

**STATE OF NEVADA
GOVERNOR'S WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD
BARRIERS AND UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE**

Wednesday, January 25, 2023 - 2:00 p.m.

**Location
Virtual Meeting**

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87407721470?pwd=Y2szTkdaRlpjRVJBTXhpYXc5T_WgxZz09

**Teleconference Line
1-669-900-6833
Meeting ID: 874 0772 1470
Passcode: 179458**

MINUTES OF MEETING

Present: Ken Evans (Chair), Crystal Slaughter, Brittany Brown, Robert Thompson, David Dreibelbis, Jerrie Merritt, George Gault, Cecil Fielder

Absent: Susan Brager, Lisa Levine, Jennifer Keiser, Lori Calderon.

Also present: Senator Dina Neal, David Schmidt, Katie Gilbertson

1. CALL TO ORDER -- OPENING REMARKS

Chair Evans called the meeting to order and welcomed participants.

2. ROLL CALL -- CONFIRMATION OF QUORUM

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

3. VERIFICATION OF PUBLIC POSTING

Katie Gilbertson affirmed that the agenda and notice of the Governor's Workforce Development Board (GWDB) meeting on January 25, 2023, was posted pursuant to Nevada's Open Meeting Law, NRS 241.020.

4. FIRST PUBLIC COMMENT(S)

Chair Evans invited comments. There were no public comments.

5. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ONLY -- Overview of subcommittee expectations, goals and proposed meeting schedule

Chair Evans stated the idea behind the subcommittee is we have a workforce development system within the state of Nevada that sometimes if you look at the data, unfortunately, what you'll see is that there's some trends or instances where maybe there is a disproportionate or disparate access to the system. Or in other cases, there may be segments of the population that for whatever reason, they're still suffering disparate or disproportionate unemployment rates. And the idea behind this subcommittee is to either A: identify situations where there's disparate

access to the system or B: even before then, if there's segments of the population that for whatever reason are still suffering based on empirical data in terms of unemployment rates or underemployment rates, we want to look at that as well. So we started out on this journey, for those of us that have already been on a turn before, we started on this journey probably about 2-1/2, 3 years ago with the intent to maybe identify two or three things that we could look at as a subcommittee and then in turn bring to the attention of the full board with the thought that if there's a policy or perhaps if there's a program that needs to be implemented by our service providers, we could identify that and then, hopefully, action would be taken such that a year or two later or whatever it takes to implement things as well as capture results and hopefully success stories. We'd be able to come back as a subcommittee and say that we impacted the system appropriately. There's a phrase I like to use is that in an ideal world, we want to make sure that our workforce development system in the entire state of Nevada is both professionally competent as well as culturally competent such as at the end of the day, regardless of people's socioeconomic background, regardless of their location, they can access our system and hopefully realize their fullest potential by accessing our workforce development system. So that was the original idea. We had a couple of meetings. I think where we are now is we're going to have some presentations today. One of them will be on a program that I was privy to and several others were privy to, to try to address the disproportionate unemployment rate amongst the sector of the population, and then the other part of the meeting will be to get a briefing by the chief economist with that empirical data that, to a certain extent, will show you or hopefully it will be self-evident where we still have some work to do to try to address some segments of our state's population that, again, are experiencing barriers or underserved access to our system. So that will be the goal as we move forward in 2023. In keeping with the spirit, the final thing I'll say of Chair Anderson we don't want to just talk about things. We want to come up with two or three things that are measurable that we know will impact the system and that, again, hopefully a year or two from now will be able to say there was some improvement in the system and access to the system or an improvement in the segment of our population that previously wasn't experiencing good results with our system or in terms of unemployment.

6. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ONLY -- Project 354 and How to Break through Barriers

Chair Evans stated this is a discussion led by Senator Neal on Project 354. She's going to give us some very good insight on some things that have gone on for the past 2+ years as well as she'll be able to give us some insight on things that we can consider as a subcommittee as we move forward in terms of trying to identify things that we can influence from a policy, governance, or implementation standpoint with our workforce development system.

