

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

**Wednesday, April 17, 2024 - 2:00 p.m.**

**Las Vegas: Grant Sawyer Building  
Attorney General's Conference Room  
555 E. Washington Ave. #4500  
Las Vegas, NV 89101**

**Carson City: Department of Employment, Training, and Rehabilitation  
Director's Conference Room  
500 E. Third St.  
Carson City, NV 89713**

**Teleconference Only  
1-669-900-6833  
Meeting ID: 899 0777 0391  
Passcode: 000138**

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**Present:** Hugh Anderson (Chair), Ken Evans (Vice Chair), Kenneth Goodrich, Scott Hammond, Gina Bongiovi, Maureen Schafer, Robert Benner, Edward Estipona, George Gault, Leslie Mujica, Derrick Gyamfi, Crystal Slaughter, Brittany Brown, David Dreibelbis, Susan Brager, Kevin Landry, Irene Bustamante Adams, Drazen Elez, Evelyn Thompson-Hilbert, Kristine Nelson, Nancy Olsen, Robert Thompson, Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May

**Absent:** Councilman Scott Black, Michael Bolognini, Ryan Woodward, Jerrie Merritt, Lawrence Montrose, Thomas White, Senator Dina Neal, Lori Calderon, Sherri Mantanona

**Also present:** Katie Gilbertson, Wendi Secrist, Jack Porter, Sophia Yager, Arianna Florence, Ben Daseler

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

**Vice Chair Evans** called the meeting to order and welcomed participants.

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

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

**3. VERIFICATION OF PUBLIC NOTICE POSTING**

**Katie Gilbertson** affirmed that the agenda and notice of the Governor's Workforce Development Board (GWDB) meeting on April 17, 2024, was posted pursuant to Nevada's Open Meeting Law, NRS 241.020.

**4. FIRST PUBLIC COMMENT(S) NOTICE**

**Vice Chair Evans** read the notice into the record as follows: "Members of the public are invited to make comments. No action may be taken on a matter during public comment until the matter itself

has been included on an agenda as an item for possible action and properly noticed pursuant to NRS 241.020."

**Edward Cervantes** provided public comment on zoom. Mr. Cervantes discussed the impact of the youth program on his life and how the WEX program can help young people start and grow businesses. While WIOA supports economic growth by matching employers with skilled individuals, it often overlooks those without experience. He believes the Employ NV Youth Hub should create a program to help inexperienced individuals gain necessary career experience and support future entrepreneurs. Additionally, the SB425 legislation and SB244 school were both mentioned as beneficial youth education and employment opportunities.

**5. \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION – Approval of February 7, 2024 minutes**

**Chair Anderson** called for any discussion on the February 7, 2024 meeting minutes. **It was moved by Maureen Schafer and seconded by Kevin Landry to approve the February 7, 2024 minutes.**

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

**Katie Gilbertson** presented the WIOA State Plan that was approved in February and it has been successfully submitted by the March 4 deadline to the US Department of Education and Labor. Ms. Gilbertson is awaiting feedback, and final acceptance of the plan will be by July 1.

**Scott Hammond** shared that the subcommittees reviewed each part of the plan that was sent out to about 70-75 individuals. Their feedback was analyzed, assessed, and discussed during the course of about four or five meetings. It appears that they will continue to work on this plan a few months longer than anticipated. In the meantime, the feedback is good, they continue working and receiving feedback, and will provide a revised version.

**Chair Anderson** took this time to give kudos to Nancy Olsen on her work and being instrumental with the WIOA State Plan and thanked her for her help in getting this accomplished and submitted in record time.

**7. DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY – Discussion on the Idaho Workforce Development Council**

**Chair Anderson** welcomed Wendi Secrist, Executive Director of the Idaho Workforce Development Council to provide training on becoming a high performing workforce board on behalf of the US Department of Labor as she has done exemplary work with her state workforce board. Training materials sent out prior to the meeting included a WIOA 101 module and two NGA high performing workforce board reports. Chair Anderson asked the Board to utilize this time in order to acquire this knowledge and continue to improve the board's efficiency.

