

STATE OF NEVADA
GOVERNOR'S WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD
STRATEGIC PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, September 11, 2024 - 2:00 p.m.

Teleconference Line: 1 669 900 6833
Meeting ID: 856 6326 9315
Passcode: 295054

MINUTES OF MEETING

Present: Nancy Olsen (Chair), Edward Estipona (Vice Chair), Drazen Elez, Brett Miller, Milt Stewart, Michael Yoder, Robert Fink, Michael Bolognini

Absent: Dr. Tiffany Tyler-Garner, Arianna Florence, Dave Schmidt

Also present: Katie Gilbertson, Ken Goodrich

1. CALL TO ORDER - OPENING REMARKS

Chair Olsen called the meeting to order and welcomed participants.

2. ROLL CALL - CONFIRMATION OF A QUORUM

Katie Gilbertson of OWINN took roll and confirmed the presence of a quorum.

3. VERIFICATION OF PUBLIC NOTICE POSTING

Katie Gilbertson verified that the meeting had been publicly posted pursuant to Nevada Open Meeting Law, NRS 241.020.

4. FIRST PUBLIC COMMENT(S) NOTICE

Chair Olsen opened the first period of public comment.

One participant provided public comment via Zoom stating her name as Ashley Martinez for the record. She is the regional representative for U.S. Senator Jackie Rosen. She's recently taken on Workforce Development issues, along with Economic Development, Chambers of Commerce, small businesses, minority communities, and other Northern Nevada concerns. She wanted to introduce herself as she plans to attend more subcommittee and Workforce Development Board meetings. She is excited to see the great work that the board is doing.

5. *FOR POSSIBLE ACTION – Approval of March 6, 2024 meeting minutes

Chair Olsen called for comments/changes to the March 6, 2024, draft minutes. There were none. The Chair called for a motion to approve. **It was moved by Vice Chair Estipona and seconded by Michael Bolognini to approve the March 6, 2024, minutes. The motion carried.**

6. DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY – Discussion on GWDB Strategic Plan and Roadmap for Implementation

Chair Olsen stated that most of the committee had likely seen the presentation on the Strategic Plan. Its purpose is to take the main goals from the state plan and turn them into measurable, trackable SMART goals, allowing us to gauge our success in implementing these goals across the system. The Chair shared a presentation showing that the strategic planning committee set three main goals aligned with the state plan that included population, engagement, and alignment. She went on further to provide a breakdown for each goal, beginning with population and its three strategies:

1. **Awareness:** Increase awareness of the public workforce system among underserved communities.
2. **Streamlining Supportive Services:** Make it easier for individuals to access these services, including through asset mapping of available resources.
3. **Reducing Service Duplication:** Ensure public and nonprofit staff are better utilized by removing overlapping services.

She then moved on to engagement and its two strategies:

1. **Employer Awareness:** Inform employers about available resources and funding.
2. **Training Alignment:** Ensure job training and coursework match employer needs, involving education providers from K-12 through adult education.

The third goal, alignment, included these three strategies:

1. **Identify Services:** Create a simple, one-page summary of services provided under Titles I–IV and DWSS to clarify offerings, linking to asset mapping.
2. **Identify Gaps:** Use asset mapping and the one-page summary to spot service gaps.
3. **Develop a Dashboard:** Consider creating a dashboard but coordinate with the state’s longitudinal data system to avoid duplicating existing efforts.

The Chair concluded that these are the three main goals and strategies from the strategic plan. The timeline for some initiatives, like the application referral system by December 2024, may be ambitious. For example, setting up a necessary contract can take at least six months.

Vice Chair Estipona pointed out, going back to the last slide on the dashboard, he sees it not as a duplication but as unification. Thinking of it as a “microsite” that acts as a cheat sheet, helping users quickly access services from different titles and organizations. It's not meant to replicate existing websites but to simplify navigation. Using heavy government jargon should be avoided so that job seekers and employers can easily understand and use it. This way, the microsite can clearly guide users through the services across various titles.