Dina Neal stated Project 354 is a project that was created from AB354 in 2017 session that was focused on double-digit unemployment and subgroups that fell within, I guess, higher unemployment rates than others, and the law mandates that workforce agencies come together to create parity within the groups. We've been doing work for a long time. DWSS is with us. We have 15 partners now who are part of the project. We're moving towards still focusing on the zip codes 89106, 89115, 89032, 89030 as our focus to do a deep dive. And the idea was to go in in triage within communities and those zip codes to make sure that they had employment opportunities. What's currently happening and what I feel is the barrier in the space is we know that the data says that single moms of color with children have higher unemployment rate that we need to take care of. But there's also a group of what I would say from 19 to 23, 24 who do not get the same level of employment work or access as they should, mainly because they either don't fall into welfare, right? They don't fall into some kind of unemployment. They are either working, looking to upscale, they're working, looking to get into actual training, but they cannot afford any of the training and nor are they eligible for the WIOA programs. I know that within the workforce model, we started to flex some of the WIOA programs with the SANDI grant and other dollars that we got in order to build more flexibility to allow for more eligibility within the programs. But it's still a problem for I would say men of color who happen to fall within 19 to 24. And I'll give an example. So when it came down to trying to get the EMT courses paid for, like CSN offers EMT courses but in

order to be eligible for WIOA to pay for it, you needed to fit some of the other criteria, either being unemployed or on TANF, SNAP, or some other barrier that those individuals were not necessarily facing. They were poor, but that doesn't mean that they were on services, if that makes sense. I'll now give you a second example. We know that cybersecurity is a big deal, right? currently within the market. There are limited programs where WIOA dollars pay for the training for individuals to get into a class. I'll give you this example. UNLV offers a cybersecurity class through its continuing education arm. In the continuing education arm, you're not eligible for financial aid. So a person can't do the FAFSA and you have to pay for the class which is \$16,000. It requires \$4,500 upfront and \$1,500 a month. The introductory course to get a sense of what the cybersecurity class is about is like \$180. So that's easy, right? for a 19-year-old or 20-year-old to pay for, but once they're hit with the full 16-week program, they can't afford it nor are there any other programs out there to support them going into the field. I only know of Nevada Partners that, next month, they're supposed to create a cybersecurity class, but what we're not clear on is what happens after that cybersecurity introduction and whether or not it translates into a full-on training where they get to do a deep dive and then get some kind of moderate expertise to then get a job. And so my concern at this point is not, I would say not the individuals who are on welfare, like I'm concerned about them as well, making sure that they transition and they're able to get jobs, but I'm looking at this gap of 19 to 24 where they want to upscale their careers, they're not on necessarily any services but yet they might be making \$15 an hour, \$14 an hour, but they don't fit into any pocket of programming, and if there is a pocket of programming that's out there, I'm not familiar with it. And I think that as the Governor's Workforce Board, I think that there's an opportunity, number one, statutorily to create a space if there's general fund money or if there's other money where we can start to align around that particular population in order to provide classes, training, and offset it where WIOA does not fill in the gap. And we're focused on strong populations, but this is the population that keeps popping up that we don't really have a full-scale ability to help. So under DWSS with Michael, they'll take anyone and then they'll try to find an opportunity for them to get into in 354, Project 354. However, not everyone has that flexibility within their agency to do that work, and this is an opportunity for the Governor's Workforce Board to move into the space to deal with this youth because they're kind of, they're within the definition of the youth or out-of-school youth that we can deal with, but they don't fall into the actual barrier population, if that makes sense.

Chair Evans stated yes, it does to me. And I see some other head nods.

Dina Neal stated because I'm trying to figure out how do we get folks who want to become a firefighter but in order to be in the firefighter class and get it paid for through WIOA, they had to have a barrier. So they had to still be on unemployment or getting some kind of assistance, SNAP, TANF, or something else in order to get the training paid for which was offered, but if you fell out of that category and you were just a regular person who was making \$18 an hour or \$17 an hour, you're not eligible to get into the program. And I know people assume, okay, well, \$17 an hour should probably pay for training, but the way that rent is, it's not going to pay for any additional training because you have to pay for rent, you have to pay for a roof over your head. So whatever that \$17 is going for is just to stabilize that person. But there's no program out there that allows for some gap assistance where, let's say, maybe somebody could come up with the \$1,500, but they can't come up with the \$4,300. There's no program out there that allows for that level of assistance for these kinds of individuals that fall out of, I guess, barrier services. I wanted to bring that up to you guys because I think there's an opportunity with this alignment of workforce that the Governor is talking about and with what CSN is trying to do in order to bridge the gap with the course credit so that we could either start paying for that additional credit beyond the 6 hour through CSN, start paying for 9 credits or 12 credits or we need to try to figure out some gap funding for 19 to 24 that are not unemployed but yet they need to upscale and they fall below the poverty line, if that makes sense.

