

STATE OF NEVADA
GOVERNOR'S WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD
Full Board Meeting

Wednesday, October 18, 2023 - 2:00 p.m.

Vegas: Grant Sawyer Building
Attorney General's Conference Room
555 E. Washington Ave. #4500
Las Vegas, NV 89101

Carson City: Department of Employment, Training, and Rehabilitation
SAO Conference Room
500 E. Third St.
Carson City, NV 89713

Teleconference Line
1-669-900-6833
Meeting ID: 859 3625 2161
Passcode: 900832

MINUTES OF MEETING

Present: Hugh Anderson (Chair), Kenneth Evans (Vice Chair), Scott Black, Lawrence Montrose, Gina Bongiovi, Jerrie Merritt, Ryan Woodward, Edward Estipona, Irene Bustamante Adams, George Gault, Leslie Mujica, Derrick Gyamfi, Kevin Landry, Crystal Slaughter, Michael Bolognini, Robert Benner, Evelyn Thompson-Hilbert, Drazen Elez, Robert Thompson, Nancy Olsen, Thomas White, Kristine Nelson

Absent: Roberta Lange, Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Ken Goodrich, Susan Brager, Lori Calderon, Sherri Mantanona, Brittany Brown, David Dreibelbis, Maureen Schafer

Also present: Katie Gilbertson, Janiese Clyne, Kara Abe, Samantha Heely, Kim Jadidi, David Schmidt, Cheryl Olson, Milt Stewart, Michael Yoder, Brett Miller, Arianna Florence, Nakeisha Ricks-Pettyjohn, Dr. Tiffany Tyler-Garner

1. **CALL TO ORDER - OPENING REMARKS AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
Chair Anderson called the meeting to order, welcomed participants, and led the participants in the Pledge of Allegiance.
2. **ROLL CALL - CONFIRMATION OF A QUORUM**
Per direction from Chair Anderson, **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 October 18, 2023, was posted pursuant to Nevada's Open Meeting Law, NRS 241.020.

4. **FIRST PUBLIC COMMENT(S) NOTICE**

Chair Anderson read the notice into the record as follows: “Members of the public are invited to comments at this time. No action may be taken on any matter during public comments until the matter itself has been included on an agenda as an item for possible action. Public comments will be limited to three minutes per person.” Please clearly state and spell your full name for the Record.

Chair Anderson invited comments. There were none.

5. ***FOR POSSIBLE ACTION - Approval of the August 16, 2023 meeting minutes**

Chair Anderson called for comments/changes to August 16, 2023 meeting minutes. **It was moved by Leslie Mujica and seconded by Michael Bolognini to approve the August 16, 2023 minutes.**

Kristine Nelson abstained from voting on the August 16, 2023 meeting minutes.

6. ***FOR POSSIBLE ACTION – State Compliance Policy (SCP) 5.9 – State Compliance Policy Procedure**

Janiese Clyne, ESD Program Chief, WISS presented State Compliance Policy 5.9 to the Board. Page one of the policy addresses State compliance policies and Governor Workforce Development Board bylaws. On page two, changes are outlined under policy and procedure, specifying that substantive policy changes must be approved by both the Governor's Workforce Development Board Executive Committee and the Full Board for ratification. Non-substantive changes require only the Executive Committee's approval. Definitions for non-substantive changes are provided, and the process for public comment is detailed, directing interested parties to the DETR website for document posting and a 14-day comment period. Page two also includes revisions in compliance with Department of Labor requirements and updates based on the August 2023 Governor Workforce Development board bylaws. On page three, a slight change is made to substantive changes, adding State Compliance Policy (SCP), requiring approval from the Executive Committee and full Governor Workforce Development Board.

Michael Bolognini asked if it was necessary to require public comment. He mentioned that public comment opportunities are offered, but it is more of a request than a requirement.

Janiese Clyne responded this was part of a DOL finding during a DETR monitoring in September. DOL recommended that State Compliance Policies were to be posted for public comment. She asked Mr. Bolognini if he was recommending a different word.

