

GOVERNOR'S WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD MEETING
AKA State Workforce Investment Board (SWIB)
Thursday, March 21, 2013 – 1:00 p.m.
Truckee Meadows Community College
Dandini Campus, Sierra Building, Room 108
7000 Dandini Blvd.
Reno, Nevada 89512

Alternate Location: Some members of the Board may be attending the meeting and other persons may observe the meeting and provide testimony through a simultaneous videoconference conducted at the following location:

College of Southern Nevada
Cheyenne Campus, Room 2647B
3200 East Cheyenne Avenue
North Las Vegas, Nevada

MINUTES OF MEETING

Present: Luther W. Mack (Chair), Dr. Nagy Aurangzeb, Councilman Bob Beers, Cary Brunson, Jo Cato, Tim Crowley, Jolene Dalluhn, Jim Flemming, Gerard Gardner, Mary Beth Hartleb, Collie Hutter, Horacio Lopez, Michael McMahon, Cass Palmer, Michael Raponi, Maite Salazar, Dr. Maria Sheehan, Patrick Sheets, Sarah Sommers, Kris Wells, Frank Woodbeck and Bradley Woodring.

Absent: Jon Richard Abajjan , Steve Hill ,Senator Ruben Kihuen, Windom Kimsey, Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Senator Mark Manendo, Assemblyman James Ohrenschall

Also present: William Anderson (DETR, Chief Economist), Holly Balmer (NSHE), Moshe Bialac (Nevada State AFL-CIO), Odalys Carmona (DETR), Deandrea Ceccarelli (Community Services Agency), Mark Costa (DETR, CFO), Jaime Cruz (Workforce Connections), Heather DeSart (Workforce Connections, Deputy Director), Ardell Galbreth (Workforce Connections, Executive Director), Byron Goynes (Workforce Connections), Samantha Hill-Cruz (DETR), Katherine Jacobi (Nevada Restaurant Association) Karleen Johnson (DETR), LeVerne Kelley (DETR), Dr. Carol Lucey (Western Nevada College), Earl McDowell, (DETR, Deputy Administrator, Workforce Solutions Unit), Michele Monloya (Community Services Agency), Tamara Nash (State Board Liaison, DETR), Grant Nielson (ESD/DETR, Chief, Workforce Investment Support Services Unit), Dennis Perea (DETR, Deputy Director), Cloyd Phillips (Community Services Agency, Executive Director), Dr. Thomas Piechota (UNLV), John Thurman (Nevadaworks), Dr. Marcia Turner (Health and Medical Services Sector Council, Chair), Beth Wicks (Nevadaworks), Robert A. Whitney (Nevada Attorney General's Office), Ken Witcher, (Aerospace and Defense Sector Council, Chair), Mae Worthey (DETR).

I. WELCOME – Chair Luther W. Mack called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL AND CONFIRMATION OF QUORUM – Tamara Nash took a Roll Call and confirmed when there was a quorum.

III. VERIFICATION OF POSTING – Tamara Nash verified the agenda for the meeting was posted in accordance with Nevada's Open Meeting Law.

IV. INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS – Chair Mack welcomed the new members of the Board as well as returning members. New member, Jolene Dalluhn of Quest Counseling and Consulting introduced herself.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS NOTICE – Read into the record by Chair Mack:

Members of the public will be invited to speak before; however, 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. Public comment may be limited to three minutes per person at the discretion of the chairperson.

Chair Mack asked if there were any public comments from the north or south. There were none.

VI. DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION - APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 10, 2013 MEETING MINUTES –
It was moved and seconded to approve the January 10, 2013 Minutes. Motion Carried

VII. DISCUSSION– GOVERNOR’S WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD -MISSION STATEMENT

A Member suggested adding the word “to” after “Workforce Investment System.” Another member commented it was a great way to start the meeting by reading the mission statement.