**Wendi Secrist, Executive Director of the Idaho Workforce Development Council** thanked the board for inviting her. She stressed what a journey it had been and was thrilled to be able to share what her state had learned along the way. Including that not only are they a state workforce board but also serve as the local workforce board. She explained the history of how the council formerly operated as an advisory council to the Idaho Department of Labor. However, there was a recognition that the workforce development system involved eight agencies, 24 programs, and over \$160 million towards workforce activities, thus the former Governor established a task force to understand where all resources could be housed in one central agency. The Idaho Workforce Development Council established authority as an independent office under the Governor in a 2017 executive order from their former Governor to advise the Governor, the Legislature and other interested parties. As a part of this order, there were three specific goals which included increasing public awareness of the access to education and training opportunities, improving effectiveness, quality and coordination of programs/services, and provide the most efficient use of federal, state, and local resources.

**Leslie Mujica** asked what type of data was collected pertaining to the last goal of the three (provide the most efficient use of federal, state, and local resources). She specifically wanted to know who is employing the participants and what type of positions they are filling.

**Wendi Secrist** discussed how various resources and investments in the state, such as vocational rehabilitation, adult dislocated worker programs, youth programs, and veteran programs, are managed and assessed. She emphasized the importance of evaluating performance data quarterly to understand how funds are utilized and to measure outcomes. While state-specific WIOA performance measures haven't been established, other funding programs focus on metrics like wage gains and employment outcomes. The Workforce Development Council is data-driven, aiming to determine what works and adjust strategies as needed. Each initiative has its own metrics, sometimes aligning with federal standards or internal measures supported by cross-agency data sharing agreements.

**Leslie Mujia** responded and said they are currently asking similar questions and having a hard time receiving answers. Ms. Mujica expressed there is no way to know the effectiveness of a program without quantifying the outcomes.

**Wendi Secrist** agreed and mentioned this would be further discussed in a future slide, expressing that the process to get to the point where they are currently at took a long time. She moved on to the strategic approach of the Idaho Workforce Development Council. Director Secrist highlighted the importance of geographic representation and engagement throughout the state, ensuring that efforts aren't overly concentrated in Boise. The council integrates non-members through committees, expanding their reach and effectiveness. Director Secrist also elaborated on the council's responsibilities under WIOA, emphasizing a systematic approach to strategic planning, performance measurement, and accountability. She referred to the Cornell Law School's website as a valuable resource for understanding WIOA requirements, which outlines 12 specific responsibilities for State Workforce Development Boards. Director Secrist summarized the core functions: overall strategic plan, coordinating the workforce development system, promoting best practices, continuous improvement of the system, technology utilization, accountability and program oversight, and labor market information. The council, in collaboration with the Idaho Department of Labor, delineates tasks and responsibilities through an MOU to ensure clarity and efficiency, particularly in areas like labor market information. In their planning process, the council conducts listening sessions statewide to gather community feedback, which informs the focus areas of their state plan. This plan is distinct from their strategic plan, which aligns with the governor's goals and includes specific strategies and focus areas derived from community input. Director Secrist then described the council's role in overseeing and improving the workforce system in regards to funding. She detailed how federal funds flow from the U.S. Department of Labor through the Idaho Department of Labor to local grants, emphasizing the state and local boards never touch any of the funding.

**Chair Anderson** asked about the challenges and strategies involved in establishing accountability and program oversight within the Workforce Development Council. He inquired specifically about the initial resistance encountered and how an environment of collaboration was fostered, where all parties felt united in working towards a common goal.

**Wendi Secrist** responded to Chair Anderson's question by emphasizing the importance of relationship building and trust. She explained that overcoming initial resistance involved a lot of listening to understand past issues and discussing necessary changes moving forward. The goal was to create a level playing field where every partner had an equal voice. The council aimed to address the challenges of various programs collectively rather than individually. Director Secrist highlighted the importance of collaborative advocacy, such as presenting united committee presentations to the legislature to demonstrate the integrated efforts of different programs. This helped show the legislature that their investments were effectively serving Idahoans and employers. Additionally, the council conducted 16 community listening sessions with multiple agencies participating to gather feedback and create goals that met the needs of all stakeholders. Building these relationships and trust through actions and collaboration was key to their success.

**Derrick Gyamfi** inquired about the technology improvement responsibilities of the board and requested details, particularly from a budgetary standpoint.