Michael Bolognini replied that it should state request public comment, and not require.

Janiese Clyne indicated that they could make that change.

Chair Anderson called for comments/changes to the revisions to GWDB bylaws. **It was moved by Michael Bolognini and seconded by Jerrie Merritt to approve State Compliance Policy (SCP) 5.9 – State Compliance Policy Procedure**

7. **DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY – Presentation on State Plan Draft**

Katie Gilbertson, Policy Analyst, GOWINN started the presentation with an overview of the task for the Board during the meeting and the timeline for revising and submitting the WIOA State Plan. She explained that the current State Plan, the proposed draft for the new plan, and an executive summary of the changes from the current plan to the draft plan were provided to the Board members in advance of the meeting. Ms. Gilbertson thanked Nancy Olsen, Arianna Florence, and all of the work group members for their contributions over the past year. Next, the timeline for approving the draft, sending for public comment and the Governor's office, and making revisions for the final draft of the State Plan were presented.

David Schmidt, Chief Economist, DETR presented the economic overview portion of the State Plan. He presented three key points: Nevada's economic landscape, targeted groups that the Board

has examined throughout the past year within the State Plan, and microdata on other various populations. First, Mr. Schmidt reviewed that Nevada has had the fastest employment growth in the country, meanwhile, Nevada also has the highest unemployment rate in the country at around five percent. This is attributed to workers re-entering and re-engaging with the labor market. Higher unemployment rates have contributed to a decline in wage growth. Second, Mr. Schmidt delved into the demographic breakouts of populations with lower labor force participation and higher unemployment rates. He highlighted these groups include people with any disability, people in poverty, women with preschool-aged children, people with a high school degree or less, and African American males. The State Plan analyzes the barriers to employment for these groups and factors across the northern and southern parts of the State to identify disparities. Third, the State Plan covers broader economic trends through examining age, race, language, veteran status, and poverty level impacts on labor force participation and unemployment using Census microdata. Mr. Schmidt indicated that there is a wealth of data tables within the Plan to help policymakers understand the effects of determining factors on populations through broken-out data.

Nancy Olsen shared that the State Plan has undergone significant streamlining efforts, reducing its length by nearly 50 pages compared to previous plans. Ms. Olsen continued to present the three goals and ensuing strategies and measurements that will be used to monitor and implement those goals. First, the population goal aims to prioritize populations with high unemployment or low labor force participation and increase engagement by developing targeted strategies to address their specific needs. Second, the alignment goal ensures collaboration among required partners to maximize efficiency, minimize duplication, and streamline access to services for workforce system clients. Third, the collaboration goal implements common processes and systems across the entire workforce system to eliminate redundancy and simplify the participant experience. Ms Olsen further explained the differences between the proposed draft and the current draft, stating that before there were many goals and strategies with partners implementing different aspects, but the new plan calls for a more coordinated and systemic approach. Beyond the goals, the State Plan includes program-specific sections for core partners (Title I-B, Title II, Title III, and Title IV), each with detailed responses to ensure federal compliance. Additionally, the State Plan retains sections responding to federal prompts with highlighted portions indicating the federal requirements for clarity.

Ryan Woodward expressed gratitude for the comprehensive plan but raised concerns about the general and non-measurable nature of the goals. He highlighted the apparent emphasis on job seekers and the lack of attention to employers in the plan, noting that the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) aims to align the needs of both employers and job seekers. Mr. Woodward questioned the intentional lack of specificity and measurability in the goals and sought clarification on this approach. He also pointed out that the top 10 jobs identified in the plan appear to be very basic and entry-level, lacking a comprehensive strategy to meet the diverse needs of employers in Nevada.

Nancy Olsen replied that the Plan is responding to federal prompts, and David Schmidt's economic analysis addresses workforce gaps. She mentioned that Title III of the plan focuses extensively on employers. The initial 100 pages emphasize economic analysis, and later sections delve into goals and strategies. Regarding the goals' broad and overarching nature, Ms. Olsen confirmed that it was intentional. The decision was made to avoid narrow and specific SMART goals within the Plan, as any additional performance measures would be federally mandated. While the State may consider additional measures, they want to avoid being held to them at the federal level. Ms. Olsen invited other subject matter experts to provide their input.

