

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

**STRATEGIC PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, March 6, 2024 - 2:00 p.m.**

**Teleconference Line: 1 669 900 6833**

**Meeting ID: 821 4296 6428**

**Passcode: 336404**

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**Present:** Nancy Olsen (Chair), Edward Estipona (Vice Chair), Drazen Elez, Brett Miller, Milt Stewart, Michael Yoder, Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno, Senator Lange, David Schmidt, Robert Fink, Dr. Tiffany Tyler-Garner

**Absent:** Michael Bolognini, Sherri Mantanona, Arianna Florence

**Also present:** Katie Gilbertson, Craig Statucki, Janiese Clyne, Kim Jadidi

**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, 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 comments. There was none.

**5. \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION - Approval of December 6, 2023 meeting minutes**

**Chair Olsen** called for comments/changes to December 6, 2023 draft minutes. There was none.

**It was moved by Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno and seconded by Brett Miller to approve the December 6, 2023 minutes.**

**6. DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY – Update on WIOA State Plan**

**Chair Olsen** reported on the WIOA state plan submission:

- **Submission Details:**

- The WIOA state plan was submitted on Monday, March 4.

- **Approval Process:**

- The plan was approved by the Governor's Workforce Development Board before submission.
- It will now undergo federal review by the Department of Labor and the Department of Education.
- It is common for these departments to request additional information or clarification.

- **Challenges:**

- This year, the likelihood of requests for additional information is higher due to significant changes and streamlining in the state plan.
- Late guidance from the federal departments caused last-minute adjustments.
- **Review Timeline:**
  - The federal agencies have 90 days to provide feedback or approve the plan.
  - If no feedback is given within 90 days, the plan is considered approved.
  - Conditional approval is possible, requiring certain changes.
- **Approval Deadline:**
  - The plan must be approved by July 1.
- **Acknowledgments:**
  - Special thanks to Katie Gilbertson for her efforts in managing the submission process and coordinating with the board.
  - Appreciation extended to all participants involved in developing and revising the plan.

**7. DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY – Update on GWDB Strategic Plan**

**Katie Gilbertson** provided an update on the strategic plan:

- **Acknowledgment:**
  - Katie thanked Chair Nancy Olsen for the appreciation and acknowledged everyone's hard work on the WIOA state plan.
- **Overview of the Strategic Plan:**
  - The strategic plan is derived from the goals, strategies, and measurements of the WIOA state plan.
  - It aims to be a more tangible, feasible, and agile document for the Governor's Workforce Development Board (GWDB) to use as a playbook for implementing the WIOA state plan.
- **Task Force Formation:**
  - Chair Anderson and Vice Chair Evans identified five members to create a GWDB strategic plan task force.
  - The task force first met on February 23rd and will meet again next Tuesday.
- **Process and Timeline:**
  - The task force meetings involve reviewing and modifying goals, strategies, and measurements from the WIOA state plan.
  - An initial draft of the strategic plan is expected by the week of March 18th.
  - A stakeholder engagement process will take place until the end of April, involving workforce partners, economic development, chambers, state agencies, and title agencies to ensure the plan meets their needs.
  - The executive committee will review the plan on May 13th.
  - A subcommittee will review the plan on June 6th.
  - The full board will review and approve the plan on June 12th, followed by the implementation process.
- **Conclusion:**
  - Katie emphasized that the strategic plan will be easier to digest and work with compared to the WIOA state plan.
  - She invited Edward Estipona, a task force member, to add any comments.

**Edward Estipona** highlighted that the strategic plan will be much easier to digest because it will be significantly shorter. Unlike the 200-plus page WIOA state plan, the strategic plan will be concise and straightforward, making it more accessible for everyone.

**8. DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY – Perkins V State Plan Revision**

**Craig Statucki, Director of the Office of Career Readiness, Adult Learning, and Education Options at the Nevada Department of Education** provided an update on the Perkins V State Plan revision. The Perkins V is a federal funding initiative aimed at supporting Career and Technical Education (CTE) for eligible secondary and postsecondary educational agencies in Nevada:

## Overview of Perkins V and Its Importance

- **Purpose:** Perkins V funding supports CTE programs for secondary and postsecondary education.
- **Eligibility:** 14 school districts, 3 charter schools, and 4 community colleges in Nevada.
- **Funding Allocation:** Based on county population of 5 to 17-year-olds and those living in poverty; postsecondary allocations based on Pell Grant numbers.