Chair Evans stated yes, and at this point, before I ask a question, I want to find out if any

other members of the subcommittee have a question. Mr. Gault, I think you unmuted yourself. Anyone else? Senator Neal, if you would, could you give the subcommittee, especially for those that may not have been aware of Project 354 before today, could you give a brief synopsis and then could you talk specifically about the job fair or employer fair efforts that we made and maybe some of the anecdotal if not empirical barriers or things that came out of that, please?

Dina Neal stated for Project 354, we were actually able to do a lot of - so we focused on targets. I would say 2018, 2019, we focused on particular target. We started to do career fairs within schools. We went to Desert Rose, Cheyenne High School. We did an event at Doolittle. We did a targeted effort to then go exactly to the population, and so what we did was we built our business bench. So at one point we had 60 businesses that were part of our employment bench, meaning that if we were going to do the fair over at Cheyenne High School or at Desert Rose, which is an adult ed crossover campus that has three different age groups, we were able to bring in 60 employers at a time and then we started to continue to build that business bench so that when we did have a fair, we had a well-rounded group of employers. I weeded out all of the sign hanger companies, the other companies that were temporary employment because the whole idea under 354 was that if we were going to engage in work, number one, we were going to triage, right? We were going to go through the process of who that person was, what were their barriers, why weren't they able to achieve the interview, and if they weren't able to achieve the interview, after we work with that employer, we try to get that employer to do a second shot and then go back and continue to build on their soft skills so they could go back and do the employment because a lot of our 354 participants had never worked before and they never actually had a chance to work out some of the issues that they were encountering. For example, we go to the school, we had a registration so we were using EmployNV but then we also had our own kind of data form that we created that we put through Workforce Connections. And then they would walk and do some initial soft skills. So we would do the how to write your resume. I believe at one point we did how to tie a tie, how to present yourself before you then made it around to the employers. We did that at Desert Rose. We did that at CSN, when we did an employment event there on the North Las Vegas campus because we were trying to prepare the students mentally to be able to go and talk to the interviewer before they actually presented themselves. So there was a lot of work and a lot of our partners came to the table in order to kind of build this circle because I was really strong about making sure that we did everything that we could in order to help that person put their best foot forward. And after they put their best foot forward, if they didn't make it through the interview, we did a call back to find out what happened, why weren't you accepted, what did the employer say, try to talk to the employer, why didn't you select them, why didn't you want them, is it something that we can fix, because if it's something that we can fix, then can you give them another shot? And that was pretty much our model for up until the pandemic. We're talking about getting back into the school sites, going back to Desert Rose, going back to some of the sites that we weren't able to continue to do the work and make the dent because the pandemic kept us out of the schools for two years. And so there's a return back to the targeting that we were doing and, hopefully, we can pick that up pretty soon. Our next event, which really isn't an employment event, it's just to get information back out there, which is at Canyon Springs on the 30th, where we're going to be able to at least get information for DWSS programs, 354 programs and CSN to about 300 students on Monday. And so I'm trying to continue the work from where I'm at, but I know that I'm going to have to rely on the partners to do the targeted events as I'm in session.

Chair Evans stated absolutely. That's perfect because I want individuals that have not been part of that 354 journey to be aware of the leadership that you've displayed as well as the way we mobilized and you mobilized a bunch of business sector partners to create opportunities, but then at the same time, if individuals are wondering what I mean when I mention having a system that's both professionally and culturally competent, some of the examples of some of the things that were done that are - I'll use the term nontraditional - are culturally competent in that they make the extra effort to ensure that we're providing access as well as proactively

reaching targets of the population that otherwise might not be reached. So 100 percent spot on, Senator Neal. Thanks for providing that insight. And let me ask, are there any questions by any of the other subcommittee members before I kind of bridge over to why we wanted to do the 354 presentation? Thank you again, Senator Neal. The other reason why we wanted to do this presentation is because as we think about the two or three objectives we want for this subcommittee as well as when we think about things that we may want to do from a governance, a policy, on actual implementation influence standpoint, Project 354 did some innovative things, they did some nontraditional things, it did some extra-effort things. For example, within our system now, my understanding of it is people kind of either have to get it or they don't as far as accessing the system. And I'm not saying that to be overly critical. When you're dealing with a lot of individuals and a huge system, you have to standardize things. At the same time, I think what Project 354 suggests and what I want to commend Senator Neal on is that sometimes you have to do some things that are nontraditional and innovative because I think we've all heard that saying, the definition of insanity is doing the same thing and expecting different results.