Chair Olsen responded to Vice Chair Estipona’s remarks stating she was glad he mentioned the dashboard as from her understanding, she thought the dashboard would be more focused on performance metrics rather than just being an asset map or resource tracker.

Vice Chair Estipona agreed that yes, it could include performance-based data as shortcuts. Users could drill down from broader metrics on a homepage to specific dashboards. But more than just a dashboard, it would function as a unified resource hub, mapping out all state services in one place. Currently, there is not a single spot that lists every service across agencies. So there needs to be a central site where users can easily find and click on the service they need, choose their area, like Las Vegas, and get directed to relevant services for state resources.

Katie Gilbertson shared that she sees the Strategic Plan dashboard different from the NPWR dashboard. The NPWR dashboard is more about tracking long-term historical data, while the Strategic Plan dashboard is meant to be more of a "pulse," providing real-time metrics. For example, it could track things like the number of events held, participation levels, and the

impact of specific activities, like hiring events or new resource centers, which NPWR wouldn't cover. So, it's meant to be timely and unique, not just a repeat of what's on NPWR. It reminded her of the continuous improvement dashboard that was in development a few years ago, but with a more current, practical focus.

Chair Olsen reported that they have been working on developing a better application and referral system and have had meetings with DETR and their office to explore existing tracking options. Currently, the north uses a new system through Nevada Works, while the south has its own approach. The state level is to establish a unified, statewide system with policies to support consistent referral tracking. This would allow them to measure improvements and growth in referrals.

Milt Stewart asked from a Governor's Workforce Development Board perspective, what resources can the Governor's Board provide to support this effort? He sees that DETR is leading these conversations with partners. The timeline feels very aggressive and challenging without more resources or people to make it happen. Also, will DETR cover the costs for any tools or referral systems, or how will that be managed? He's not clear on the funding or resources.

Chair Olsen replied that there are still a lot of unanswered questions, such as whether the system will be purchased or leased, and how it will be funded. Ideally, this would be a statewide system rather than separate regional ones, and there's been discussion about possibly using Governor's Reserve funds, depending on the final cost. The systems that are being considered vary widely in price, from around \$2,500 per user to several hundred thousand dollars overall, with about four options being reviewed so far. Currently, EmployNV doesn't offer this capability, and it quoted a high price to develop it. Creating a RFP, contracting, and subsequent training process could take several months.

Vice Chair Estipona noted looking at the schedule and knowing how complex government procurement is, this timeline is very ambitious. That doesn't mean progress can't be made; gathering data and information is likely the most crucial first step. Once all the facts are received, then the committee can start thinking about specific systems and costs, like whether a dashboard is needed or other tools, to get some ballpark figures. If the state ends up funding this, it will likely trigger an RFP if the cost exceeds a certain threshold. He suggested breaking down each strategy into manageable parts, with small groups focusing on gathering information for each one. This way, each piece can be tackled without getting overwhelmed, just as before with the current strategic plan, which was condensed from the larger state document. Treating the deadlines as guardrails helps make this more manageable.

Chair Olsen took a quick moment to mention that she was thinking the same thing about creating work groups for implementation in regard to the Vice Chair's comments.

Drazen Elez agreed that this is a great plan, but the timeline challenges come down to how defined the goals are. Currently, there are no dedicated resources for teams to accomplish many of these tasks. For these goals to move forward, there's a need to outline a plan, conduct further research, and possibly take additional steps. If the committee determines funding needs, it won't be as simple as issuing an RFP. Budget amendments or additional funds would require agencies to submit requests, possibly involving emergency general funds, which brings political considerations. That's often why projects, however promising, can face delays as it is difficult to find resources. For many of these goals, there'll need to be a buy-in from involved agencies, especially if their resources are needed. An example is the "Did You

Know" campaign, which is a great idea, but coordinating all agencies might be challenging. For instance, social media plans are set a year in advance, so implementing such a campaign would require everyone to have similar resources and alignment. So, there may need to be a restructuring for some of this work as exploratory activities to establish realistic goals and next steps.