**Wendi Secrist** explained the technology improvement responsibilities of the board, focusing on the practical steps taken to foster collaboration and effective use of resources. Initially, discussions about creating a statewide data system met with resistance, leading to the decision to work with existing systems while promoting collaboration. For example, the Department of Labor uses a statewide labor exchange, while Vocational Rehabilitation and Adult Education use separate systems. To address this, they developed a co-enrollment methodology to track and improve service delivery across different programs. Additionally, with apprenticeship programs, multiple agencies decided to consolidate into one system managed by the Department of Labor for better efficiency and security. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the board focused on supporting participants virtually. They acquired "Big Interview," a tool for online interview practice available to all workforce partners, facilitating remote career planning and support. Director Secrist also detailed the budgetary aspects, explaining the use of the governor's reserve fund. Up to 15% of WIOA federal funds from adult, dislocated worker, and youth can be set aside in the governor's reserve fund for statewide activities, with an additional 25% for rapid response to dislocated worker needs. The remainder goes toward local grants. The board uses these funds for various initiatives, including technology improvements and special labor market projects. Director Secrist presented a detailed budget that included all the WIOA required activities to be supported through the governor's reserve, which agency has primary responsibility over that certain activity, and how the activity is accomplished. Previously, the Department of Labor was not allocating costs based off of activities and initially they questioned why the council was asking, however Director Secrist explained that they are jointly responsible for some of these activities so they should work together to determine if the activities are being adequately resourced, and if not, how to dedicate more resources towards those activities. She also informed that the council and Department of Labor now look at the budget together and ask if these are the right things to be investing in.

**Maureen Schafer** acknowledged strong leadership within agencies, noting that both the agencies and the board share common goals. She referenced past conflicts from Idaho's council and Department of Labor, noting those challenges are similar in Nevada, emphasizing the need for trust amidst necessary but challenging changes. The federal compliance plan submitted meets only the minimum requirements, while the Idaho state plan aligns more closely with collaborative efforts, emphasizing trust and data sharing. Ms. Schafer questioned whether trust-building and improved data sharing have been achieved through secondary planning, despite initial resistance from agency heads who are accustomed to federal reporting standards that may not ask the right questions.

**Wendi Secrist** highlighted their approach of using quarterly performance reporting from various programs to identify areas for collaboration and improvement. By analyzing data and having regular meetings, they can discuss successes, challenges, and potential strategies for enhancement. The emphasis is on sparking dialogue and sharing expertise rather than chastising or penalizing anyone. This cross-program approach allows them to work more closely together and continuously improve the workforce system among all partners.

**Vice Chair Evans** inquired about the flexibility to reallocate resources within programs and the possibility of obtaining additional resources, either from the state or external sources, if needed.

**Wendi Secrist** explained that while there isn't a mechanism to directly share funding across different titles, they can reallocate resources between certain programs like adult and dislocated worker programs. This flexibility has been beneficial in improving outcomes. They now have better visibility into funding utilization and can make mid-course adjustments. Additionally, they constantly monitor spending within service delivery areas to ensure resources are allocated effectively. If there's a need for additional resources, they can collectively approach the legislature to advocate for funding based on the data they have gathered.

**Leslie Mujica** asked a question pertaining to the allocation of funds from the governor's reserve and who has the authority to spend from this reserve. She expressed concern about ensuring accountability and program oversight, as highlighted in one of the slides. Ms. Mujica sought clarification on how

decisions are made regarding the allocation of funds from this reserve to ensure adequate investment in relevant programs.

**Wendi Secrist** elaborated on the management of the governor's reserve funds, which are held by the Idaho Department of Labor. These funds are primarily allocated to support Title 1B programs, including adult, dislocated worker, and youth programs. The Department of Labor annually subawards around \$170,000 to the Workforce Development Council to maintain the council. They collaborate to outline how these funds will be spent, ensuring they align with the responsibilities outlined in their memorandum of understanding (MOU). Together, they establish budgets for various activities such as rapid response activities, fiscal management, accountability systems, and disseminating eligible training provider lists. They also fund special projects, such as a position within the Idaho Department of Corrections to support youth transitioning out of the justice system. This collaborative approach allows them to address program needs effectively and allocate funds where they are most needed.

**Derrick Gyamfi** asked about ensuring consistency in performance measurement, data collection, and metrics across different systems and programs. He mentioned the avoidance of integrating technology systems and asked how they ensured that collected data aligned and communicated effectively.

**Wendi Secrist** explained that the data shown on the chart is what programs reported to their federal partners, ensuring consistency in the measures used for reporting. They collect the data once it's been reported and analyze it to avoid comparing different metrics. She mentioned the importance of agreeing on definitions and methodologies for measuring performance across different programs, such as co-enrollment.