Dina Neal stated she wanted to give a shout-out to Robert Thompson because there was some people like Michael Yoder and Robert Thompson who at the very beginning, when we talked through this - and it's something that you guys could do - was we did an exercise before we started, which was where is there flexibility within your rules, regulations, and the law in order to operate within the space to try to do this work? And it was across the board, childcare, DWSS, DETR, because that was the conversation. It was like, okay, here's this law but where is there flexibility so that either you can color outside of the lines and it won't be illegal, so you can help do the work. And DWS and Thompson jumped right in and under Whitley they gave me like full support for childcare, for the TANF, and they really went in and created an actual office of workforce because of the Project 354 relationship at the beginning. And that spawned a whole new level of I would say transition and creation within their office. But it was because they were willing to flex the rules, not breaking the rules but seeing where the gray was to continue to do the work. That was one of the most powerful elements of Project 354. And they would come to my aid every time I put the call out regardless of the student, the individual, and I just wanted to make note of that because you have some really powerful thoughts, partners on this Zoom who I think have been very supportive of innovation.

Chair Evans stated that's what we want to bring out, duplicate, and to the extent possible, have that be the new standard. In fact, if I may, before I give you time for closing remarks on your presentation, Senator Neal, I do see Mr. Thompson here. Sir, would you like to add anything at this point for the benefit of the subcommittee?

Robert Thompson stated the only thing he'd like to add is we just saw the need. Senator Neal, who was Assemblywoman Neal at the time, was just coming to us with frustration, and Director Whitley is a master in if the law doesn't say no, then it's yes. Those gray areas mean yes, and he doesn't accept no ever. But really if we're going to take a moment to do any shout-outs, I'm going to shout out to Mike Yoder, who is my Workforce Development manager. Really, all I did was take Mike's handcuffs off and connect him with Senator Neal, and then they pushed it forward and then Mike would report back to me constantly on what was happening. Mike was the leader for DWSS, Richard was the innovation, and Senator Neal was the passion. All I did was drive a little bit in the background.

Dina Neal urged everyone to look at this session, because there's still room to bring some kind of BDR or within an existing BDR, bring a policy change, to really think about how you can fund that group that I mentioned that falls outside of the traditional barrier with some kind of fund or look at how you can expand what CSN is doing beyond the 6 credits, where they come in, trying to get their high school diploma to allow for that to be more of an opportunity for them to get more training and education that maybe is paid for through an existing state money that can maybe offset more college education or training that might be within the CSN system. Because we got to figure out how to get people in to a training so they can get a career.

Chair Evans thanked her again. I'm sure we'll possibly be having you back as well. As what I would invite all my subcommittee members to do as well as other members of the public is find out more about Project 354, maybe attend some of the events, and to the extent you can support that, you're also supporting the subcommittee here.

7. DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY -- Identifying the Underserved Populations through Data

Chair Evans stated this is a discussion, information only by the DETR chief economist, David Schmidt. And I think what he's going to do is provide you with some empirical data as well as normally he provides some anecdotal or empirical or objective synopsis as well.

David Schmidt stated he thought this presentation will hopefully tie in pretty well with what you just heard from Senator Neal. I'm the chief economist for the Research and Analysis Bureau within the Nevada Department of Employment, Training, and Rehabilitation. And I'm here in part to start from talking about AB354 and where that is in the law. We do a report every quarter that is focused on groups that meet a rate of high unemployment within a particular county compared to the county as a whole. And there are three factors here. You can see on the screen if the unemployment rate is double the county as a whole, if it's 4 percentage points higher than the county or if it's been higher for 3 consecutive years. So if it's much higher or a certain level higher or it's persistently higher. And I do include the link to the report area. You can find it on our bureau's website, NevadaWorkforce.com. We parsed this data a few different ways. The law originally called for a few demographic groups, but the table that we used within the census has more data than that, and so one of the things I've been trying to do in our department is make sure that we're sort of [inaudible 00:51:14]. If it doesn't say no, it's yes. How can we broaden the perspective in the groups that we're considering here? And so, we parsed the data a few different ways within this report. I will say for anything that's not the state of Nevada Clark County or Washoe County. This data from the census at the county level is only available on a 5-year rolling average. Because we're trying to provide the state of every county that 5-year perspective, it sort of suffuses a lot of this report. But when you look at groups - and here I'm just going to talk about Clark and Washoe County just to not spell it all out but if you read the report, we do have all 17 counties, the same groups. So I want to take a look at Clark County, Washoe County, and identify for those three definitions of high unemployment, what group meets at least one of those thresholds. So for Clark County, if you're looking at age, you're looking at the buckets of 16 to 19, 24, and 75+. Race or ethnicity groups that meet at least one threshold would be black, African American, and Alaskan native, and two or more races. Gender groups, females, females with children who are 0 to 5 years old, and females with children who are 0 to 5 and 6 to 17. We kind of think of that 0 to 5 and 6 to 17 as sort of preschool age and school age. All of these are buckets that are defined by the Census Bureau. So if your question is why 5 years old, because that's how they measure it and that's how we have access to the data. Education groups - again, not surprising, these are common across a lot of different counties - less than high school or high school or equivalent or groups that have high unemployment. Poverty status - individuals whose household income is below poverty level. Other groups would be people with any disability. You'll see a lot of the same groups for Washoe County, though there are some differences. For Washoe County, that oldest age group is not included here. The Hispanic ethnicity as well as some other race are included. We also see females with children who are 0 to 5 and 6 to 17, so having both preschool and school-age children. The same educational groups, also people who are below poverty level, also people with any disability. When you purse out the actual data - I will apologize if you need a magnifying glass to read this, but just to sort of help you see how many different data points we look at when we do this. This is the unemployment rates by demographic group for each county, also including both the 5-year and the 1-year data points for Clark County and Washoe County. This data is available on a 1-year basis for any area whose population is 65,000 or more from

