indicated that the law itself does not include TANF, but that governors for every state were allowed to choose to include TANF in the state planning process, and that Nevada's governor at that time did so. Chair Olsen next explained that the state plan includes several main components that are determined at the federal level. As such, Chair Olsen indicated that the US Department of Education and the US Department of Labor determine what is required within the state plan, which is largely based also on the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act. Chair Olsen further indicated that each state plan allows an executive summary that includes: the economic outlook for the state; strategic elements; operational elements; coordination between the programs; common assurances; and program specific requirements. Chair Olsen explained that for each of the core programs, there is a separate section of the state plan that is very specific to that core program as well as the combined state plan partner programs, and that each program has a performance indicator that is completed with performance targets. Chair Olsen next discussed the requirements of the strategic elements as well as the visions and goals of the strategic elements. Chair Olsen explained that up to this point, Nevada has chosen to have the goals under the categories of access, alignment, quality, and outcomes, and that state-specific performance goals can be added if desired although they have not been added to the state plan in the past. Chair Olsen further indicated that assessment of the system is a requirement and that the prompts from the US Department of Ed and the US Department of Labor include describing the strategies that will be implemented in these areas, including the industry sectors and career pathways.

Michael Bolognini asked if the Board has any knowledge on why the decision was made in the past not to create state-specific goals.

Chair Olsen indicated that she has no knowledge regarding this and explained that the first state plan under the Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act was submitted and approved in the spring of 2016, which was prior to her start date. Chair Olsen explained that she has since been involved in the biennium and the four-year plan that went into effect in 2020, but that the goal at that time was to try and improve what was already in place. Chair Olsen further explained that very few people are still around from the timeframe of the creation of the first plan.

Michael Bolognini suggested that this subcommittee could look at discussing and potentially making a recommendation to the full Board of inclusion of state-specific goals, noting that the GWDB has a better chance of moving the ball forward and accomplishing things if some specific goals for workforce development are established.

Lisa Levine, GWDB Executive Director, noted that Mr. Bolognini raises a great point regarding Nevada-specific focuses and that the Board should utilize the regional focuses with the RDAs as well as the one-stop shops to ensure that they have all the needed information. Ms. Levine discussed some of the things seen in other states, who have moved away from having just a WIOA state plan and instead have a unified state plan. Ms. Levine explained that in Nevada, the WIOA-designated agency is DETR, and suggested that the subcommittee think about whether a unified plan would really allow for fewer silos and more of a unified voice with all the different multi-agency and external partners.

Chair Olsen noted that it is possible to do a combined state plan that would bring in additional partners, as well to have additional targets or performance measures.

Milt Stewart indicated that while he was not involved in the original WIOA state plan, he believes that part of the thought process behind not having specific state measures beyond the common measures was that once they are in the state plan, the GWDB is held to them versus having the ability to create their own metrics and performance goals outside of the state plan.

Chair Olsen noted that the biggest difference is being held to them at the federal level versus being held to them at the state level.

Lisa Levine suggested that if the committee did not want to add to a WIOA state plan, action could still be taken to have Nevada goals, clear objectives, and perhaps even a strategic plan from the GWDB around where the state's strategic workforce development efforts should go so that there are still hard performance and metrics that need to be met and then provided to the members of the Board. Ms. Levine indicated that Chair Anderson and Vice Chair Evans have expressed an interest in seeing specifically how much funding is allocated from WIOA and the other 16 workforce development funding streams that come in the state from the federal government, what programs those fund, what the dollar amounts for them are, and ultimately what the final outcome and performance metrics are following the investment, data that has not yet been specifically provided to the Board.

Drazen Elez reiterated that Nevada is a biannual state that has not only goals, but performance measures that need to be included in the biannual budget. As such, federal performance measures and biannual budget measures need to be met. In addition, the agencies have to balance which of the measures they are going to meet. Therefore, Mr. Elez noted that if a third set of measures is added, they would need to be aligned with both of those. Mr. Elez further noted that if the federal metrics are not met, some of those are goals that have certain fiscal penalties that would be imposed on the state and specifically on ESD grants. As such, Mr. Elez opined that when looking at certain performance measures, it is important to look at what state agencies currently have as far as performance goals needing to be met and assessing whether or not additional goals the GWDB wishes to achieve are in line with or in conflict with those performance-measure goals.