Vice Chair Evans asked Ms. Olsen to address how the State Plan will be an augmentation to Mr. Woodward's concern.

Nancy Olsen explained the group's extensive discussions about creating a strategic plan, envisioning a concise document of two or three pages. This strategic plan would further develop the measurements and strategies from the State Plan. The aim is for this strategic document to be a dynamic, living tool that leads into the implementation phase of the broader State Plan.

Vice Chair Evans thanked Ms. Olsen and noted that this would be discussed in a later agenda item.

Michael Bolognini questioned the risk of adding more specific goals to the State Plan. He brought up that Ms. Olsen indicated the State would be held federally accountable for those specific goals, but countered that if that is what helps the State achieve its goal of connecting skilled workers to employers then why is that a bad thing.

Nancy Olsen responded that while having additional measures at the State level is not inherently negative, there are federal sanctions outlined in the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act for states that fail to meet performance targets. She highlighted the potential loss of over a million dollars in federal funds for Nevada if the State fell under sanctions. The work group and Strategic Planning Subcommittee, with Ms. Olsen's recommendation, decided against adding more measures at the State level to avoid significantly increasing the risk of falling under federal sanctions.

Irene Bustamante Adams expressed gratitude for the challenging task and praised the move toward a more strategic plan. She asked about specific timelines for measurements in the plan, particularly the consequences of not achieving them. The concern is centered around accountability and enforcement, especially regarding aspects like referral tracking systems or common intake. Ms. Bustamante Adams wanted clarification on whether there are explicit timelines and consequences, especially for core partners.

Nancy Olsen answered that each core partner is affiliated with a governing body or agency, and reports to the GWDB. The intention is to discuss additional reporting measures with the GWDB as part of the strategic planning mentioned by Vice Chair Evans. Regarding the consequences of not achieving goals, there are limits outside of each eligible agency. Ms. Olsen acknowledged a lack of follow-through in previous state plans, noting the absence of a clear next step or implementation plan after outlining various steps, strategies, and goals in past versions of the state plan.

Ryan Woodward thanked Ms. Olsen for the ongoing efforts in putting the Plan together and acknowledged the helpfulness of the question being asked. Mr. Woodward, not being immersed in the everyday details and thus not being apprised of the partners' accountability measures, expressed a desire to see more specificity or "teeth" in the goals, aligning them with federal standards for clearer accountability. The key question posed by Mr. Woodward was who is ultimately responsible for the Plan. The inquiry is driven by a need to understand the lines of accountability and leadership within the implementation of the plan.

Nancy Olsen explained The Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act (WIOA) presents complexity in terms of authority, as it designates authority to the Governor's Workforce Development Board, the eligible agencies, and ultimately to the governor. Ms. Olsen explained that the GWDB functions more as an advisory and coordinating group because each of the core partners falls within an eligible agency whose governance structure extends to the governor. Direct authority is not conferred to the governor's board, but rather to the governor. Each core partner has performance measures and targets specified in individual sections of the State Plan. Performance measures are uniform across all core partners, and negotiations for performance targets are conducted under federal law.

Evelyn Thompson-Hilbert echoed the appreciation for the hard work on the behemoth project. She acknowledged the bureaucratic nature of the Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act (WIOA) and shared insights from her research on the return on investment of federal dollars. Ms. Thompson-Hilbert's concern is about the limited time to delve into quarterly reports from agencies and she raised questions about the alignment of performance measures with federal dollars in the context of the strategic plan. Ms. Thompson-Hilbert emphasized the importance of a balance between business perspectives and advocacy for the people served. She sought guidance on how the advisory body can be more proactive and involved, offering useful advice.