the American Community Survey, and so if you squint and read closely, you can actually sort of see where there's been big swings, where there's been narrow swings. It's also, I think, worth pointing out in a very technical way for some of these different groups like age, race or ethnicity, and gender and presence of children. All of these have a baseline of the total population who are aged 16 or older. But when you look at people by education status or by poverty status or whether they're individuals with a disability, these actually use some different population ranges, and you can see those marked here. People who are - if you're looking at gender and children, actually, I got that wrong - that's age 20 to 64, so this is not including people who are 65 or older. For education, you're looking at the population 25 to 64, and so whenever I'm talking about education here, I'm not necessarily talking about the 22-year-old who might still be in school, but this is participation for individuals at least 25 years old who have a high school degree or less or have not completed a high school degree. So I think that can help bring a little bit of nuance about who to be thinking about when I describe these different populations. If we look at the numbers of people affected here in orange, I highlighted the groups that meet at least one of those thresholds. And there's a lot of data points here in part because when you look at people who have persistently higher or lower rates in some counties, especially small counties, this might not be a big change, especially because we are looking at a 5-year average, but comparing that 5-year average over three different periods next to each other. There tends to be a lot of overlap in this data. But you can also see from looking at this where some of the largest groups are, especially if you're looking at Clark County or Washoe County. These can help to identify where there might be large concentrations of numbers of people. We could also use this data to look at groups that have much higher rates of unemployment. One way we can think about this data is look at the counties themselves. In which counties do we have the same groups show up a lot of the time? I don't have all of the maps that we produced here. They are all in our report. But just to highlight a few that have some pretty high frequency occurrence, age 16 to 19. I said it's common and you can see here there's a couple of counties for which we don't have data. The number of unemployed people is so low that even the American Community Survey can't tell us anything about that county. But for those counties that have data, there's only three where age 16 to 19 is not a group that has high unemployment. But you can see as you look through some of the other age groups, even age 60 to 64, only shows up in Lincoln County. Age 65 to 74 shows up in a few of our rural counties. Age 75 and older is in Clark County and Storey County. And so who has high unemployment can shift a little bit depending on the counties that we're looking at. I think these maps are most helpful to see is it really common, is it rural, is it urban? I think those are some of the questions that we can kind of answer from this. To look at another piece of it, without a doubt, people who have a household income that's below poverty level, almost everywhere. There's a couple of counties where this is not true, Storey and Esmeralda County, but pretty commonly, there's potential chicken and egg thing here. People who don't have jobs are more likely to be below poverty level. People who are below poverty level face higher barriers to finding employment, like transportation barriers or child or family care responsibilities. And so there can be a lot of interrelationships. So this is not to say this causes that or that causes this but to say these two things go together pretty frequently. Also, the challenges for women with children, especially both preschool and school-age children, you can see in sort of the center top here, especially a problem for some of our urban counties, like Washoe County and Clark County. Also for some of Northeastern Nevada, this is something that can come up a lot in mining counties, probably in part because of the schedules required there. And so for women who have children household, having a higher rate of unemployment is definitely out there. I also want to highlight - you can see here on the top right - individuals with any disability. I'm going to come back to this because it shows up in another chart they have in a bit, but this is a pretty common metric, and it shows up a lot of the time, that people who have a disability very commonly face higher rates of unemployment in the state. Another way of looking at this is to compare the same demographic data, but here I'm taking Clark County and Washoe County, so we can see some of the similarities or differences between these areas. This shows a number of different things. In red, you have Clark County. In blue, you have Washoe County. We have the same demographic groups. But this is going to be using that 1-year data because by focusing on the