Chair Olsen recognized Mr. Elez for noting that some of the execution team members weren't present and are not on the board. Commenting, all they can really do is ask them to participate, as there is no authority to require their involvement.

Katie Gilbertson explained that the execution teams were created to delegate tasks to those with the best expertise, focusing on practical implementation. The timeline and sequence were designed around existing progress and priorities, such as the application and referral system, and aimed to build momentum. The aggressive timeline was established in response to the governor's concern about ensuring the plan's completion, though the December deadline was more of a checkpoint than a strict requirement. The three-year plan, starting in June 2024, was deliberately designed to provide flexibility, allowing for reassessment and adjustments as needed. Initial priorities included creating digital campaign materials and addressing funding requirements in preparation for the legislative session. The inclusion of non-board members in the planning was intentional to broaden collaboration across the workforce system, involving entities like veteran services and corrections, which are often overlooked despite their relevance. Overall, the approach emphasized commitment and accountability to demonstrate the board's seriousness to the governor.

Brett Miller questioned whether there's flexibility in what gets implemented regarding the proposed measurements. He pointed out that many of the measurements would require manual tracking, which might lead to inconsistency across partners. Mr. Miller believes this could result in a lot of work with minimal value. He mentioned that this has been a concern from the start, as he's unsure whether these measurements will help achieve the intended goals, especially since those responsible for tracking them weren't involved in the discussion.

Milt Stewart raised his frustration about the strategic plan, noting he was unclear if any Nevadaworks staff were involved in the development of this plan. He proclaimed that generic statements suggesting certain activities are not being done are inaccurate and emphasized the need to recognize existing work, particularly at one-stop centers and other workforce agencies. Mr. Stewart felt the plan might benefit from engaging stakeholders, including local boards, to better understand current initiatives and avoid duplicating efforts. Ms. Stewart suggested that execution teams require broader buy-in and involvement in shaping strategy and implementation. While acknowledging the intent behind the plan, he believed it felt somewhat disjointed and called for recalibrating through stakeholder discussions to build upon existing progress rather than assuming gaps.

Chair Olsen raised his frustration about the strategic plan, noting he was unclear if any Nevadaworks staff were involved in the development of this plan. He proclaimed that generic statements suggesting certain activities are not being done are inaccurate and emphasized the need to recognize existing work, particularly at one-stop centers and other workforce agencies. Mr. Stewart felt the plan might benefit from engaging stakeholders, including local boards, to better understand current initiatives and avoid duplicating efforts. Ms. Stewart suggested that execution teams require broader buy-in and involvement in shaping strategy and implementation. While acknowledging the intent behind the plan, he believed it felt somewhat disjointed and called for recalibrating through stakeholder discussions to build upon existing

progress rather than assuming gaps.

Vice Chair Estipona highlighted the tension in the room. In response, he emphasized the importance of fostering collaboration and harmony when addressing group tensions, aiming to create an inclusive process rather than imposing decisions. He framed the current plan as flexible "guardrails," not rigid directives, and suggested it be used as a working document to identify challenges and opportunities. Vice Chair Estipona proposed breaking the plan into smaller working groups, including advisory members, to assess feasibility, obstacles, and actionable steps while allowing for iterative realignment. He acknowledged gaps in the plan and saw the discussions as an opportunity for improvement. Highlighting the importance of consulting stakeholders with hands-on expertise, Vice Chair Estipona advocated for a fact-based, collaborative approach rather than making assumptions. He recognized the urgency of past leadership but stressed the need for collective progress and participation to avoid the board's historical pattern of stagnation. Vice Chair Estipona urged for mutual understanding and a shared effort to ensure sustainable and meaningful outcomes.

Chair Olsen suggested that the group consider forming a work group, with both current members and additional contributors, to handle parts of the plan. She emphasized identifying specific areas for the work group to focus on that make sense for collaborative effort.

