

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

**STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKING GROUP**

**Wednesday, March 12, 2025 - 2:00 p.m.**

**Teleconference Line: 1 669 900 6833**

**Meeting ID: 815 2673 9145**

**Passcode: 322709**

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**Present:** Nancy Olsen (Chair), Edward Estipona (Vice Chair), Brett Miller, Milt Stewart, Robert Fink, Arianna Florence, Dave Schmidt, Dr. Tiffany Tyler-Garner

**Absent:** Drazen Elez, Michael Yoder

**Also present:** Tiffany Vazquez, Elaine Rodriguez, Brenda Kresge, Ken Lawson, Cheryl Olson, David Gardner, Kimberly Jadidi, Sara Millett, Armando Leiva, Madison Freitas

**1. CALL TO ORDER - OPENING REMARKS**

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

**2. ROLL CALL - CONFIRMATION OF A QUORUM**

**Tiffany Vazquez** of OWINN took roll and confirmed the presence of a quorum.

**3. VERIFICATION OF PUBLIC NOTICE POSTING**

**Tiffany Vazquez** 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.

There were none.

**5. \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION – Approval of September 11, 2024 meeting minutes**

**Chair Olsen** called for comments/changes to the September 11, 2024, draft minutes. There were none. The Chair called for a motion to approve. **It was moved by David Schmidt and seconded by Edward Estipona to approve the September 11, 2024, minutes. The motion carried.**

**6. DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY – Discussion on revisions to the strategic plan**

**Chair Olsen** gave all participants in the meeting the opportunity to introduce themselves before starting on agenda item. The Chair led a discussion on revising the strategic plan that was created a year ago with input from core partners. The plan underwent significant changes, causing concerns about its realism and implementation. Chair Soderberg has asked the committee to take a fresh look at the plan, incorporating input from those who are

implementing it on a daily basis. Chair Olsen presented the current plan, highlighting issues such as unrealistic timeframes and the inclusion of entities not involved in the planning process. The state plan had four overarching goals that shifted focus without proper input. “What do we keep? What do we keep but make significant changes? What do we throw out? What do we add?” The format should be simplified. The Chair mentioned the action item of creating inventory of all workforce partners in state.

**Milt Stewart** added to the comment that the challenge is in accurately identifying partners and ensuring the information remains relevant and current.

**Chair Olsen** noted that an entity must serve as the keeper of the document and present the information in a useful format. Chair Olsen proposed the formation of a workgroup and meet once a month.

**Vice Chair Estipona** gave background on the state plan, that it was written broad based. He clarified the plan needed to be broken into achievable tasks that show positive gains. The goal is to achieve better unification and efficiency within the workforce system. He suggested breaking up into teams of three.

**Chair Olsen** responded to Vice Chair Estipona’s remarks stating her concerns on the overlap and asked for opinions.

**David Schmidt** suggested sorting the tasks into groups for better organization. He also suggested separating targeted partners from responsive partners.

**Chair Olsen** suggested that we use the State Plan as a starting point, focusing on population, alignment, and collaboration. While there was a desire to split up work, she had concerns about potential overlap.

**Arianna Florence** noted that there has been a significant overlap in the past. She emphasized the importance of keeping workgroup together to avoid silos and to ensure all agencies collaborate effectively.

**Vice Chair Estipona** suggested that while splitting up the work might be efficient, if challenges arise, the group should work more collectively. The idea was proposed to tackle each item as a group, starting with the first item and addressing subsequent items together. This approach would allow the group to catch any overlap. Stronger communication was emphasized as a priority, rather than rushing through tasks, as speed may have contributed to the current issues.

**Chair Olsen** agreed to share two documents with the workgroup and Tiffany Vazquez will schedule a meeting for next month.

**Vice Chair Estipona** proposed that after the work group completes each section, the findings should be presented at the larger group meeting. This would provide an opportunity for others, who were not part of the workgroup, to offer opinions or thoughts. Additionally, during the work group discussions, it should be identified who else needs to review the work before it is finalized. A notation should be made to ensure that relevant individuals provide their input, preventing the group from returning to the same issues.