Michael Bolognini clarified that his intent in asking the question was not to create arbitrary goals but rather to suggest that the subcommittee and the committee in general look at how to move the state forward, potentially with the idea of using state-specific goals for agencies that are in alignment with those already in existence.

Brett Miller noted that there are four classes of goals around which goals are mandated and that state-specific goals are associated with those many goals.

Milt Stewart informed the subcommittee that the reporting workgroup or committee from the prior Governor's Board had started the process of evaluating the partners with regards to what populations

they served and the amount of funding that they receive. As such, Mr. Stewart indicated that some of that work may have already begun.

Chair Olsen discussed the performance indicators, noting that they are set in law, but each state and each agency within that state that falls under WIOA is required to set negotiating targets with the federal agency and explained what these targets are under Titles I, II, III, and IV. Chair Olsen noted that the state signs common assurances for both the Department of Labor and the Department of Education. Chair Olsen further noted that there are specific prompts to which the state needs to respond for the operational planning and the coordination of state plan programs.

Ken Evans asked the Chair if she is planning with the subcommittee where GWDB is within the two-year or four-year timeframe.

Chair Olsen indicated that she is and noted that the subcommittee submitted the revisions for the 2020 state plan to the full Board last fall. Chair Olsen reminded the members of the subcommittee that the state plan is a biennium as far as revisions or updates, and the full plan is a four-year plan. As such, Chair Olsen indicated that in 2022, the plan was submitted for revisions to the 2020 plan with the full, four-year plan due March 1, 2024. Chair Olsen further indicated that any changes to the state plan or any version of the state plan also has to go out for public comment for at least 60 days, as well as needs to be approved by the full Board, which then pushes back that deadline significantly. Chair Olsen suggested that this can be approached a few different ways: starting from scratch and building a new state plan; taking the existing state plan and making revisions; or creating some sort of hybrid between the two so that there are new sections of the state plan and other pieces of it based mostly on the previous versions.

David Schmidt noted that DETR's contribution to the state plan is to provide a labor market and economic analysis piece. Mr. Schmidt further noted that the subcommittee might find it helpful to think about the element of what do we want to know about where we are today and how early do we need that to make other decisions. Mr. Schmidt also questioned whether the existing plan is sufficient to help the realities the state is facing today as the underlying realities in 2024 will likely be very different than what they were in 2016.

Chair Olsen added that there has been a push towards making the state plan a true strategic document and a more living useful document as opposed to rubbing stamping something. Chair Olsen explained that in the past, it has been more of a compliance document than anything else.

Milt Stewart explained that he found a lot of value in participating on the previous workgroup as the discussions tended to be more direct and the meetings were not subject to open meeting law.

Chair Olsen further noted that a workgroup would not be a decision-making body, but rather working to put some things on paper that would then be presented to the subcommittee and ultimately the full Board.

Ken Evans requested that Chair Olsen provide the subcommittee with an idea of how many pages are in the state plan as well as a rough of idea of the time commitment for the last iteration.

Drazen Elez informed the subcommittee that the full plan is 283 pages.

Chair Olsen explained that the workgroups started off meeting monthly, then went to every other week, then went to weekly the closer the deadlines approached. Chair Olsen further noted her hope that by starting this early, the meetings could be kept mostly to monthly meetings for the workgroup. Chair Olsen acknowledged that the workgroup is a big time commitment.

Milt Stewart added that there was a lot of work that needed to be done prior to or in between meetings in preparation and reiterated the idea that the workgroup was substantial time commitment. Mr. Stewart further noted that the last reiteration was for revision of the existing plan and should the

subcommittee decide to create a new plan, the time commitment would certainly become even greater than in the past.

Lisa Levine requested that Eliza Cafferata discuss the federal funding piece around WIOA.

