# STATE OF NEVADA GOVERNOR'S WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD

# **Strategic Planning Subcommittee**

Monday, October 19, 2020 - 3:00 p.m.

## TELECONFERENCE ONLY 1-669-900-6833 | Meeting ID 879 0058 1938

### **MINUTES OF MEETING**

# **Present:** William "Bill" Stanley, Nancy Olsen, Aaron West, Craig Statucki, Jamie Cruz, Ryan Cordia, William "Larry" Fagerhaug, Jenny Casselman, Mechelle Merrill

Absent: Ann Silver, Doug Owen, John Thurman

Also present: Andres Feijoo, (OWINN), Joan Finlay, (OWINN), Mayita Sanchez (OWINN)

#### 1. **OPENING REMARKS**

**Nancy Olsen, Chair,** called the meeting to order and welcomed participants. he explained that under normal circumstances, the Board would not be permitted to conduct business via teleconference. However, due to COVID-19, the Governor issued Emergency Directive 006, which permits public bodies to conduct proceedings via teleconference.

#### 2. ROLL CALL - CONFIRMATION OF A QUORUM AND VERIFICATION OF PUBLIC POSTING Per direction from Chair Nancy Olsen, Andres Feijoo took roll call and confirmed the presence of a quorum.

#### 3. VERIFICATION OF PUBLIC POSTING

Andres Feijoo affirmed that the agenda and notice of the GWDB Strategic Planning Subcommittee meeting on October 19, 2020, 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 comment at this time; however, 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. At my discretion, in the interest of time, public comments will be limited to three minutes per person."

#### There were no comments.

#### 5. DISSUSSION/INFORMATION ONLY- Welcome and Members Introductions

**Chair Olsen** asked for all the subcommittee members to introduce themselves All subcommittee members introduced themselves

#### 6. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ONLY – Overview of Purpose of Subcommittee

**Chair Olsen** explained the purpose of the subcommittee which is to develop revisions for the state plan and make it more than just a compliance document.

**Ryan Cordia** asked for clarification on what the subcommittee is supposed to do versus what the executive committee did in the past.

**Chair Olsen** explained that the subcommittee is tasked with producing revisions to the state plan which will eventually be presented to the full board.

**Craig von Collenberg** explained to **Ryan Cordia** that it has been discussed for awhile to take the current unified state plan which is specific to WIOA and drawing additional partners and agencies to produce a combined state plan that contains parts pertaining to WIOA, Perkins, and the local boards and bringing all of them into alignment.

#### 7. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION – Selective of the Vice Chair

Chair Olsen asked for any volunteers to be vice-chair of the subcommittee.

Aaron West volunteered to be vice-chair.

**Ryan Cordia** made a motion to make **Aaron West** vice-chair of the subcommittee. **Bill Stanley** seconded the motion. The motion passed.

#### 8. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ONLY – Subcommittee Action Plan (a) Work Group, (b) Timeline

**Chair Olsen** shared her screen and shared her plan for revisions to the state plan. She explained that she would like for the subcommittee to work on creating a combined state plan that is strategic and allow for a better sense of integration and move away from a compliance document. She wanted to subcommittee to look at the possible steps outlined in the document and the timeline. She also said that other states have used work groups to look into particular issues for their state plans. She suggested that this subcommittee allow for the use of and provide guidance to work groups which would allow various stakeholders to provide input and offer recommendations for the state plan. The goal would be for a draft of the new state plan to be presented to the full board in October of 2021.

Jenny Casselman said using work groups is appropriate.

**Chair Olsen** offered ideas for work groups including continuous improvement, customer flow, data accountability, performance, and services for youth. The work groups would work on issues such as communication, data, career pathways, sector strategies, and common processes for core partners. Each work group would include members of the subcommittee as well as representative from the title agencies, subgrantees, and other interested parties. She asked that members of the subcommittee communicate with stakeholders to propose members of the work groups.

**Bill Stanley** asked if working groups meetings would count as public meetings and therefore need to comply with Open Meeting Law.

**Chair Olsen** said she did not believe working group meetings would be subject to Open Meeting Law for two reasons. One is only one or two subcommittee members would be in each working group and two, they would only make recommendations; they would not vote on action items.

Andres Feijoo said he would check with the Deputy Attorney General to make sure working group meeting are not subject to Open Meeting Law.

**Chair Olsen** said she wanted to work on the document with the subcommittee to determine who the responsible parties are and the timeline so a final document can be voted on at the next subcommittee meeting. She sees the subcommittee as facilitating the work groups.

Andres Feijoo asked what work group meetings are supposed to accomplish.

Chair Olsen gave examples of strategies related to the state plan that a work group might develop.

**Craig von Collenberg** asked if these working groups would develop strategies by working across all title programs and partners.