VIII. PRESENTATION – NEVADA’S ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

William Anderson, Chief Economist, Research and Analysis Bureau, DETR – He noted that since the last meeting on January 10, 2013 they had taken a second look at the 2012 labor market positions. He stated that this review happens in all states where they look at the original estimates and revise accordingly. He said for 2012 they had added approximately 18,000 jobs over the course of the year on the employment front. He stated that with respect to unemployment their original estimate for the year on an annual average basis stood at 11.6%. After the revision process that was marked down to 11.1%. He said by the end of 2012 as of December they were down into the single digits. He noted that Nevada was no longer the state with the highest unemployment in the nation by the end of 2012. He said Rhode Island now had that statistic. He added that with the January 2013 numbers the state of Nevada had surpassed California. He concluded that the year 2012 although it left something to be desired, was an improvement over previous years.

He said that he would like to proceed to do three things: provide a traditional overview discussing job growth and unemployment rates; review of how the labor market operates at the establishment level; and finally some discussion concerning Nevada’s various sectors from an economic development perspective.

He discussed first the unemployment rate. He said Nevada’s unemployment rate stood at about 9.7% in January and he noted that they would be releasing the February numbers on March 29, 2013. He confirmed that that was the lowest rate in about four years. He said that they had peaked at 14% in October of 2010. He indicated that what was most encouraging was the narrowing of the gap with respect to the U.S. nationally. He said Nevada was now about 1.8 points higher than the nation and he said that was the lowest or the smallest differential in about four years. He referred to the employment situation and he said they were seeing job growth non-stop for the past 25 months or since January 2011 they had seen job growth every month. He said that at the current time they were hovering in the 2% - 2.5% job growth rate. He noted that to put that into perspective that would translate into approximately 25,000 jobs on a year over year basis. He stated that again, to put that into perspective, prior to the recession Nevada was adding about 60,000 jobs so he acknowledged that was a noticeable improvement. He stated that Nevada had now surpassed the nation in terms of overall employment growth. He said that the numbers were volatile and could change considerably. He noted in January 2013 only five states matched or exceeded Nevada’s 2% - 2.5% job growth rate. He commented that there was a momentum building but they did have a long way to go. He referred to initial claims for unemployment insurance and noted that they had data through to February 2013 and he said they had seen initial claims for unemployment insurance decline in 36 of the past 39 months so this was reflecting some improvement in terms of the number of people filing initial claims.

He discussed the second area, a review of how the labor market was operating at the establishment level. He noted that they called this business employment dynamics. He said that what this did was look at all the labor market churn. He said that at the present time they were trending about 25,000 jobs higher than a year ago. He noted that that was a net number after taking into account all the opening and closing of establishments and all the growing and declining establishments. He referred again to what they called labor market churn and noted the most important point. He said that they had gross job gains and gross job losses so they were looking at establishments that were adding jobs and those establishments that were cutting their workforce. He referred the members to his slide and compared the positions before and during the recession. He said before the recession their gross job gains were considerably higher than gross job losses. He said that reversed itself during the recession. He stated that for the past seven quarters they had once again been seeing gross job gains exceed losses which explained the positive numbers in terms of overall employment growth. He referred to the first half of 2012 and said they had a net employment gain of about 9,500 jobs. He said about 1,800 of those new jobs were attributed to what they referred to as “births and deaths” or new establishments and closing establishments. He said the number of job gains from opening establishments was now starting to pick up and job losses from closing establishments were down to pre-recession levels. He said there were about 7,700 jobs from existing establishments, either growing or contracting. He referred to his slide concerning new establishments. He said they had approximately 3,700 new establishments opened in mid-2012 and about 2,000 closed. He said that this would provide an idea of what was happening with regard to labor market churn.

He discussed the third area, Nevada’s sectors from an economic development perspective. He said the economy of Nevada had been organized into eight different economic development sectors, with a new one now making it nine. He noted the ninth was the agricultural sector and he said that he would have that information for the next meeting. He said about 40% of the state’s job banks were really not classified into any sector. He noted that the sector approach was not necessarily designed