Brett Miller wanted to acknowledge Vice Chair Estipona's advocacy and how he serves as a balanced voice within the GWDB, always seeking real solutions.

Drazen Elez concurred with the Chair and Mr. Miller on their acknowledgement of Vice Chair Estipona's balanced perspective. He also sided with the Chair to form work groups, stating that the committee needs groups with representatives from the Governor's Workforce Development Board and relevant agencies. This setup could involve three or more groups, each focusing on different areas to foster coordination on specific issues.

Chair Olsen paused to ask if the committee needed a voting item on today's agenda to establish work groups or if they may proceed without a vote outside of the meeting. She directed the question to Ms. Gilbertson and DAG Gardner for clarification.

Katie Gilbertson clarified that a vote isn't necessary to set up a work group, as they created the state plan similarly without a vote. She added that the executive committee will discuss these concerns next week, and decisions on moving forward will likely be made then. For now, she advised waiting until that meeting.

Chair Olsen proposed following up with everyone regarding work groups and asked for input on the best approach. She proposed either creating groups focused on each population strategy or reviewing each goal and strategy to prioritize only those that are realistic, potentially setting aside others for now.

Vice Chair Estipona recommended that each strategy be evaluated individually to see if it requires collaboration or can be tackled separately. Instead of a standard rule for all strategies, he proposed assessing each one to determine if combined or separate work groups would be more effective. He suggested he, Chair Olsen, and Ms. Gilbertson draft an initial structure for the group to review and respond to, as it may encourage quicker decision-making than open-ended questions. Vice Chair Estipona acknowledged that while the process may seem slow, particularly to those from the private sector, it will pick up speed as communication and processes strengthen, resulting in fewer misunderstandings and frustrations.

Chair Olsen questioned if it would be possible to survey the members of the group without violating open meeting laws.

Katie Gilbertson recommended she'd receive individual responses as long as they were not sent in a group (email) format. She would then be able to share the information with Chair Olsen.

Brett Miller suggested for ongoing goals or action items, it would be helpful to send them out to the relevant people and ask how they would measure progress. This way, everyone can provide input on how to approach the measurements, and instead of having multiple meetings, they can find common ground and agree on the best approach.

Chair Olsen was excited about using a new tool to create a survey. She suggested using the tool to gather input on things like strategy, how to measure progress, and who should be involved. The tool will also help organize and compile the responses automatically. The Chair confirmed there is a plan being put in place and will be contacting Ms. Gilbertson to help her with it. She also asked the group to see if anyone required a copy of the presentation that hadn't had a chance to see it.

Katie Gilbertson offered to send out the document once the meeting concluded, as she already sent out the report version, which contains the same information.

Milt Stewart wanted to make it clear that he would like to avoid duplicating efforts and emphasized that there is already a lot of work being done at the local board level that can be used effectively. He suggests evaluating and leveraging the existing work, rather than starting from scratch, and applying this approach across the 17 partners to reach the goals.

7. **DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY – Discussion on WIOA Informational Brief**

Chair Olsen was to lead an update on creating a brief informational document. She requested clarification from Ms. Gilbertson on whether it was the one-page document summarizing Titles I through IV and DWSS or something else.

Katie Gilbertson affirmed Chair Olsen was correcting, noting this brief is something business board members have asked for before since they don't fully understand the scope and services provided. It was summarized into "one page" so no individual would feel pressured to condense everything into a single paragraph.

Chair Olsen shared that she once saw a great document from another state of a simple snapshot of WIOA Titles, which could be adapted to include DWSS. The goal would be to create a brief, high-level overview for people unfamiliar with the system. It wouldn't include all the details, just a simplified, big-picture view. She asked if anyone had a document like this or wanted to help put one together.