Elisa Cafferata, DETR, indicated that DETR would get a summary report of the WIOA dollars coming in and noted that there are a lot of funding streams, a lot of dollars, and a lot of moving parts because most of that money comes in in three-year rolling grants. Ms. Cafferata further noted that some states not only put all of their WIOA Titles together, they also include the Perkins dollars. Ms. Cafferata indicated that Clark County School District has requested that this be added to the state plan. Ms. Cafferata indicated that this should prompt the discussion on whether or not to go in that direction as that is an additional funding source and workforce development efforts need to be included in that planning.

Lisa Levine noted that the amount of workforce development monies coming into the state total between \$140 and \$190 million and expressed her appreciation of the subcommittee and all that it will be doing to ensure that those dollars are well spent.

Chair Olsen noted that of the 283 pages in the state plan, close to 80 pages are the individual core partners' portion of the plan, the assurances, and the targets.

Elisa Cafferata noted that when working on something like this DETR often turns to the National Association of State Workforce Agencies to get insight from other states and suggested that the subcommittee ask the what is absolutely required of the workforce partners. As such, Ms. Cafferata opined that it is possible that other states may have more streamlined plans with an appendix that provides the full detail.

Chair Olsen concurred that this is a great idea.

Draze Elez also concurred with Ms. Cafferata's suggestion and indicated his support for a committee outside of this body that works on particular language so as to include specific subject-matter experts with whom the subcommittee would provide with general goals or general direction as to how they should connect the agencies.

Lisa Levine noted that GOWINN has a partnership with the National Governor's Association and is happy to help this committee in preparation of looking at comparables. Ms. Levine further noted that a list of some states for consideration will be provided that include a unified plan that's a bit more aligned with what Nevada currently has in place. Ms. Levine further indicated that DETR and GOWINN participated in DOL monitoring earlier in the year and explained that the findings included the need to strengthen alignment and be less siloed as well as to strengthen the GWDB's involvement and increase transparency and accountability in doing so.

David Schmidt suggested that it would be helpful if earlier in the process, the committee had a sense of what the questions, the goals, and the strategies are on which the subcommittee's focus should be. Mr. Schmidt discussed the importance of determining what needs to be done, how to do it, and how to measure it using specific goals and targets, as well as determining where the gaps and holes are from which the subcommittee might want to build. Mr. Schmidt indicated that he will be sharing with GOED the annual report DETR put together as part of the Workforce Information Grant, which is tied in with Wagner Peyser and the workforce program more broadly. Mr. Schmidt further indicated his belief that this report may help to inform these kinds of conversations.

Chair Olsen noted that one of the many sections in the current plan includes responses that are separated out by each core partner rather than one full response for the state as a whole and suggested that the subcommittee might want to consider whether or not they wish to keep the responses that way or would one response at the state level be preferable and/or feasible.

Brett Miller concurred that there is much work that can be done by the subcommittee in terms of going through the plan and making the answers more cohesive.

Milt Stewart noted that there are regional differences, as well, so that would be an important piece to try and capture in the state plan.

Lisa Levine indicated the importance of including all of the different partners in the conversation.

Thomas White indicated his belief that much can be done for the workers and the potential workers in the community.

Edward Estipona noted that from a business level, he has often seen that things tied to government-based plans end up sitting on a shelf because they are unable to be read by a layman and as such, the laymen are unclear as to their role in making things happen. As such, Mr. Estipona suggested a "Cliff-notes version" for the everyday public to help bring them into the fold and create and apply a more cohesive plan.

Chair Olsen expressed her appreciation for Mr. Estipona's suggestion and reiterated Mr. Estipona's point that one of the parts missing from the state plan is implementation.

Ken Evans thanked both Mr. White and Mr. Estipona for their practical feedback.

Katie Gilbertson reminded the group that today's meeting is for discussion purposes and will not include a vote, noted the robustness and productiveness of the conversation taking place, and informed the members that they will have time to make decision prior to the next meeting in March.

Chair Olsen indicated that she would like to form the workgroup prior to the March meeting.