to be all encompassing. He said that tourism, gaming and entertainment accounted for about one third of all jobs. He referred to the business and information technology sector and noted that he had that accounting for about 4.2% of all jobs. He referred to that sector and noted that it would not be industry-based but rather occupation-based because there were I/T occupations throughout all sectors. He indicated that they would be making some modifications there. He noted that with respect to growth the largest numerical gains within the past decade had been in tourism and gaming and health and medical services. He referred to the tourism and gaming sector and said that it could be split into different categories. He said that they saw during the decade noticeable declines in casino and direct gaming establishments which was more than offset by growth in retail jobs in food and drinking establishments and in entertainment that exceeded the more traditional casino areas. He said that health and medical services was also growing well. He said it had grown by approximately 29,000 jobs. He said in rural, northern Nevada mining jobs had grown by over 75% during the last decade. He referred to average annual wages by sector and noted that it was interesting to note that of the eight sectors, seven had above average wages. He indicated that that was what economic development was supposed to do, lead the way to higher-paying jobs. He said that the sectors identified through the work of GOED (Governor's Office of Economic Development) and the Brookings Institution were higher wage sectors.

A participant asked Mr. Anderson what he would consider the definition of what was included in aerospace and defense. Mr. Anderson responded that aerospace was a mix of smaller industries from broader groups including some manufacturing industries or industries that they knew were heavily involved with providing parts and materials. He said there were also engineering services and more technical types of industries as well.

IX. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION – MINIMUM TRAINING EXPENDITURE POLICY FOR LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARDS

Dennis Perea, Deputy Director, DETR – He noted that this policy would have a very large impact on the workforce system in Nevada. He noted that nationally, not just in Nevada, a very small percentage of WIA (Workforce Investment Act) funds actually would go into training. He said that currently the local workforce investment boards would spend less than 10% of their allocation on training and this did not include on the job training. He stated that California's legislature had passed a bill that required by statute that 25% of the WIA funds should go into training. He said that Maine's state workforce investment board or governor's board passed a state policy with a goal to move the training expenditure statewide average up to 30% in FY2012 and 40% in FY2013. He said that the policy could be arduous for the boards to implement but he stated that they felt it was necessary to invest more heavily in the career training which they felt was consistent with the state's Moving Nevada Forward economic development plan and their desire to ensure strong ties between the workforce and the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE).

He stated that the statewide allocation for program year 2012 for the two boards' was approximately \$27.3 million. He stated that in real dollars this would mean that the amount of investment statewide would go from less than \$2.7 million to over \$6.8 million going into training. He reiterated that it would have a dramatic effect on the workforce system.

A member asked where the funds were coming from. Mr. Perea responded that the funds would come from WIA, specifically Title 1 funds. He stated that approximately \$32 million would come into Nevada, for program year 2012. He said that of that amount the state would have 5% for WIA administration and he said they could hold back a certain portion for rapid response type of issues which would be for mass layoffs. He said that the balance would get passed to the local workforce investment boards, which would then take those formula dollars and use them for training for people that came to their providers. He said the WIA funds were federal dollars. He said they were talking with their Department of Labor (DOL) partners and they could come in and assist the board with a breakdown of how WIA worked as it was a convoluted process. He stated that the governor's board would sit at the top of pyramid and determine the strategic direction of the workforce system for the state. He added that this was where many had used the governor's board and the state workforce board to make state compliance policy to direct more funds into training. He explained that California had taken a different approach and made the changes through their legislature.

Mr. Michael Raponi asked Mr. Perea what was the current percentage? Mr. Perea responded that for the allocation for the north it was approximately \$8 million and in the south it was approximately \$9 million out of the funds totaling \$27 million that would get transferred and would go into certificate type training or training that was on the Eligible Training Provider List.

A member asked for clarification. She asked if this meant that there was a shift of dollars away from services to training. Mr. Perea responded that there were three components for the WIA and these were core services where a person would come in to a provider looking for a job and get job referrals. He said generally speaking if that did not work one would go to the next level which was providing services such as resume writing, English as a Second Language or other soft skills. He said if the person still did not have a job, the third component would be the training component, certificate type training.

Mr. Raponi stated that what they were doing was not punitive to the local boards. He complimented the local board on taking a different direction. He said it was part of the strategic direction they were taking in terms of workforce training. He said they were focusing on certain sectors and those sectors would require increased training from community colleges. He said that when that was done and you looked at the overall direction that the state was taking for the development of the workforce they needed to have some parameters and they were trying to establish those parameters. He said that the direction that the two directors had already taken in terms of local board activity was to be complimented.