**Derrick Gyamfi** inquired about strategic metrics rather than federal compliance metrics, measuring aspects like awareness, stewardship, and quality services at the strategic plan level, beyond the compliance plan. He asked if there were any metrics being used for these aspects and how consistency in measurement was ensured if they were being measured.

**Wendi Secrist** highlighted the need for collaboration in defining measurement criteria across various programs, including those funded by the state. She emphasized the importance of consistency in measuring aspects such as work-based learning, which is significant in Idaho. Director Secrist mentioned an activity focused on aligning definitions of apprenticeship programs, whether they are registered apprenticeships or state versions, to ensure consistent and reliable data analysis.

**Kristine Nelson** provided clarification regarding the administration of the governor's reserve in Nevada. She explained that while 15% is set aside, only 10% of that constitutes the actual governor's flexible reserve funding, with the remaining 5% allocated to State Administration. This funding is received by the designated grantee, which in their case is DETR, and is used to fund innovative projects and OWINN initiatives. Approximately a third of this funding goes towards OWINN projects annually, with the remainder designated for workforce projects determined by the governor and his cabinet. Ms. Nelson also mentioned an upcoming presentation to the legislative Revenue committee on April 29th, where details about the distribution and usage of this funding at the state level would be provided.

**Kevin Landry** clarified a point of confusion regarding the operation of the governor's board in Idaho, which functions as a local Workforce board. He mentioned that in Nevada, for example, the governor's workforce support does not have direct budgetary authority, as that responsibility lies with the local boards. This difference in structure can lead to confusion when comparing discussions between states.

**Wendi Secrist** elaborated on various programs operated outside of the WIOA funding stream in Idaho. She highlighted the State Workforce Development Training Fund, which is supported by a 3% offset of unemployment insurance taxes from employers, funding grants for initiatives like industry sector outreach, innovation projects, and employer grants. Additionally, she discussed the use of

ARPA funding, particularly receiving \$30 million for expanding childcare services, and the launch of the In-Demand Career Fund, which is \$75 million annually, that provides grants to high school seniors for post-secondary education aligned with in-demand careers. The Idaho workforce council also leads the Talent Pipeline Management Initiative for Idaho to align training from the In-Demand Career Fund with industry needs. They partnered with the US Chamber Foundation to train economic development professionals, education, and workforce system partners in the talent pipeline management methodology. The council funded eight positions across the state in economic development organizations, industry associations, and community colleges to implement this methodology, using the resulting information to guide resource investment in registered apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships, and work-based learning. Additionally, they extended a successful youth apprenticeship program with state funds and ran a teacher externship program in partnership with the Idaho STEM Action Center, enabling teachers to connect with employers and bring real-world workforce insights back to their classrooms. The overall strategy involved collaboration with various partners to scale initiatives and ensure mutual benefits, meeting performance metrics and allocating funding towards actionable, successful programs.

**Ken Goodrich** commended Director Secrist on her presentation and expressed interest in the process of achieving deeper insights into agency metrics and building trust. He confirmed that they began by benchmarking agencies using fundamental metrics reported to the federal government. He then inquired about the leadership process of delving deeper into these metrics and fostering trust among agencies.

**Wendi Secrist** responded to Mr. Goodrich's inquiry by recognizing that numbers alone didn't provide enough detail to advise, collaborate, or lead change effectively. To address this, the council delved deeper into program specifics and outcomes rather than relying solely on performance metrics, which often failed to measure true outcomes. They fostered an environment of sharing and collaboration among agencies, focusing on amplifying efforts, problem-solving, and ensuring seamless service delivery to Idahoans. Director Secrist's leadership process involved inviting agencies to present their work and impact to the Council, discussing their measures of success beyond federal reporting, and providing support based on these insights.

**Ken Goodrich** sought clarification on the concept of outcomes in contrast to mere metrics or numbers. He asked for an example to better understand the distinction.

**Wendi Secrist** explained the distinction between outcomes and outputs using the example of the Launch program. While outputs might include metrics like completion rates or credential attainment, outcomes delve deeper into the impact of these achievements. For instance, instead of solely focusing on whether a student completed a program, outcomes would assess whether that completion led to meaningful employment or increased wages. Director Secrist emphasized the importance of measuring these deeper impacts to assess the true effectiveness and return on investment of programs like Launch, as opposed to being satisfied with the fact people are just in the program without any indication on how the program bettered their life. She also discussed how they track student choices, gender gaps, and employment outcomes to evaluate the program's success in facilitating career pathways and economic advancement for participants.