Drazen Elez expressed his support for the commentary from Mr. White, Mr. Estipona, and Mr. Evans, as well as with Mr. Schmidt's suggestion to figure out some general goals or a basic outline.

Lisa Levine concurred with Mr. Estipona's suggestion of having a summary page of what the GWDB is doing, the purpose of WIOA, and a high level of what the objectives are and how they are aligned as a starting point. Ms. Levine opined that the big piece of getting into the WIOA state plan is increasing its usefulness so that government workers are making it helpful for employers and training partners, as well as ensuring transparency and accountability of where the money is going.

Edward Estipona concurred with Mr. Elez's suggestion of having a good outline to help and determine who is necessary to do what part and then begin piece-mealing out the tasks that would ultimately intertwine back together cohesively in the end. Mr. Estipona further indicated his support for the formation of a workgroup as soon as possible, noting that whatever the subcommittee can do to eliminate some of the red tape will help the group as a whole to become more efficient. Mr. Estipona further noted that if the plan is created correctly this time around, despite the amount of work it will take to do so, it will be easier moving forward. Mr. Estipona indicated his belief that the plan needs to begin again from scratch because so much has changed since 2016.

Chair Olsen concurred and asked Katie Gilbertson if it was allowed to request for volunteers for the workgroup in today's meeting.

Katie Gilbertson indicated that the Chair could ask for volunteers but that nothing could be voted upon today.

David Schmidt suggested adding members to the workgroup that are not members of the subcommittee so as to diversify the input.

Katie Gilbertson suggested sending out an interest poll with all the supplemental documents following the meeting.

Chair Olsen concurred with this suggestion. Chair Olsen further noted that Ken Evans has volunteered to be ex-officio for the group.

Drazen Elez informed the group that all the nuances of the state plan will need to be included in the Governor's budget, meaning that if the group arrives at the plan in 2024, it would not be included in the budget until 2025 or 2026. As such, Mr. Elez wanted to ensure the group was aware of the timelines with which they need to work in order to implement the state plan.

Chair Olsen concurred, noting that what is possible in the budget is absolutely something that the group needs to keep in mind when working on the state plan.

Ken Evans indicated that as the group moves forward with the state plan, it is important to keep in mind where the plan is going strategically in terms of having a more resilient, diversified economy and indicated the importance of ensuring that the group comes up with strategic overarching themes that can go into this plan.

Chair Olsen noted that a lot of the implementation could very well fit within the current positions of the members who work for the state as well as within current budgets, and indicated her belief that there is still a lot that can be done to implement strategies in the state plan without needing to request additional funding or needing to move funds.

Edward Estipona concurred and noted that moving forward, the group can begin moving towards working within existing budgets and discussed the importance of building a strong foundation upon which it will be easier to build in the future.

Chair Olsen indicated that the US Departments of Education and Labor love repetition, and reminded members not to be surprised at the amount of repetition that generally cannot be eliminated. Chair Olsen informed the group that the document would be sent to members today, along with the current state plan and a survey-type request poll for the workgroup. Chair Olsen next asked the members their opinions on meeting quarterly or more often.

Edward Estipona suggested getting the workgroup going, and noted that by March, there should be a better understanding of the frequency with which the group needs to meet.

Ken Evans thanked the Chair and the subcommittee members for providing input into this discussion and noted that this was an excellent start. Mr. Evans concurred with Mr. Estipona's suggestion of getting the workgroup started as soon as possible.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS NOTICE (SECOND)

Chair Olsen invited comments.

There was no public comment.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The December 5th, 2022 meeting was adjourned.

Notice of this meeting was posted on or before 9 a.m. on the third day prior to the meeting on the Internet at:

http://owinn.nv.gov/GWDB/GWDB_Workforce_Meetings/ and
[Nevada's Public Notice website at https://notice.nv.gov/](https://notice.nv.gov/), as required by NRS 232.2175.

Supporting public material provided to Committee members for this meeting is posted on OWINN's Website at http://owinn.nv.gov/GWDB/GWDB_Workforce_Meetings/ may be requested from the Executive Director's Office at 555 E. Washington Ave. Ste. 4900, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101; or call (702) 486-8080.