It was moved and seconded to approve the minimum training expenditure policy for Local Workforce Investment Boards Motion Carried

X. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION – APPROVAL OF REVISIONS TO NEVADA’S WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT STATE COMPLIANCE POLICIES

Grant Nielson – Chief, Workforce investment Support Services Unit, ESD/DETR - Noted his colleague would be discussing the policy changes and would address any questions.

Karlene Johnson, DETR - Discussed the different sections:

a. Section 1.6 – Eligibility for Adult and Dislocated Worker Training Services

She noted that this section was updated due to a Department of Labor (DOL) finding when they had monitored it. She indicated that they had updated priority of service for special populations of military personnel. She indicated that they had also updated types of military personnel. She indicated that there was an update to the types of documents that could be utilized to determine eligibility.

Councilman Bob Beers referred to the definition of a surviving military spouse and stated it appeared it would exclude the spouses of the Marines that were recently killed in the training accident in Hawthorne. He said that he wondered if a Washington-based policy was trying to tighten it up to exclude those who survived spouses who lost their lives outside of Middle Eastern combat. Mr. Grant Nielson responded that the policy was a direct quote from the federal guidance that was received and he explained that they did not have the ability to change it. He offered to research the issue to determine if it would exclude those parties killed in that specific situation. He thought it could be looked at closer perhaps on a case by case basis. Councilman Beers suggested taking up the action item at the next meeting if more research was needed and offered a proposed amendment and said at the top of page three to delete “in Afghanistan, Iraq or other combat-related areas is considered to be a military spouse”. Mr. Nielson responded that they were unable to change it that way. He said they could perhaps augment but not delete verbiage. He said they would do the research and provide a written explanation of what could and could not be done.

Mr. Nielson suggested voting on it, accepting it as is and then augment it in the following meeting. Councilman Beers suggested it could be changed at the current meeting. Karlene Johnson noted that it was not possible to change it at the current time as it had been written by the DOL and came from the Veteran’s Administration. She said the state could make it broader but it could not make it narrower than content that the DOL and Veteran’s Administration had issued. Councilman Beers asked if they could broaden the language by deleting the words “in Afghanistan, Iraq or other combat-related areas”. Mr. Nielson confirmed that they would research the ability to do that. Councilman Beers asked if it could be approved today with the instruction to augment it if allowed. Mr. Nielson said they would come back to that as they had to put a motion forward to accept the policy.

b. Section 1.9 – Individual Training Accounts

Karlene Johnson stated it was a recommendation from the DOL. She explained there were items called Individual Training Accounts (ITAs) and the state of Nevada on page two had a waiver from the DOL for these ITA on use. She indicated that was the only change to that policy.

c. Section 3.11 – Property Management

Karlene Johnson stated that it was a recommendation from the DOL and the Legislative Council Bureau on improving what the policy stated. She stated they had added a technical guidance letter. She said that they had lowered that to one year from two years. She referred to page two and indicated what the term “intangible property” was. She referred to page three and indicated that there needed to be a physical inspection of the inventory and they had also added the one-year useful license component. She referred to page five for the report of the excess property.

d. Section 5.5 – Reports and Sanctions

Karlene Johnson indicated this section concerned reporting and instructions and was updated for the DOL and due to the Executive Order from Governor Sandoval. She explained that it was necessary to report to the federal government 45 days after the end of each quarter for all WIA participants. She said the state on page two had modified number one from “30 days” to “23 days” for the local boards to submit their preliminary report and that information would form part of the Report 9130.

John Thurman referred to the policy change discussed in Section 1.6 and stated having reviewed it prior and with directives received from the Veteran’s Administration and the DOL he said the changes that he saw in the policy would actually broaden it from previous policy. He said the thought that it would cover those individuals’ families or spouses of the young men killed in Hawthorne. He said the language used prior to the change would have excluded them but the language being proposed did include them. Councilman Beers thought they should take the opportunity to make the language more explicit if they had the opportunity to do so. Grant Nielson responded that if they wanted to include that language they could include it to augment the current language and then they could revise and research to ensure that it was appropriate and check with the DOL sources.