Vice Chair Evans explained that all the questions asked by the Board members are leading the group in the right direction. The intent of the strategic plan is to extrapolate the overarching goals out of the compliance-oriented WIOA State Plan and develop them further into a two-to-three-page strategic planning document that will have metrics and implementation, and then monitored and reported on in a real-time manner. This will position the Board to provide advice and influence the governance of the workforce system. Vice Chair Evans noted board members that will be involved in the development of the strategic plan.

Kristine Nelson recognized the nature of the State Plan as a compliance document and expressed support for the strategic plan approach, emphasizing state-level control and measurement. She raised a concern about the potential involvement of the governor's office, suggesting an earlier review to avoid significant changes during the 30-day review period. Ms. Nelson also brought up the importance of involving Industry Sector Councils in providing input to the Board, especially for insights into regional employment needs. She recommended increased engagement and involvement of these councils to better inform the state group about regional and employer needs.

Leslie Mujica mentioned that at the last meeting, the Board had requested more tailored and uniform reports that showcase achievements and success rather than simple read-offs. She agreed with Mr. Woodward's earlier point on the need for these reports to add "teeth" to the goals, aligning with the goal of incorporating them into the Plan for more effective monitoring and implementation.

Katie Gilbertson, GOWINN noted that the next speaker will discuss best practices on title reports.

Derrick Gyamfi acknowledged the need to proceed with the current WIOA State Plan due to timing and potential fines. However, he asked for clarification if the Board should anticipate that a sub-strategy will be developed for the next iteration, emphasizing that the next State Plan will likely have a different structure and content.

Nancy Olsen responded that the desire for a dynamic, living document that actively guides the work between State Plan iterations. Ms. Olsen explained that there is not a lot that can be changed about the WIOA State Plan since it responds to federal prompts. However, she stressed the importance of having a state-level document that effectively drives implementation and measures success in response to the state plan's strategies.

Vice Chair Evans added that there is potential for Nevada to participate in initiatives, such as the National Governor's Association's initiative, aimed at transforming State Plans to be less compliance-oriented and more strategic, real-time, and innovation-focused. He encouraged leveraging national platforms, including engagement with the Congressional Delegation, to influence potential counterproductive federal requirements that may hinder effective implementation at the State level.

Nancy Olsen agreed with Derrick regarding the due date for the WIOA State Plan. She emphasized the State has to have a substantially approvable State Plan for the federal funds to flow into Nevada. For example, Ms. Olsen shared that for Title II that would amount to \$7 million that would be forgone if the State Plan was not submitted in time.

Chair Anderson summarized that he has heard the concerns along with the importance of promptly submitting a compliant report. He expressed that hopefully the governor sees that the Board put together a compliant report for the federal government. Chair Anderson conveyed that this desire for the Board is to create a data-driven and teeth-driven agenda that outlines what the Board would like to accomplish in a given year with given targets. He suggested approving the Plan with confidence in the ongoing subcommittee work to address concerns related to metrics, data, and accountability.

8. *FOR POSSIBLE ACTION - Approval of the State Plan draft

Chair Anderson called for comments/changes to the revisions to the State Plan draft.

Michael Bolognini asked for clarification that at a high level, the intent is to submit this Plan to check the boxes with the federal government and then the Board will focus on coming up with tangible goals for specific divisions of the State that will be upheld to commence the initiative to meet those specific goals with measurable objectives.

Chair Anderson told Mr. Bolognini he was absolutely correct.

Kristine Nelson asked what the purpose of the executive summary is.

Chair Anderson replied that the executive summary will elevate the metrics that they want to be held accountable for. It will take its main focus, from the longer plan that will be submitted to the federal government and identify where data and accountability are requested.

Edward Estipona said the 250-page plan is very general and allows the State to get its federal funding whereas the two-to-three-page document will be where specific details will be developed in conjunction with the local boards to ensure everybody can move forward. The living shorter document will be used to achieve things and the federal document will be to receive funding until the culture of federal funding is changed.

Kristine Nelson responded that she understood there would be a strategic plan, but asked what the attached document title “executive summary” was.

