

STATE OF NEVADA
GOVERNOR'S WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD

STRATEGIC PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE

Tuesday, February 2, 2021 – 1:00 p.m.

TELECONFERENCE ONLY
1-669-900-6833 | Meeting ID 871 49661 1720

MINUTES OF MEETING

Present: Nancy Olsen, Chair, William “Bill” Stanley, Jenny Casselman, Craig Statucki, Jaime Cruz, John Thurman, Ryan Cordia, Mechelle Merrill, Craig von Collenberg, Aaron West

Absent: Ann Silver, William “Larry” Fagerhaug

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

1. OPENING REMARKS

Nancy Olsen, Chair, called the meeting to order and welcomed participants.

2. ROLL CALL - CONFIRMATION OF A QUORUM AND VERIFICATION OF PUBLIC POSTING

Per direction from Chair 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 Governor’s Workforce Development Board Strategic Planning Subcommittee meeting on February 2, 2021, 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.”

Chair Olsen invited comments from the public. There were no comments.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Olsen noted that the minutes for January 5, 2021 were not yet complete and would be presented for approval at an upcoming meeting.

6. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION – Establishment of Core Partners Group for State Plan revisions

Chair Olsen stated that having the full Subcommittee work on the fine details of State Plan is not practical. The intent is formation of a Core Partners Group within the Subcommittee with a couple of additional people outside of the Subcommittee to organize the recommendations of the work groups for specific revisions. At a minimum, the goal would be have Title Core Partners and TANF participation in the Core Group. At this time, Mechelle Merrill is confirmed for Title IV and Chair Olsen for Title II. Chair invited Jaime Cruz, John Thurman and Kris Nelson for Title I. Kris Nelson would also be able to assist with Title III. Jenny Casselman is invited as well. Two individuals will come from TANF and SNAP employment and training. Revisions from the Core Group will be brought to the full Subcommittee for approval and then ultimately on to the full Governor’s Workforce Development Board prior to federal submission. There was consensus to proceed with the outlined process. **Jaime Cruz** and **John Thurman** confirmed their availability to participate.

Chair Olsen invited a motion.

Craig von Collenberg made a motion to approve the establishment of the Core Partners Group for State Plan revisions. Jenny Casselman seconded. The motion carried.

7. **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION - Partial Revision for 2022 modifications of State Plan that includes goals and assessments of progress and areas impacted by these changes**

Chair Olsen stated that the partial modifications will target the goals and assessment of progress as well as the economic outlook and the individual partner portions. For the joint portion of the State Plan, it will focus on the strategic goals and the assessment of those goals, with the economic outlook taken care of by DETR. There was great discussion on this during the last meeting, but no firm commitment to move in this direction.

Chair Olsen opened the topic for discussion.

Bill Stanley noted that he was not in attendance at the last meeting and asked for a brief summary of the discussion and progress thus far. Chair Olsen summarized that during the last meeting, there was discussion on the targeting of specific areas of the State Plan, rather than attempting a total revisions. Discussion would involve areas of significant impact in terms of revisions going forward. Two areas that she identified, based on the current content of the State Plan and examples from other states (Mississippi in particular), dealt with strategic goals in four years. Strategic goals in the Nevada State Plan include access, alignment, quality and outcomes. Under each area are multiple goals that have been submitted and approved as part of the State Plan for 2020. Most are not currently being measured in terms of progress. In many cases, the goals are met by one Title, but not by the entire workforce system. In other cases, goals are met by one area, but not the entire State. Determinations will include which goals still apply, which need to be adjusted and how progress towards meeting goals will be measured. At this time, the only measures available are the core performance measures. There is no suggestion to come up with significant additional data. Some goals may lend themselves to data, but many will be narrative in nature. The Mississippi plan included clear guidelines for measurement of progress and it would be helpful to include similar language in the State Plan. Mr. Stanley commented that discussions approximately a year ago included how to move the State Plan from a compliance document toward more action-focused. He appreciates the effort towards achieving this goal.

Chair Olsen invited additional comments, particularly in regards to the approach to narrow the scope of the revisions for the first mid-cycle revision. There is a requirement to submit a new State Plan every four years. However, the next cycle is a mid-cycle revision. Although not required, there is an opportunity to make revisions. Mr. Stanley agreed with the approach, noting that this is a massive undertaking and difficult to do all at once. Bifurcating the process with a focus on the most important aspects is a good approach.

There being no further discussion, Chair Olsen invited a motion.

Bill Stanley made a motion to proceed with partial revisions for the 2020 State Plan for submittal in 2022. Jenny Casselman seconded. The motion carried.

8. **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION - Establish work groups: 1. Common Processes and Customer Flow; 2. Data and Accountability**

Chair Olsen noted that in preparation for this meeting, Subcommittee Members were provided scope of work documents for the work groups and a recommendation form. The documents detail the expectations for each of the work groups as well as the process for using the recommendations to implement changes to the State Plan. With the idea of having a more target of revisions, the Subcommittee discussed at the last meeting the potential for narrowing the work groups for greater impact on State Plan revisions. The work groups will be comprised of individuals recommended by Subcommittee Members. The commitment would include one meeting per month from March through June at a minimum.