**Ken Goodrich** inquired about the process of getting everyone interested in focusing on outcomes rather than just standard metrics or numbers. He wanted to know if there was a pivotal moment when the importance of outcomes clicked for the group and if there was any advice on how to generate interest in this approach.

**Wendi Secrist** highlighted the importance of partners feeling supported, which changes the dynamics of collaboration. She emphasized that the partners need to feel backed by the council, knowing that they will receive support regardless of who gets credit for the work.

8. **DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY – Board Training on Behalf of the National Governor’s Association Center for Best Practices**

**Jack Porter, Program Director, National Governor’s Association** expressed gratitude for the opportunity to speak and introduced himself as the program director for Workforce Development and economic policy at the National Governor Association. He acknowledged the invitation and collaboration with Director Secrist and outlined NGA's role as the voice of the nation's Governors, representing them across various policy discussions. He provided an overview of NGA's Workforce Development technical assistance program, highlighting their support for strategic planning, convening networks, and producing written products on policy topics. Mr. Porter also introduced two key publications: the "WIOA Policy Levers Brief for Governors" and the "High Performing Board Framework." The first was issued about a year ago to identify high-impact opportunities for Governors to execute their workforce development policy agenda through WIOA, emphasizing the substantial authority WIOA gives to Governors in funding, vision setting, and training standards. The second publication details the role of state boards in driving strategy beyond compliance, including vision setting, convening key stakeholders, and ensuring system accountability under WIOA.

**Sophia Yager, Senior Policy Analyst, National Governor’s Association**, discussed three major themes integrating information from the two publications about Governors and State Workforce Boards collaborating for success, along with state examples of high-performing boards. The first theme was state strategy and governance, where Governors can create, communicate, and execute the Governor’s vision and priorities for workforce development. Three WIOA levers are to issue a clear charge to the State Workforce Development Board to serve as a strategic body both for WIOA and beyond WIOA programs, appoint board members that are aligned with industry needs and have a vested interest in workforce development, and codify strategies in the WIOA state plan. Ms. Yager noted that the Governor can clearly charge and empower the State Workforce Development Board to accomplish strategic roles. While the WIOA state plan has its flaws, it provides essential inter-agency coordination and a strategic foundation. The Board acts as a connector and setting the vision by creating a strategic plan aligned with the Governor’s vision and championing the public workforce system in industry and geographic areas. Ms. Yager commended the GWDB’s current initiative to create a strategic plan as it will serve as a great step in making the Board the strategic convener. Success in this area looks like when boards make progress towards shared goals, align funding opportunities and partnerships with the Governor's vision, and promote the workforce system effectively, ensuring policies and resources matched stated priorities. Examples from Minnesota and Indiana illustrate effective strategic planning and successful legislative reformation because of strong strategic vision supported by the Governors and implemented through the State Boards. The second theme was investments and partnerships, highlighting the flexibility that WIOA grants Governors through formula funding and the Governor's Reserve. Governors can take 15 percent of WIOA Title I allocations for reserve funding and then take up to 30 percent of what is left over in youth, adult, and dislocated worker to adjust the allocation such as rural versus urban disparities or high levels of dislocated workers in certain sectors. An example of effective use of Governor's Reserve funds was Career Connect Washington, where initial governor’s reserve funding of four pilot programs led to sustained state investment in successful youth engagement programs. Ms. Yager emphasized the board's role as a convener in facilitating strategic partnerships, ensuring clear roles and responsibilities among partners, and aligning efforts with the state's goals and vision outlined in the WIOA state plan. Success looks like employer and workers’ needs are met and policy and programs are informed by policy that the Board has established. Sector partnerships were highlighted as a best practice, with state boards providing funding and technical assistance to inform career pathways for students. Colorado was provided as a best practice for sector partnerships as they fund it partially through Governor’s Reserve and the State Board sets criteria for the funding. The sector partnerships inform career pathways for students, connecting all the WIOA strings together. Additionally, the California Breaking Barriers to Employment Initiative demonstrated successful state-funded grants aligned with WIOA priorities, emphasizing stakeholder engagement and alignment with targeted populations.

**Vice Chair Evans** asked if NGA could connect him with the California program and potentially present to the GWDB Barriers and Underserved Populations Subcommittee.