urban areas of the state, we can get more frequent data so we can look at how things are changing in time. The gray area in these charts shows you the common distribution for other states. And so I'm comparing Clark and Washoe County to every state in the nation to say, are we higher, are we lower, are we in a pretty similar place in terms of unemployment for these various groups and how that's changed over time. And so that gray area, there's 10 states above it, 30 states in the gray area, 10 states below it. And so I think, broadly, you can see how unemployment has trended over time. Because Clark County has had higher unemployment, it tends to be a bit higher, but you can see in general, a lot of these measures are moving in pretty similar directions. I think, especially for the purposes of who are people that face additional barriers and how does that compare, especially looking at the groups for people with a college degree. This is kind of interesting to me that we have higher rates of unemployment, especially in Clark County, that is common among the other states for people with some college or even a Bachelor's degree, even though the overall rates of unemployment are lower. The flip side is we actually have somewhat lower unemployment for individuals with less than a high school degree than the national average. I think in part this might be because of the economy that we have and the types of jobs we have available, there's potentially a little bit more opportunity. It's not great. It's not that people with less than a high school degree have better employment outcomes, but that we might be a little bit more favorable for how can we help to connect these people to jobs and how big is that gap. Another dimension that I've wanted to add to this and I think is pretty important is to not just look at the unemployment rate. The way that we measure employment and unemployment - you can think of the population that we're looking at, there's a share of people who are working. Those are people who are employed. There are people who are actively looking for work. Specifically, they've looked in the last 4 weeks. These are people who are unemployed. If you are not working at all and you are looking for work, then we consider you unemployed. Employed people plus unemployed people is our labor force. So that's everyone who's either working or actively looking for work. If you're not in the labor force, we talk about the participation rate, which is how many people in your population are in the labor force. And so the higher that percentage is, the more people who are working or looking for work. The lower it is, the fewer people who are working or looking for work or engaged. You might say they're actively involved in either working or looking for work. I'll use engagement to talk about this a little bit. So the higher your participation rate, the more people are engaged with the workforce. Lower participation rate, the lower that engagement rate. And so you see again, if we look at the participation rate and how it compares to other states - in the bottom row, the second chart from the left is people who have less than a high school degree. You see we actually, in Nevada, we tend to have higher rates of engagement for this population. One of the areas where we tend to have rather low participation in the state is at the state level for individuals who are white or people who are Asian. And so I think this is an imperfect measure because it doesn't say people who want to work or not. A lot of people who don't participate are retired or voluntarily out of the workforce. But some of the areas where Nevada tends to have somewhat lower participation is in those more affluent areas where people are probably more likely to be retired than not necessarily looking for work. And so just to say this isn't necessarily a perfect measure. But what I think is really interesting is if you take unemployment and you take participation and you put them together, you get a really busy chart. But what I've done here is the horizontal dark lines in the middle are 100 percent. What I'm doing is for unemployment rate, on the horizontal axis, and participation on the vertical axis, saying for each group, in each county, using that 1-year data, which demographic groups have, say, high participation and low rates of unemployment or people who have low rates of participation, low rates of engagement, and high rates of unemployment. I think that's a really interesting population. Who has low unemployment and high participation, they're actively engaged and they're finding work? I think this could be really helpful, especially for the subcommittee, to think about with all of the different data points, with all of the different highlights that I had in that table, what specific groups might face particularly high barriers? And are those barriers related to they're unemployed because they're just not finding work and they're not even looking for work because they don't think there's any jobs for them or are they unemployed because they're actively looking for work and they're at the start of their