Milt Stewart reported similar conversations are already taking place at the local board level, including discussions with Edward about articulating the contributions of local boards to their communities. Ms. Stewart mentioned that Workforce Connections is engaging in similar efforts. He expressed frustration with the shifting focus between narratives and numerical data, emphasizing the need for consistency in expectations. While willing to contribute to the process, he urged clarity in defining what is being asked for to avoid

confusion and inefficiency.

Vice Chair Estipona suggested each group should provide a short, clear narrative about what they do, focusing on who they serve, business partners or job seekers. Once collected, they offered to consolidate the input, leveraging their team's copywriters to refine the document with the perspective of the end user—business partners or job seekers—rather than internal stakeholders. Vice Chair Estipona emphasized the importance of serving these external groups effectively. To enhance clarity, he suggested each organization provide a detailed list of services, including definitions, to identify overlaps and areas for discussion. These overlaps could then inform a deeper audit to determine whether services are duplicated or distinct, helping to identify gaps. Vice Chair Estipona stressed the importance of using plain language to ensure accessibility, with an eye toward translating content for underserved communities in the future.

Milt Stewart commented that Title I and Title III already use EmployNV, which generates a report called the Pearl, summarizing local board activities.

Chair Olsen took the time to share a couple of links in the chat for two upcoming Adult Education events: Virtual Open House for High School Equivalency and Virtual Open House for Adult Education and Family Literacy. Also, she'll work on organizing the Title and DWSS information and send it to Vice Chair Estipona. She thanked him for emphasizing the importance of a marketing perspective in putting it all together.

Michael Yoder The speaker sought consensus on the definition of "duplication of services," emphasizing that it is primarily about protecting the client. He explained that many partners in the workforce system provide similar services, and the goal is to avoid redundant assessments or services for clients. Mr. Yoder highlighted that, for example, in the case of re-entry services, they defer to experts like FIT or Hope for Prisoners who specialize in helping individuals with criminal backgrounds find employment. Mr. Yoder clarified that duplication of services means not repeating assessments already conducted by a partner, not necessarily eliminating services provided by different partners. He also acknowledged the importance of knowing which partners are experts in certain areas and prioritizing referrals to them when appropriate, ensuring clients receive the right services without overwhelming any one partner. The focus is providing holistic case management and the best support for the client.

Chair Olsen responded that she thinks it's important to emphasize that when duplication of services is discussed, they're really focusing on unnecessary duplication to avoid redundancies that don't benefit the client.

Milt Stewart again commented that he agreed with Mr. Yoder and while he doesn't believe in silos, he does think organizations have their strengths, and those strengths should be leveraged.

Chair Olsen stated that she would coordinate with Ms. Gilbertson to gather the necessary information from everyone and send it to Vice Chair Estipona so he can organize and refine the document.

8. DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY – New Business from Subcommittee Members

Chair Olsen called for new business from any of the members to discuss.

Drazen Elez wanted to give an update on his report several months ago, that they received a \$10 million grant from the Department of Education's Rehabilitation Services Administration. The grant aims to create a comprehensive digital platform and mobile app for individuals with disabilities, providing access to resources and services from elementary school through adulthood. They've involved about 17 partners in the disability community and are on track to launch this platform by the end of 2025, making it a valuable resource for Nevadans. He added that it guides them through school and various resources, presenting a "trip" through life with the ultimate goal of employment. Along the way, it provides support and resources to help them achieve their education, experience, and career aspirations.

Chair Olsen called for further discussion on new business. There was none.

9. SECOND PUBLIC COMMENT(S)

Chair Olsen asked for final public comment. There were none.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The September 11, 2024 meeting was adjourned.

Notice of this meeting was posted *on or before 9 a.m. on the third day prior to the meeting* in the lobby of 1 State of Nevada Way, 3rd Floor – Nevada Building, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119.

**OWINN's Public Meetings website – <https://gowinn.nv.gov/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 Website at <https://gowinn.nv.gov/meetings/> may be requested from Katie Gilbertson at 1 Harrah's Court, 3rd Floor, Nevada Building MC29, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119; or call (702) 486-8080.