**Chair Olsen** noted that, based on experience with the State Plan, the work group does not

need to consist solely of subcommittee members. If necessary, a few additional people may be added to ensure coverage for all core partners, but the size of the work group will be kept manageable.

**David Schmidt** had potential concerns about having a quorum of subcommittee members in the workgroup, as it could lead to a meeting of the committee and raise open meeting law issues.

**David Gardner** clarified that if a quorum plus deliberation or action occurs, it would be considered a meeting under the open meeting law. The group discussed the possibility of having a smaller group to avoid quorum issues. They also discussed the need to post meetings in a timely manner to comply with state requirements.

**Tiffany Vazquez** confirmed that this subcommittee meets quarterly, and we can schedule meetings in between.

7. **DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY – New business from subcommittee member and next steps**

**David Schmidt** mentioned reports were recently compiled for use during the legislative session, focusing on the distribution of activities within DETR across the state. These reports include data from the perl file, such as the number of registrants and their profiles, offering an easy way to examine statewide differences. The reports may be helpful or informative for other members when engaging with and analyzing the data. Links are below:

[https://detr-ra-bureau.shinyapps.io/UI\\_Claims\\_by\\_Assembly\\_District/](https://detr-ra-bureau.shinyapps.io/UI_Claims_by_Assembly_District/)

[https://detr-ra-bureau.shinyapps.io/UI\\_Claims\\_by\\_Senate\\_District/](https://detr-ra-bureau.shinyapps.io/UI_Claims_by_Senate_District/)

<https://nevadaworkforce.com/Legislative-Districts>

**Milt Stewart** requested clarification regarding the types of services being discussed. Specifically, it was asked whether the focus is on UI services, workforce development services, or data related to the perl file.

**David Schmidt** explained that the shared reports focus on various data points. The first couple of links are UI-focused, providing detailed lists (not visible in the dashboard for confidentiality reasons), including information on top occupations and industries of people filing for unemployment benefits, broken down by area. The third link includes legislative district reports, showing data on unemployment, labor force participation, and workforce system participation, along with demographic summaries such as single parents, veterans, and disabled veterans. The data also covers performance outcomes and the distribution of unemployment claims, with an emphasis on trends by district. He is working on adding VR data, such as participant counts and case aging, with the aim to provide more localized, district-level insights rather than statewide data, which can feel too broad. The goal is to make the data more useful and accurate, and feedback or suggestions on how to improve this would be welcomed, as the website is easy to update.

**Milt Stewart** requested comparative analysis between districts.

**David Schmidt** shared that an attempt was made to map the concentration of data across districts, but the initial version was programmatically inefficient, causing slow load times. To avoid frustration, it was decided to prioritize fast-loading, responsive elements, such as the unemployment claim data, which can be used for comparisons between districts. This

data could also be helpful for the rollout of a new unemployment benefit system, allowing for targeted analysis, such as identifying where claimants with specific characteristics (e.g., less than a high school degree) are located.

**Chair Olsen** asked if the data was from NPWR.

**David Schmidt** noted that the current data being used is from internal DETR sources, such as unemployment claim data, and not from NPWR. One of the goals moving forward is to integrate more of DETR's data into NPWR, including data on unemployment claimants. This would provide a more comprehensive picture of the unemployed population, complementing existing data sources like the perl file, and making this information more accessible.

**Chair Olsen** announced that an approval was recently received for a contract amendment with the data vendor for adult education, which will allow for the development of an interface with EmployNV. This will enable data sharing, including demographics, outcomes, and testing information, with core partners, supporting alignment and collaboration efforts. Additionally, research focusing on adult education was recently completed, and the report is expected soon.

**8. SECOND PUBLIC COMMENT(S)**

**David Gardner** asked for final public comment. There were none.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

**The March 12, 2025 meeting was adjourned.**