career and just in kind of a transitional place? I think this could help us to tease those apart a little bit. And so, for example, looking at Clark County, if I look at the upper-right side of this chart, these are groups whose participation rate is higher than the population as a whole for the area, and their unemployment rate is high. [Interposing] So their participation rate is high, their unemployment rate is high. And it's not too surprising when you look at who's in this group, especially those that are at the farthest edges, people who are 20 to 24 years old, 25 to 29 years old, 30 to 34 years old. People early in their careers tend to be more unemployed, not necessarily because they completely lost jobs but because as you move from job to job, there's periods of unemployment as you're kind of figuring out your career. This is a group that participates at a much higher rate. These are 20 to 30 percent higher than the population for all ages, so they're more likely to be engaged, but they're also more likely to be unemployed. And I think the solution for how do you help unemployed people in these populations, if you're focused on how do I get you to engage in the first place, that's not where the win is. The win here - like these people are already engaged - the question is how can we help, for those people who are actively showing up looking for work, going through job search, how can we help to make that next step, make that connection, make that period of unemployment as small as possible. As you get closer to the center of the chart, especially, you tend to see more large groups here, just because the larger a group is, the more it will tend toward a central average. But you can see a couple of other groups here, including people who are male, who are more races, as well as the female with children under 18, under 6 and 6 to 17. So we talked about that as a group that has high rates of unemployment. You can see women in this case do tend to participate at a slightly higher rate than average. But really where their difference is, is in the unemployment. They're participating at about an average level, but they tend to have more challenges with unemployment. So it's not that they're not looking for work. They're actually above average in that, but the ability to find work, to make that connection is probably where the bigger barrier for this group is. And then to move to the lower right quadrant, I think this is the biggest barrier, it's the biggest challenge, and I think what might be of most interest to the subcommittee, people who have below average levels of participation, so they don't work or look for work at the same rate. They're more likely to be not looking for work at all, not engaged in labor force. And they have higher rates of unemployment when they do engage. It's important to note participation and unemployment are two separate concepts. You can't be in both buckets. So you have to have someone who's not participating and someone who's looking but unemployed to move this direction in the quadrant. There's a couple of common groups. As I said earlier, people who have a high school degree or less or people who have less than a high school degree, lower rates of participation than average, higher rates of unemployment than average. Also, women who have children who are preschool age only, a little bit less likely to participate, a little bit higher rates of unemployment. We see black or African American shows up in this group for Clark County. We also see the youngest and the oldest workers. People who are 16 to 19, you can see kind of in the middle vertically or toward the left a little bit, as well as the oldest workers; 65 to 74 and 75+ are both in this category, and the older you get, the farther that participation rate falls. A lot more people are retired and just not engaged in work search. And it's probably harder to find that fit, even when they're looking for work. But the two that I would highlight, because I know that you will see them again on the next chart, is people with any disability and people who are below poverty level. Obviously, these stand out, pretty low level of participation, much higher rates of unemployment. Just looking at the axis at the bottom, you can see for people below poverty level, we're talking unemployment rates that are three and a half times what the unemployment rate is for the population as a whole. Also, Washoe County because we can do the same sort of comparison there. A few differences here. We see the some college or Associate's degree creep into it here. Sometimes this is just because if you have - because this is an average for the population, if one group is much higher, the average will shift a little bit. But we do see a lot of the same groups. We see 75+. We see 65 to 74. We see 16 to 19. We see black or African American. We also see white alone - and white alone, specifically not Hispanic or Latino because race and ethnicity data, it's commingled a little bit. We see people who have less than a high school degree or high school degree or less. We still see the extreme impact for people below poverty level. Here, over 400 percent or 4 times the average unemployment

rate than the population as a whole. And so I think this is really helpful for me to think about, and I'd be happy to share like each quadrant for each county. I just didn't want to overwhelm this presentation with chart, chart, chart, chart, chart. But I think this is helpful to think, you know, if your participation rate is low, the question is not just one of for someone who comes to you and says, I'm looking for work, how do we help them make the next step. There's another piece that's probably more in outreach. How do we engage the people that aren't looking for work? How do you get people to take that step from not participating to looking for work to hopefully finding a job and becoming employed and sort of drawing that full connection through all phases. If you have low participation and high unemployment, there's both an engagement question and a, once they're looking for work, how can we overcome those barriers questions. But I think this is a really helpful framework for me to think about for particular groups in particular areas. What sort of strategies and what sorts of resources might be necessary to help improve employment outcomes overall.