Nancy Olsen clarified that Ms. Nelson was referring to the document that Ms. Gilbertson put together to help the Board understand the changes from the old State Plan to the new State Plan. She explained that the former executive summaries reviewed page-by-page changes, however given the vast amount of changes in this version of the Plan it was more feasible to provide an overarching summary.

Ryan Woodward asked if this Plan was to receive the funding, but not to dictate the allocation of the funds.

Nancy Olsen answered the majority of the funding is formula-based. There are sections in the State Plan that detail how each partner allocates their funds, but what the partners receive from the federal government is formula-based.

Brett Miller, Workforce Connections informed that for Title I, the State Plan details how the formula funds flow from the State to the Title I services in local, individual areas. Mr. Miller explained this is an approval of the methodology of allocating funds from the State to local areas by the DOL with respect to Title I.

Ryan Woodward thanked Mr. Miller for his explanation and said that most of the conversation seemed to be about Title I funds for Workforce Connections and Nevadaworks. He noted he would like to have more conversation about the other Titles.

Vice Chair Evans concurred.

It was moved by Irene Bustamante Adams and seconded by Jerrie Merritt to approve the State Plan draft.

9. DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY – Discussion on Title report revisions

Nakeisha Ricks-Pettyjohn, Senior Fellow, National Skills Coalition, greeted the Board and reflected on her experience in Tennessee, highlighting the importance of measuring what truly matters beyond the six core performance indicators outlined in WIOA. Ms. Ricks-Pettyjohn cited a quote from the Commissioner of the Tennessee Department of Labor and Workforce Development, Deniece Thomas, “You can hit every federal measure and still do your state a disservice,” emphasizing the need to measure what matters by going beyond the six core performance indicators. She emphasized the need for a business-oriented approach in the public workforce system, citing a

300 percent increase in one program by engaging the Tennessee workforce board in business conversations. Ms. Ricks-Pettyjohn applauded the Board's engagement in discussions about impact, return on investment, and addressing gaps in the current system, noting that these interests are indicators of a high-performing workforce board aligned with national expectations. She noted in Tennessee when the workforce board negotiated with the workforce programs which outcomes they wanted to see and how they wanted the programs to report, performance reports were produced that were similar to profit and loss statements. She stressed the significance of producing digestible reports that business board members can understand and ask questions on to convey the effectiveness of workforce programs.

Nakeisha Ricks-Pettyjohn, National Skills Coalition, introduced the National Skills Coalition as a national group focused on inclusive high-skill training for better lives and sustained business growth. She outlined their approach through analysis, technical assistance, organizing, advocacy, and communications to improve state and federal skills policy. Ms. Ricks-Pettyjohn shared insights from listening sessions conducted with stakeholders across the country, emphasizing the need for flexible and meaningful legislation. She presented seven themes from these sessions, leading to their campaign for an equitable and resilient workforce strategy. From that campaign, Ms. Ricks-Pettyjohn shared three top-line recommendations for investing more, investing equitably, and investing differently. She delved into the importance of data disaggregation and accountability for creating an inclusive economy. Drawing from Minnesota's example, Ms. Ricks-Pettyjohn emphasized the value of disaggregated performance data in promoting accountability and shared alignment of resources. In response to the Board's discussions and proposed WIOA State Plan goals of performance, Ms. Ricks-Pettyjohn highlighted the importance of formulating key performance indicators (KPIs) that measure what matters, posing questions about quantitative and qualitative outcomes, data sources, accountability, and collaborative review processes. Ms. Ricks-Pettyjohn shared an example of key performance indicators from Tennessee and discussed how their Board decided on this template. She recommended a phased approach to target setting through "soft" and "hard" targets, as demonstrated in Tennessee, to ensure impact without stifling the system. Ms. Ricks-Pettyjohn showcased how KPIs can be integrated to drive workforce strategies and inclusive economic growth.

Chair Anderson requested that Ms. Ricks-Pettyjohn send the slides to Ms. Gilbertson for dissemination to the Board. Chair Anderson then asked what stood out for Ms. Ricks-Pettyjohn when the Board was discussing their State Plan earlier in the meeting.