## State Plan Revision Process

- **Stakeholder Engagement:** Extensive stakeholder meetings from June to December, with significant input from various counties and educational institutions.
- **Approval Timeline:** Scheduled for State Board of Education approval by March 27, submission to Governor Lombardo by April 10, and required federal submission by May 10.

## Strategic Goals and Performance Targets

- **Reduction of Goals:** Streamlined from 35 to three main strategic goals to focus efforts.
  1. **Improving Access and Achievement in High-Quality CTE:** Defined high-skill, high-wage, and in-demand occupations with collaboration from various stakeholders.
  2. **Systematic Approach to Career Pathways:** Revised secondary CTE programs of study, reducing the number of programs and aligning them more closely with Nevada's economic needs.
  3. **Ensuring a Pipeline of Skilled Talent:** Focused on creating a pipeline for skilled talent in public and private sectors, including a pipeline of CTE educators.

## Performance Indicators

- **Secondary Indicators:**
  - Academic Proficiencies: Based on ACT for Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics, and Nevada State Science Assessment for science.
  - Program Quality: Included new indicators for recognized postsecondary credentials and work-based learning participation.
  - Post-Program Placement: Tracks students staying in Nevada for postsecondary education or entering the workforce.
- **Postsecondary Indicators:**
  - Retention and Placement: Focused on how many students earn recognized postsecondary credentials.
  - Non-Traditional Program Enrollment: Tracking enrollment in programs traditionally underrepresented by gender.

## Implementation and Future Steps

- **Challenges:** Addressing the difficulty in hiring CTE educators due to higher wages in industry jobs compared to educational salaries.
- **Next Steps:**
  - Ongoing adjustments to the Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment (CLNA) to reflect the revised state plan.
  - A collaborative, regionally focused approach to CLNA involving combined efforts from secondary and postsecondary institutions.

## Conclusion

Craig emphasized the importance of continuous collaboration and improvements in data collection to ensure the Perkins V goals are met effectively. The focus on strategic, measurable goals aims to enhance the quality and accessibility of CTE programs, ultimately preparing students for high-demand, high-wage careers in Nevada.

**David Schmidt** raised a question about the third goal related to working with GOED on identifying high-demand, high-skill, high-wage jobs and industries. Specifically, he addressed the criteria behind GOED's ranking of in-demand jobs, noting that factors such as STEM skills and educational requirements play a role in this ranking. He inquired whether the list had been reviewed to ensure that it does not exclude potential high-skill, high-wage occupations that may not necessarily include a STEM or higher education component. This is particularly relevant for Career and Technical Education (CTE), as some high-skill, high-wage jobs suitable for CTE might not align with the STEM or degree-focused criteria typically used. Mr. Schmidt emphasized the importance of ensuring that the identified occupations reflect those that would be most applicable to CTE programs. He noted that from DETR's projections, job openings can be analyzed in various ways, highlighting a distinction between occupations with numerous openings and those specific roles critical for advancing economic diversification. These categories sometimes overlap but can also diverge, underscoring the need for careful consideration in the ranking process to support the broader goal of economic development and diversification.

**Craig Statucki** responded to the question by emphasizing the importance of defining in-demand occupations more comprehensively, incorporating both GOED's and DETR's research and analysis. He acknowledged a concern raised by subrecipients about the dominance of Clark County in driving statewide demand and highlighted the need for regional flexibility. This regional approach allows for more tailored support for school districts and community colleges based on localized demand, rather than a one-size-fits-all statewide perspective. Mr. Statucki mentioned that this flexibility is crucial as the demand for certain occupations can change over time. For instance, while welding might be in demand today, it may not be tomorrow. Rather than eliminating such programs abruptly, there's an understanding that occupational demand is cyclical. This approach allows for rolling adjustment to programs, ensuring they remain relevant without being overly reactive to short-term trends. He also pointed out the benefits of restructuring CTE programs to provide more flexibility for districts to address specific local needs, especially in the later years of study. For example, a district might have a unique need for masonry skills if they have a qualified instructor, even though it's not feasible to establish a statewide program for such a specialized skill. This localized approach ensures that students receive training that is directly applicable to their community's economic landscape, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of CTE programs in preparing students for the workforce.

**Chair Olsen** noted that public comments submitted by Mr. Statucki, despite his position as her boss, influenced the inclusion of specific definitions in the WIOA state plan. These definitions pertain to in-demand, high-wage, and other critical employment categories. Chair Olsen highlighted that these definitions were incorporated into the state plan before it was passed by the Governor's Workforce Board. This inclusion ensures that the plan is aligned with the updated and precise criteria for evaluating and addressing workforce needs.