**Sophia Yager** affirmed. She then turned to the third and final theme of performance and accountability, noted as an area of interest for the GWDB. Ms. Yager highlighted two key policy levers for governors under WIOA: establishing additional metrics and standards beyond the six required metrics under WIOA and ensuring high-quality training providers. Piloting additional accountability metrics in a strategic plan outside of the WIOA state plan can be a great starting point to align the workforce system with the Governor's vision. The board plays a critical oversight role in setting standards for training providers listed on the Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL). She cited Alabama's state board as an example of effective credentialing efforts, driven in collaboration with the governor's office. Ms. Yager emphasized success looks like the Board exercising its role in accountability, including tracking and presenting data effectively to ensure compliance objectives are met and using feedback for continuous improvement. An example provided was Kentucky's Work Ready Strategic Plan, which outlines distinct metrics for system performance and accountability across four key pillars and the meaningfulness of the four pillars. Ms. Yager concluded by expressing support for the board's strategic initiatives and offered further assistance offline if needed.

**Maureen Schafer** expressed appreciation for Ms. Yager's and Director Secrist's presentations, acknowledging the importance of governance and accountability. She reflected on the board's framework and how it could support system partners, agency partners, and community partners as they grow and expand. Ms. Schafer emphasized the need for the board to continue setting governance standards and convening roles, as well as codifying its own governance and ensuring accountability through metrics. She appreciated the insights provided by the presentations, noting how it expanded their understanding of their responsibilities as a board member.

**Susan Brager** expressed interest in learning more about the Alabama public-private entity focused on non-degree credentials. She highlighted the unique context of their state, where a significant portion of the population does not have college degrees. Ms. Brager emphasized the importance of exploring this initiative further and expressed a desire to gather more information about the program to avoid duplicating efforts and leverage existing successful models.

**Leslie Mujica** expressed gratitude for the valuable information provided and highlighted the significant work ahead for the board in gathering necessary data and fulfilling their responsibilities. She emphasized the importance of accountability and raised a question about ensuring collaboration among partners toward a shared goal. Specifically, Ms. Mujica inquired about the responsibility for ensuring alignment and coordination among partners.

**Sophia Yager** emphasized the importance of relationship building and soft skills in ensuring collaboration among partners. She also highlighted the significance of the governor's engagement and alignment of the board's actions with the governor's vision as powerful ways to encourage cooperation and unity toward common goals.

**Leslie Mujica** acknowledged the need to engage with the governor and seek assistance in obtaining the necessary data. She expressed frustration with encountering obstacles in accessing the requested data despite the simplicity of the information. Ms. Mujica emphasized the importance of taking responsibility for obtaining the needed data to advance their objectives.

**Edward Estipona** emphasized the importance of relationships in collaborative efforts, stressing that nobody is the boss of anybody in their work together. He highlighted the challenges in obtaining and utilizing data, including limitations on federal data usage and the need to avoid setting themselves up for penalties in federal funding. Mr. Estipona also noted the lack of income tax in their state compared to others, urging for creativity in finding matching funds to leverage federal grants. Despite these challenges, he expressed alignment with the governor's goals and advocated for patience and mutual respect in their endeavors.



**Derrick Gyamfi** expressed appreciation for Ms. Yager's presentation and specifically highlighted the Kentucky Work Ready strategic planning metrics as a valuable framework. He assumed that this framework is geared towards employers and suggested that there might be another version tailored for training providers. Mr. Gyamfi emphasized the importance of sharing this framework to help replicate its success in their own context.

**Sophia Yager** acknowledged Mr. Gyamfi 's request for more information about the Kentucky Work Ready strategic planning metrics. She mentioned that while the screenshot she provided focused on employer-specific metrics, there are other pillars in the plan, including metrics related to credential attainment. Ms. Yager offered to share a link to the full plan and mentioned that Kentucky has a useful dashboard regularly used by their State Workforce board for data and accountability discussions. She cautioned that dashboards do not necessarily solve all data-related problems.

**9. DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY –Discussion on Title Reports**

**Chair Anderson** initiated a discussion on the most recent submission of the title reports, expressing gratitude to the title partners for their submissions. While noting that there might not be ample time for in-depth discussion during the meeting, Chair Anderson invited members to ask questions or share comments based on the reports that were submitted.