Mr. Stanley inquired whether staff will provide an outline matrix or whether they are seeking input on which data should be looked at. Chair Olsen stated that they have set data that is expected to be gathered for performance reporting, including demographics, barriers and performance. However, the Data and Accountability Work Group could work towards streamlining collection. Currently, a participant goes to Workforce Connections and fills out forms. They then then go to the Title II program and repeat the same process. They may even proceed to Title IV

doing yet again the same thing. Data sharing restrictions make it difficult for the agencies to share information. The work group would be positioned to assist in making suggestions to streamline the process. Example scope of work topics for the work group include what types of data should be looked at in terms of collection, reporting and sharing. Demographics are not currently necessarily shared but should be. Sharing data also eliminates the duplication of efforts. There are federal reporting requirements that must be met. Recently, the Governor's Workforce Development Board has moved to quarterly reporting. This work group could provide input and the State Plan could contain guidance on how this is handled. There is not a good systemwide method of tracking referrals and co-enrollments between titles. The State Performance Report includes a section that calls for the percentage of students co-enrolled between titles and thus far, they have not been able to report these numbers. It is hoped that a work group can develop ideas for accomplishing this goal.

Mr. Stanley said that it would be helpful to understand how the data collected on intake could be shared with core partners. **Jaime Cruz** stated that this is the pipe dream, as something very few states have been able to achieve. There are limited examples, such as Florida and Texas, which have made some progress in this area. The biggest challenge in Nevada is that everyone is on a separate system. One-Stops for Title I and III input clients into the State management information system, EmployNV. Titles II, IV and TANF each use different systems, which makes it impossible to share information. A solution discussed in the past is implementation of SARA, a system that facilitates connectivity to subsystems through collection, extraction and sharing of data.

John Thurman agreed that because varying data gathering and reporting systems are used, it is difficult to have an accurate picture of the entire data. This also results in challenges with providing services from one title to another. Data must be collected from the client multiple times. The case manager often cannot see the total summary of what services have been provided to the client and thus cannot easily integrate its own services. Within EmployNV, over 300 data points are gathered per client. These can be reported for Title I and Title III. With robust implementation of SARA more connectivity is possible. While some programs are capable of limited communication, it is also true that when one change is made in one program, this requires subsequent changes to other programs, resulting in burdensome and costly processes.

Mr. Stanley asked whether Texas and Florida's program is off-the-shelf or proprietary. **Mr. Cruz** said it is the same software Nevada possesses, made by Geographic Solutions. In Nevada, it is referred to as EmployNV. Florida refers to it as EmployFlorida and Texas refers to it as Texas Works. The key is not so much the software, but that some states are just further ahead. In the 1990s, the Bush governors in Texas and Florida pushed system integration. Thus, integration is mandated in those states, while in Nevada is it not. It would be a monumental task for all Nevada partners to get on one software system, thus making SARA a more viable route. **Chair Olsen** commented that based on recent conversations and to the extent it is currently being used, the SARA interface has not been able to provide required demographic data. **Mechelle Merrill** confirmed this understanding. The other important detail is that the program is only as good as the permissions provided. Data sharing agreements are required and the client must give permission. **Mr. Stanley** asked Mr. Cruz for his view on whether each agency should be using the same software for data collection. If so and if the data is automatically shared across platforms, he asked whether the client would then not be required to give permission for sharing. **Ms. Merrill** chimed in and stated that typically in situations where a state requires all agencies to perform functions in a uniform manner, they build the permission disclosure into the system application forms.

Mr. Stanley stated that it will be very helpful to be able to provide succinct explanations to the legislature and other officials that the current system is not conducive to a healthy and seamless workforce system. **Chair Olsen** noted that the Title II Program offers services to students with or without documentation. This one issue gives some pause in terms of having a joint system. In addition, SARA is quite costly. **Ms. Merrill** stated that Chair Olsen's figure of \$80,000 is approximately accurate. Originally, the program was offered free for a limited time for pilot users, which is why many partners and titles came on board. **Chair Olsen** recalled that DETR is paying a couple hundred thousand dollars for use of the program. This would be a concern for Title II. It may be necessary to rely on release of information from participants in order to share information, as there are also multiple applicable laws. These include the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act, HIPAA and a law that protects UI data.

Mr. Stanley opined that states that are successfully integrating the sharing of data have certainly learned how to address these issues. He asked about the source of funding and costs for such programs. **Mr. Cruz** stated that DETR assumes the cost of the SARA product. It also pays for the system that houses vocational rehab and EmployNV. **Ms. Casselman** was not able to verify that the cost comes out of DETR's budget. For the purpose of this discussion, there are positive test cases where a single statewide system is proving to be effective. Other states have decentralized programs. She offered to verify the cost and funding source for the discussion going forward.

Chair Olsen noted that in 2017, the legislature had a budget proposal that included moving Title II from the Department of Education to DETR. This was ultimately voted down by the legislature, because they felt that Title II was an education program in addition to a workforce program and did not want to move it out of the education arena. It would be interesting to know how Texas shares its data across the different titles, particularly in terms of privacy requirements.