**Brett Miller** asked a question about the allocation of the approximately \$12.8 million funding for Career and Technical Education (CTE) in Nevada. He specifically asked for the rough breakdown between secondary and postsecondary programs.

**Craig Statucki** provided the breakdown of the allocation for Career and Technical Education (CTE) funding in Nevada. He stated that it's approximately 63% for secondary programs and 37% for postsecondary programs. He also mentioned that compared to other states, Nevada's allocation leans slightly more towards postsecondary programs. Additionally, he noted that before Perkins 5, the percentage for postsecondary was lower, but he didn't have the exact figure. Furthermore, Statucki mentioned that outside of federal funding, Nevada receives a little over \$13 million annually from the legislature for state secondary CTE funds.

**Brett Miller** inquired about the distribution of secondary placement outcomes, noting that approximately 65% of students were placed, which he considered quite positive. He then asked for insight into the proportion of students placed into postsecondary education versus those entering the workforce.

**Craig Statucki** explained that he didn't have the breakdown of secondary placement into postsecondary education versus the workforce readily available but mentioned that they use surveys sent out by subrecipients to gather placement data. He acknowledged the limitations of survey data but noted that they are improving their data collection methods, including utilizing NPWR for better verification. He also mentioned that post-program placement includes students who indicate joining the military, which currently relies on survey data.

**Chair Olsen** asked if Mr. Statucki had any out of state interstate data for employment and if he would be able to report that under Perkins.

**Craig Statucki** mentioned that they recently received a request from the US Department of Education regarding the use of an interstate agreement to track post-program placement of students. He clarified that they are not currently using such an agreement but acknowledged it as a potential option for further discussion among stakeholders, legislators, and the governor's office. Mr. Statucki proposed differentiating between in-state and out-of-state placements to better understand where students are going after completing their programs, which could be valuable information for tracking the effectiveness of CTE initiatives.

**David Schmidt** inquired about additional types of data or labor market population information that could enhance the targeting of services, particularly for programs like TR (presumably referring to Training and Retraining initiatives). He suggested identifying potential gaps in data that, if filled, could improve the effectiveness of future plans.

**Craig Statucki** highlighted challenges in rural school districts regarding stakeholder engagement, particularly with local Workforce Development boards. He noted that CTE directors in these districts often wear multiple hats, making it difficult for them to engage with stakeholders effectively. Mr. Statucki emphasized the importance of supporting these districts in making connections and understanding labor market data, suggesting that professional development and collaboration between agencies could help facilitate this process. He also mentioned the surprise some districts face when their perceptions of in-demand occupations don't align with the data, indicating a need for ongoing education and training for educators in understanding labor market trends.

**9. DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY – New Business From Subcommittee Members**

**Dr. Tiffany Tyler-Garner** raised questions about factors beyond federal measures and reporting that could enhance the understanding and impact of CTE programs. She suggested exploring other drivers in the workforce that may not currently be accounted for in the system. This could involve examining anomalies in data and understanding shifts in education policy and implementation at the district level. Dr. Tyler-Garner emphasized the importance of contextualizing the work to better serve communities and individuals participating in CTE programs, aiming for a more comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing outcomes.

**Chair Olsen** mentioned a project called Aligned Case Management, which involves representatives from different titles and agencies, including the Department of Welfare and Supportive Services. This project focuses on common intake and referral processes. There are two groups currently working on the referral process and common intake, which will eventually merge. Janiese Clyne has been leading this effort, and Chair Olsen proposed scheduling a presentation on the progress of this group at the next quarterly meeting.

**Chair Olsen** expressed satisfaction with the progress being made in various areas and emphasized the importance of ensuring that progress continues without delay. She noted that the advancements align well with the implementation of the strategic plan currently in development. Chair Olsen anticipated that the next meeting would be an opportune time to discuss these developments further.

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

**Chair Olsen** asked for final public comment on telephone and Zoom.

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

**The March 6, 2024 meeting was adjourned.**

Notice of this meeting was posted on or before 9 a.m. on the third day prior to the meeting at the Grant Sawyer State Building 1st Floor Lobby at 555 E. Washington Ave. Las Vegas, NV 89101. GOWINN'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 GOWINN's Website at <https://gowinn.nv.gov/meetings/> may be requested from Katie Gilbertson at 555 E. Washington Ave. Ste. 4900, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101; or call (702) 486-8080