**Tracy Brown-May** inquired about the specific Title I Youth programming and how it captures the 16,000 students in Nevada who are on individualized education plans (IEPs) mandated under WIOA to receive career counseling. She sought clarification on how these students are accounted for within the program's data.

**Brett Miller** provided clarification on the Title One youth program, explaining that it covers individuals aged 14 to 24 and is divided into in-school and out-of-school programs. He outlined the in-school eligibility criteria, including barriers like disabilities, foster youth, involvement in the juvenile justice system, or being low-income. Mr. Miller noted that there is a significant unmet need in Nevada, with a large gap between available funding and the number of youth who could benefit from the program. He estimated a need of around \$9 million for Title One youth funding in Nevada, highlighting the substantial gap in services for disconnected, or out of school, youth.

**Derrick Gyamfi** sought clarification on the numbers mentioned, questioning if the total number of youth needing assistance was 45,000, with only 900 currently being served, and an estimated addition of 5,000 every year. He calculated the gap to be around 40,000 youth in need of services.

**Brett Miller** clarified that the total number of youth in the age group of 16 to 24 was around 42,000, with an estimated 5,000 more being added annually. Considering that they can serve approximately 900 per year, the gap amounts to around 4,000 youth per year who are not receiving services. Mr. Miller shared that this is a compounding issue that gets worse each year.

**Chair Anderson** highlighted the efforts of Workforce Connections to reach out to the approximately 42,000 disconnected individuals who are not engaged with the workforce or education systems. They are using initiatives such as partnering with the RTC and placing employment opportunities in fitness facilities to make it easier for these individuals to find support services. The goal is to offer alternative paths like entrepreneurship and practical skills training to re-engage them in opportunities beyond traditional college education.

**Edward Estipona** emphasized the challenge of reaching underserved groups, particularly those reliant on Medicaid or individuals over the age of 24. Many of them frequently change contact information, making it difficult to establish consistent communication. However, he noted that social media has been an effective channel for maintaining contact with these individuals, as they tend to keep their social media channels updated even when other contact information changes frequently.

**Chair Anderson** added that there is an issue of continued dialogue with the exiting clients once they complete their services.

**Nancy Olsen** highlighted two points. First, she noted a trend in adult education where a greater number of younger individuals, although not under 16 or still enrolled in K-12 education, are seeking adult education services. She attributed this increase to the impact of the pandemic, especially the prolonged period of virtual learning. Secondly, Ms. Olsen emphasized that based on Census data, there are still over 300,000 individuals aged 18 and over in Nevada who lack a high school diploma or equivalency, underscoring the ongoing need for adult education services in the state.

**Kevin Landry** raised a point of contention regarding the priority given to training providers offering postsecondary credentials. He suggested a focus on basic high school credentials as a priority, emphasizing the importance of addressing foundational education needs before advancing to postsecondary training. Mr. Landry also highlighted the increasing importance of trade schools in today's evolving job market, suggesting a shift away from traditional college education. He encouraged a reevaluation of where future educational investments, such as 529 accounts, are directed.

**10. DISCUSSION/INFORMATIONAL ONLY – New Business from Full Board Members**

**Edward Estipona** expressed a desire to see more productive dialogues like the one in the previous meeting where state agencies, the state board, and local Workforce boards engaged in fruitful discussions. He highlighted the importance of understanding challenges and offering assistance to build trust and solve problems collaboratively. Mr. Estipona emphasized the need for continued efforts to foster positive communication and problem-solving among stakeholders.

**Derrick Gyamfi** emphasized the importance of budgetary accountability and funding for driving strategic initiatives and pilots within the board. He suggested that exploring collaboration or partnership with other entities could facilitate faster progress. Mr. Gyamfi also mentioned the need to address challenges faced by title providers, particularly regarding technology and staffing resources, suggesting that they might be willing to provide data if adequately supported.

**11. SECOND PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Chair Anderson** invited comments. There were none. He expressed deep appreciation for the passion and dedication brought by the board members to the project. Despite the challenges, he noted progress being made and thanked everyone for their hard work and participation in the meeting. He acknowledged the value of the training session, recognizing the importance of revisiting and reinforcing the basics while also moving forward. Finally, he thanked everyone for their time and adjourned the meeting.

**12. ADJOURNMENT**

**The April 17, 2024 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:**

<https://gowinn.nv.gov/boards-commissions/gwdb/> 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 <https://gowinn.nv.gov/boards-commissions/gwdb/> 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.