**Chair Olsen** agreed that is how she envisions the workgroups and emphasized the importance of having the work groups have representatives that can work across title programs and partners. She added that the work groups should not work in isolation and should have access to resources they need that the subcommittee can hopefully provide.

Chair Olsen asked if anyone on the subcommittee was involved with the state plan planning process in 2015/2016.

Jaime Cruz said he was. Chair Olsen asked Jaime Cruz if he could speak to the process that was in place at that time.

Jaime Cruz said originally there were many working groups but it ended up being cumbersome meeting all the Open Meeting Law requirements so an adjustment was made where the working groups made recommendations to a leadership group which did subject itself to Open Meeting Law when it met and ultimately made decisions on what would go into the plan. DETR staff was responsible for the actual process of taking the ideas and recommendations and putting it into the state plan.

**Chair Olsen** emphasized that a year was not a long time so establishing the timeline was important. She also said it was important so not have too many workgroups.

**Bill Stanley** asked if the subcommittee would create a feedback form that would guide the working groups so they would be working with stakeholders to answer particular questions and retrieve specific data that would inform the state plan.

Chair Olsen responded that the work groups would get a template to provide feedback.

Bill Stanley asked for an example to explain.

**Chair Olsen** gave an example of the continuous improvement working group; the template would be a way for the working group to respond to the charge that aligns with the sections of the state plan that involves every partner. The work groups would look for strategies that truly integrate the partners and get them out of silos.

**Mayita Sanchez** tried to clarify **Chair Olsen's** remarks saying she believed what was being proposed was splitting up the state plan and assigning a section of the plan to each of the work groups to revise. The revised sections would then be presented to the subcommittee group.

**Chair Olsen** agreed somewhat with what **Mayita Sanchez** said but described that there were multiple parts of the state plan that cover overlapping strategies such as continuous improvement, data and performance.

**Craig von Collenberg** said he liked the basic structure of the plan which allows the work groups to work across different components of the plan unlike the previous plan submission where each title program submitted their section separately.

**Chair Olsen** said she noticed before in the state plan that goals listed in the joint section did not apply to every title so there was not as much overlap as she expected. She said she was willing to work on her plan and make any necessary revisions to present at the next subcommittee meeting.

**Bill Stanley** gave the example of youth re=entry to see if he understood the plan; would the subcommittee look into what is being done for youth reentry across the title programs and the state, what the performance metrics are, and what is being done to improve youth reentry?

**Chair Olsen** said that was a great example because the strategies and goals can be developed as part of the state plan to address that issue.

**Bill Stanley** followed up by giving an example of a strategy for youth reenty that would involve the different title programs. He said if this is the type of example that the state plan revision process would look into, he understands the plan.

**Chair Olsen** added that we need to make sure we are not duplicating efforts regarding customer flow so we need to develop strategies to improve that.

**Bill Stanley** followed up with his youth reentry example and talked about the importance of the whole workforce ecosystem helping with the youth reentry process.

Chair Olsen agreed. She emphasized that whatever is added in the state plan, we are accountable for it.

**Bill Stanley** said he has been frustrated by not understanding how the ecosystem is supposed to work because it is so siloed. A vibrant state plan would emphasize more cross-agency and cross title program collaboration.

Chair Olsen said she will continue to work on her plan to present to the next subcommittee at the next meeting to vote on.

Larry Fagerhaug asked if Chair Olsen will have a summary of what the Strategic Planning Subcommittee has done thus far at the next full board meeting.

Chair Olsen said she will.

**Larry Fagerhaug** said he liked the matrix **Chair Olsen** produced and believed it would be a great way to break down the silos.

Chair Olsen talked about scheduling the next meeting. She acknowledged everyone is busy but the timeline to finish this state plan is one year.

Andres Feijoo said it would be smart to present to subcommittee members as a poll several days and times that work for them.

Chair Olsen said she would like to stick to the same day and time each month.

#### 9. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION – Meeting Schedule

Chair Olsen tabled any action on this item for now.

#### 10. PUBLIC COMMENTS NOTICE (SECOND)

**Chair Olsen** read the statement into the record: "Members of the public are invited to comment at this time; however 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. In my discretion, in the interest of time, public comment will be limited to three minutes per person." She invited comments from Carson City, Las Vegas, or on the telephone.

#### There were no comments.

#### 11. ADJOURNMENT – The October 19, 2020 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:

OWINN's Public Meetings website - <u>http://owinn.nv.gov/GWDB/Performance and Reporting Subcommittee</u> Meetings/ and Nevada's Public Notice website at 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 Web site at <a href="http://owinn.nv.gov/GWDB/Performance">http://owinn.nv.gov/GWDB/Performance</a> and Reporting Subcommittee Meeting and may be requested from the Executive Director's Office at 555 E. Washington Ave, Las Vegas, Nevada or call (702) 486-8080