Nakeisha Ricks-Pettyjohn shared three things that she found interesting from the earlier conversation. First, was a shared accountability approach that Tennessee adopted. She shared that their state submitted a combined workforce plan and required shared responsibility across the Titles, envisioning a one-stop lens for constituents in a shared scope of services. Second, a strategic training session is proposed, where Board members can have a deep dive into performance measures, allocation, and appropriation. Ms. Ricks-Pettyjohn suggested conducting a SWOT analysis and writing a letter to the governor outlining the board's functions and responses. She highlighted the importance of grounding everyone in open conversations to clarify expectations. Third, Ms. Ricks-Pettyjohn emphasized that the Board should exercise its authoritative power to leverage the information they need by implementing structures that support the Board. She provided examples of how the Tennessee board transformed their reporting processes to fit the needs of the business members through clear and concise reports that use red, green, yellow indicators. These changes will allow Board members to take a deep dive, tailoring questions to extract the desired information and outcomes.

10. DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY – Discussion on Childcare Subcommittee and Childcare Working Group

Vice Chair Evans remarked the need for a clear Subcommittee structure and nomenclature. He stated the formal subcommittees are the Strategic Planning Subcommittee, Childcare Subcommittee, and Barriers and Underserved Populations Subcommittee. Additionally, Vice Chair Evans mentioned having working groups, like the childcare working group and potentially an IT working group, to address specific issues or initiatives. The differences between subcommittees and working groups are

explained as the subcommittees will have standing meetings and follow a more rigid structure, whereas the working groups will be more adaptable to conduct business more efficiently.

Kristine Nelson asked why childcare is specifically called out.

Vice Chair Evans explained that they originally had a data performance measurements subcommittee that was later sunsetted after completing certain tasks. He described how the creation of subcommittees, such as the Childcare Subcommittee, is driven by systemic priorities. For instance, coming out of COVID, childcare was a systemic barrier and impediment for workforce development. The Childcare Subcommittee was formed to handle high-level strategic issues, while a child care working group was established to address specific tasks, like a demonstration project for regional child care facilities. The structure reflects an evolving response to overarching issues and priorities within the workforce development system.

Katie Gilbertson, GOWINN added that the Childcare Subcommittee was specifically targeted by the Board due to presentations from the Children's Cabinet, the Department of Health and Human Services Division of Welfare Supportive Services last August and October. These presentations highlighted the consistent issue of childcare as a barrier to workforce participation. The Board recognized the national significance of this issue and initiated the Childcare Subcommittee in response. The timeline for the childcare working group was displayed, and it was emphasized that a member of the Children's Cabinet who presented last year is actively involved in the work group, collaborating with Ken Evans and board member Leslie Mujica to ensure strategic and inclusive efforts.

Leslie Mujica shared that unions spoke up about the need for childcare because it impacts apprenticeship completion rates given that childcare costs \$16,000 per year.

Kristine Nelson answered those responses clarified her question.

Vice Chair Evans noted that the next agenda item is for the creation of the Childcare Subcommittee. The Childcare Working Group already has identified leadership as Leslie Mujica and Kim Cullen from the Children's Cabinet.

Robert Thompson asked if Karissa Loper Machado from Welfare was on the work groups or if she could be on the Subcommittee.

Vice Chair Evans replied external individuals are welcome to participate in the working groups, and efforts are made to be as inclusive as possible to gather diverse perspectives. However, for subcommittees, there is a need to adhere to a specific composition structure. The aim is to involve a broad range of voices in the working groups to ensure comprehensive insights and perspectives for moving forward effectively.

Chair Anderson added that the establishment of working groups and subcommittees is not meant to introduce complexity but rather to break down the key issues that the Board aims to address. The intention is to strategically tackle these issues, enhance the quality of data, and ensure a more accurate critique and response. Chair Anderson stated this approach aims to optimize the impact of efforts and resources invested by efficiently addressing specific components of the larger challenges.

11. *FOR POSSIBLE ACTION – Creation of Childcare Subcommittee and Appointment of Subcommittee Chair

Chair Anderson called for comments/changes to the creation of the Childcare Subcommittee.