Chair Evans thanked David for his presentation. I guess in the interest of kind of moving us forward, I mention the fact that we'd like to come up with two or three things for us to tackle over the course of this year. What I'd like to ask is, if indeed you could share digitally, all the chart information, because I'm sure we have individuals on here from rural areas or from some of the more, I'll call them quasi-suburban areas or counties as well as the mining counties. So we want to share the information because, for example, I think one thing I noted is it looked as if - and I think you pointed this out - with the exception of maybe three or four counties, all of them have a concern about 16 to 19 year olds, if I followed that correctly. So, David, the two things I'd like to ask is subsequent to this meeting but before our next meeting - and I'll share the reason why in a few minutes - if we could get all the charts digitally. And then what I would be interested in is, from your perspective, I think I was interpreting data correctly plus you were saying things. I assume that a lot of my colleagues were doing the same, but if you could provide us with what I'm going to call preliminary summary observations based on what you see plus the color coding and especially with the intersection slides, and then in addition to that, I'm going to call them potential ideas or solutions or thoughts that you have, I welcome that to kind of focus our efforts, since this is something that you're typically on top of. And then with that, here's what I would like to propose to the subcommittee. As I listen to the presentation plus having been on the subcommittee before plus the Governor's Workforce Development Board before, I think there's two of them that I was aware of and one that just came to the forefront. The first one is the 16 to 19-year-olds and to a certain extent, the 20 to 24-year-olds is an area that we need to focus on, so there may be an objective or policy related to that. I know like Senator Neal mentioned, there are probably several members in that age group that are interested in being EMTs, but they have to figure out how to deal with that gap that she talked about. I'm just using that as a way to connect the dots. The other population I was somewhat aware of is individuals with disabilities, okay, is another area for us to possibly consider. And then the last one - this is the focus of the Childcare Working Group, and what I'll share with the group is this is an example of where we connected the dots to something plus we paid attention to anecdotal information as well as concrete information of what actually happened during Covid and post Covid. If we look at the subgroup for women that have children 0 to 5 or 6 to 7, basically have both preschool and elementary age children, there's a challenge there, so perhaps an objective. What I will share with the group is that based on, again, what we saw during Covid as well as pre Covid and what the data suggested, that's the reason why we formed the Childcare Working Group and we are actually looking at things that we can do to influence policy, whether it's on the employer end or the employee end or the client end. What are things that we can do to our system to influence the childcare system that in turn influences people's access or ability to utilize the workforce development system. So that's the third one. But I don't want to steer the group just off of something that I said. For what it's worth, I'm a retired Air Force lieutenant colonel, so there's a term I use called the benevolent dictator. I don't want to do that here. I want the group to participate and come up with ideas based on the data that Mr. Schmidt provided as well as the actual Project 354 experience and individuals like Mr. Thompson and others that may be on the phone. And the last thing I want to say before I stop talking in this segment is that whatever we come up with

needs to work across the entire state. Again, if we look at 16 to 19, that's not just a rural issue or an urban issue or an ethnic population issue. That appears to be an issue across the board that we need to address for two reasons. One, because of what the data says, but the other thing is - let's face it, the 16 to 19-year-olds, those are going to be the individuals that 10, 20, 30 years or more from now that we're counting on to carry the state into its next phase. So, with that, any final questions or thought, Mr. Schmidt, that you'd like to share with the group?

David Schmidt stated he looked forward to sharing the information. I think the impetus of AB354 at the start was how do you highlight groups that have additional needs, and I've been pleased to be a part of the process and look forward to helping to flesh out, you know, how can we help provide information to drive the decisions that you all have to make? So thank you for the opportunity.

Chair Evans stated he appreciated his participation, and was sure he can work with Katie, plus I know this is recorded so that we can follow up on those items that I asked for that will help focus us as we move forward.

8. DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY -- Feedback and Plans for Future Meetings

Chair Evans stated this is a discussion as well as a chance for feedback from subcommittee members on the plans for future meetings. I think I kind of already teased it a bit as far as taking the data that he shared, taking the insight that Senator Neal shared, and then trying to come up with two or three objectives, again, based on what I've seen so far but it won't just be on what I've seen. I think if we look at statewide 16 to 19-year-olds and then in addition to that, individuals with disabilities statewide, I think there's some opportunities there, and then possibly a third barrier may be some overlap with women that are below poverty, less than high school but have school-age children. I think there's some opportunities there. But let me also open it up right now and see if anyone had observations or other thoughts that they'd like to share at this time. And again, don't be bashful. Seeing none. There will be time to get the information from David, and then what I would ask of you, here's your homework, take a look at the data, think about those three areas that we talked about but there may be more or if you have individuals that talk to you about things, whether it's rural, urban or whatever, jot those ideas down and be prepared to come back so that we can identify the objectives that we want to move forward with and how we want to influence the system.

9. SECOND PUBLIC COMMENT(S)

Chair Evans invited comments. There were no public comments.

14. ADJOURNMENT

The January 25, 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:

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.