Mr. Stanley expressed concern that participants may be worn out by the system before services can be delivered, leading them to leave before they gain employment or upgrade their skills. Anything to streamline the process makes sense for the workforce system. One of the main complaints has been frustration with the system. **Mr. von Collenberg** recalled feedback from workforce professionals who cited not only the importance of data sharing but embedding the privacy release in all intake forms. **Ms. Casselman** stated that a great place to start is with an asset map for all the workforce programs across the state. **Mr. Stanley** commented that the subcommittee he is chairing is approximately three-quarters of the way through developing the asset map. They have completed the required Titles I through IV and are now moving through TANF, adult education and some nonrequired workforce development, such as apprenticeship. They are bringing in the State Apprenticeship Council to give a picture of those particular assets for inclusion in the map. The process was based on the Iowa model, as it made the most sense. Other needed elements were added.

Chair Olsen invited a motion to establish the two work groups.

Bill Stanley made a motion to establish the two work groups: 1. Common Processes and Customer Flow; 2. Data and Accountability. Craig von Collenberg seconded. The motion carried.

Chair Olsen requested that Subcommittee members email her with suggestions for participants for the work groups.

9. **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION - Hiring of State Plan Coordinator**

Chair Olsen acknowledged that this item may be premature, however it was included for discussion to determine whether Subcommittee members would be in favor of hiring a State Plan Coordinator if funding is available. It will be a contracted, short-term position to assist with putting the State Plan together and completing the revisions along with the Core Group. **Mr. von Collenberg** stated that it is a great idea to have a full-time person focused on this goal. **Ms. Casselman** concurred, but commented that it would be a good approach to track the legislative session in terms of OWINN's structure before any recommendations for expanded staffing are made. **Chair Olsen** clarified that it would not necessarily have to be through OWINN and that Mr. Cruz mentioned that there might be available funding through Workforce Connections. **Mr. Cruz** stated that the short answer is yes. However, there is a current proposal on the table to roll OWINN into DETR. If this occurs, there will be structural changes. DETR may have available staffing to cover such a position. **Mr. von Collenberg** agreed that it makes sense to see what happens during the legislative session. However, WIOA allows for the hiring of a director for the State Board that can be paid out of WIOA funding. He suggested that they look at this possibility, particularly in terms of hiring a director for the workforce board. **Mr. Stanley** asked whether the WIOA funding allows the board to hire a consultant that would direct the process in the same respect as a full-time employee.

Mr. von Collenberg said that the language guiding the director position is not specific in terms of role. The Board would have to agree upon the details and hiring. **Mr. Stanley** commented that moving the State Plan from a compliance document to an action-oriented document is a full-time job. This work is critical to the State and requires a greater time commitment than that of volunteers who meet once per month. **Mr. Thurman** said there has been a precedent in the State, in that when OWINN was established, it was funded out of the Governor's reserve fund, taken to the legislature and subsequently sourced by the General Fund. The Governor's new budget proposal brings funding back to DETR. The precedent is already set that the Governor's reserve funds could be utilized. **Chair Olsen** concurred, as OWINN was originally funded as primarily staff to the Board from the Governor's reserve. Of particular concern is the timing. It would be great to have a full-time position as Board director, but this is not likely to happen over the next several months. The legislature may take until May to make decisions regarding OWINN moving to DETR. The concern is that the revisions to the State Plan would have to go to the full Board in October in order for the required approvals for federal submission. **Mr. Stanley** shared the concern, which is why he asked whether a consultant could be hired very quickly. All of the work being performed by the six subcommittees has to be coalesced and reports generated. **Mr. von Collenberg** stated that he believed it to be an allowable use of the Governor's reserve funding to issue an RFP to engage an agency to assist in the process. **Chair Olsen** was concerned that the process would take six months. **Mr. von Collenberg** estimated the time frame to be one to one and a half months. **Ms. Casselman** asked about capacity for OWINN to provide staffing support. **Mr. Feijoo** stated that there currently is no such available staff at this time.

Chair Olsen asked for consensus to move forward in terms of determining viable options. **Ms. Casselman** said she was in favor of waiting to see the results of the possible OWINN move to DETR as well as changes within secondary education during the legislative session. **Chair Olsen** suggested tabling the discussion for the March meeting. **Mr. Stanley** reiterated that there is a tight timeline and the need for dedicated personnel. **Chair Olsen** commented that there may be more detail available for the March meeting in terms of the move of OWINN to DETR. **Mr. Stanley** added that they would likely have access to the actual bill by that time as well. **Chair Olsen** noted that the bill will also include the date for enactment. There was agreement to table the agenda item until the March meeting.

10. PUBLIC COMMENTS NOTICE (SECOND)

Chair Olsen invited comments from the public. There were none.

11. ADJOURNMENT – The February 2, 2021 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 - http://owinn.nv.gov/GWDB/GWDB_Workforce_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 http://owinn.nv.gov/GWDB/GWDB_Workforce_Meetings/ and may be requested from the Executive Director's Office at: 555 E. Washington Ave., Suite 4900, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 or call 702-486-8080