Michael Bolognini asked who was being considered for Subcommittee Chair.

Vice Chair Evans responded that Susan Brager is being considered for Subcommittee Chair.

It was moved by Michael Bolognini and seconded by Jerrie Merritt to approve Creation of Childcare Subcommittee

Chair Anderson appointed Susan Brager as the Chair of the Subcommittee.

12. DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY – Update from Barriers and Underserved Populations Subcommittee

Vice Chair Evans mentioned the Subcommittee is advancing pilot initiatives focused on engaging different regions (North, South, and rural areas), with a potential emphasis on tribal populations. The goal is to identify and implement initiatives and best practices that can be adapted or applied statewide. The next Barriers and Underserved Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for October 25th.

Dr. Tiffany Tyler-Garner, City of Las Vegas Department of Youth Development and Social Initiatives clarified the Subcommittee is committed to Statewide representation and addressing regional, population-specific, and systemwide issues. The upcoming agenda will feature a standing report from Nevadaworks and special topics, including a presentation from Vocational Rehabilitation on individuals with special needs in employment. Additionally, there will be a discussion and presentation on trauma-informed Workforce Development.

13. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ONLY – New business from Full Board members

Chair Anderson informed that the 2024 meeting calendar will be voted on at the next meeting and to please contact Ms. Gilbertson with any questions.

Drazen Elez provided that the Department of Employment, Training, and Rehabilitation, in collaboration with the Nevada Department of Education, has secured a \$10 million grant from the US Department of Education. This substantial grant aims to enhance transition services and outcomes for children with disabilities. The goal is to establish centralized services for individuals with disabilities, ensuring equitable access to support services for students and their families across the state, regardless of geographic location. The project also involves creating materials and channels to effectively reach and benefit individuals throughout Nevada.

Chair Anderson asked if they had already received the grant.

Drazen Elez confirmed that was correct.

Chair Anderson shared that while he is not expecting an answer at the moment, the Board is interested in understanding the impact of the \$10 million grant. He requested information on how the funds will affect the population served, with a focus on observable metrics and benchmarks. The Board is interested in seeing a comparison of the situation before and after the grant, specifically assessing the impact over the coming quarters and years.

Drazen Elez said he would be able to figure out a way to

Chair Anderson noted at every meeting, the Board emphasizes the importance of data and he expressed a keen interest in understanding the impact of the \$10 million grant. Chair Anderson highlighted the need for meaningful metrics that can demonstrate positive changes resulting from the grant within a year or over the coming quarters. The Board is seeking evidence of tangible improvements and outcomes for the deserving population targeted by the grant.

Drazen Elez acknowledged the importance of meaningful metrics and highlighted the collaborative nature of the grant involving multiple partners. The primary goal is to increase the transition of youth and students with disabilities into employment or post-secondary education, ultimately leading to self-sufficiency. He expressed a willingness to provide updates on the progress and measurable outcomes of the grant, suggesting it as a potential agenda item for a future meeting.

Michael Bolognini asked the duration of the grant.

Drazen Elez noted it is a five-year grant to spend \$10 million and elaborated on which benchmarks need to be met during the duration of the grant.

Vice Chair Evans mentioned two things: first that Ken Goodrich noted that he would be absent prior to the meeting and should be excused and second regarding the IT working group. Vice Chair Evans discussed the importance of reporting and monitoring, emphasizing the role of the IT working group led by board members Derek Gyamfi and Ryan Woodward. The focus is on developing an IT system that facilitates collaboration among the seven partners mentioned, ensuring effective reporting and monitoring at both the local board and state agency levels. The IT working group will assess existing systems and identify requirements for an efficient reporting framework.

14. PUBLIC COMMENTS NOTICE (SECOND)

Chair Anderson invited comments. There were none.

15. ADJOURNMENT

The October 18, 2023 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:

<https://gowinn.nv.gov/boards-commissions/gwdb/> 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 GOWINN's Website at <https://gowinn.nv.gov/boards-commissions/gwdb/> 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.