It was moved and seconded to approve the revisions, additions and language as provided. Motion Carried. Nays - Councilman Beers, Maria Salazar, Horacio Lopez, Jo Cato, Sarah Sommers, Patrick Sheets

XI. REPORT/DISCUSSION – GWIB INDUSTRY SECTOR COUNCIL UPDATES

Earl McDowell – Deputy Administrator, Workforce Solutions Unit, DETR – He noted that there would be a brief update on the status of the sector councils. He stated the main function with the Workforce Solutions Unit was to provide administrative support for all nine sectors. He said the additional one just added was agriculture which would be formally beginning from May 20, 2013. He said all the sector councils were operating with a Chair except for the Logistics and Operations Sector Council.

a. **Healthcare and Medical Services Sector Council** – Dr. Marcia Turner, Vice Chancellor of Health Sciences, NSHE and Chair

She indicated that they had had two full sector council meetings and a number of subcommittee meetings since January 10, 2013. She said that they had an: Economic Development Subcommittee; an Education and Training Subcommittee; a Data and Evaluation Subcommittee; a Legislative, Regulation and Policy Subcommittee; and a Grants and Resources Subcommittee. She indicated that each of those subcommittees had been working on defining its charge and developing a series of objectives. She said what they had been doing for each of the subcommittees was also having them develop their own strategic plan and from that they were developing what they referred to as a stackable strategic plan. She stated that the strategic plan for their council was a combination of those individual strategic plans and objectives for each subcommittee. She indicated that all the subcommittees were doing an excellent job coordinating with other subcommittees and there was a lot of overlap. She explained that the Economic Development Subcommittee worked closely with the Education and Training Subcommittee because the Education and Training Subcommittee would be looking at and assessing what workforce was being developed and the Economic Development Subcommittee would assist in showing what workforce was needed.

She referred to the Chair of the Data and Evaluation Subcommittee who had been working with representatives from DETR, GOED, DHHS (Department of Health and Human Services) and NSHE to try and do a baseline study on the demand and supply for health professionals in Nevada. She stated it was based on existing information from DETR. She noted it also was helping them to understand where there were some gaps in the data and this would assist them in defining their game plan for the next studies that they needed to do and to gather new data and therefore make more informed decisions and recommendations. She stated that their next full council meeting was on May 9, 2013 and she said that they would be meeting quarterly the month before the GWIB meeting.

Bradley Woodring commented that at the January 10, 2013 meeting that he had wanted to get in touch with the sector council Chairs and with the assistance of Tamara Nash all his information had gone out. He noted that in response he received a wonderful phone call from Dr. Turner explaining what they were doing in her council and discussing the opportunities for the GWIB members to be involved with them. He thanked her again for this call.

Dr. Maria Sheehan asked whether the Health and Medical Services Sector Council had had a chance to review the health workforce in Nevada report. She said the report had a lot of recommendations as to what the workforce needs would be in the future. She asked if the council was working on that report. Dr. Marcia Turner responded that that was the report that she was referring to when discussing the Data and Evaluation Subcommittee. She said it was the baseline study and had identified a lot of the action items that would fall under this Data and Evaluation Subcommittee. Dr. Maria Sheehan asked if the

recommendations would come to the GWIB. Dr. Marcia Turner responded that it was part of that subcommittee's set of objectives for their portion of the strategic plan. She said she was not sure if there was time at the GWIB meeting to present their strategic plan. She said that at their last full council meeting they had the stackable strategic plan in draft form approved. She said the Data and Evaluation Subcommittee's action items were in concert with the recommendations from that study and that would all filter up through the stackable strategic plan. She added that the stackable strategic plan would be presented to the GWIB at some time.

b. Aerospace and Defense Sector Council – Ken Witcher, Chair

He stated that he would like to advise the members of the GWIB about some of the workforce leads and opportunities. He said several of the opportunities that they had had since January 10, 2013 included a proposed partnership with UNR (University of Nevada Reno) providing some training and in providing that training there were some resources available and they were able to coordinate and ensure that the sector council was able to provide input on the right way to utilize those training funds. He indicated that that was a great opportunity that they hoped to duplicate in the future. He noted that they had also had an opportunity in southern Nevada to do some community outreach. He explained that this had come from one of the sector council members, Dr. James Kuzma, the principal of Rancho High School in Las Vegas. He commented that Dr. Kuzma had said that the council was not really drawing from a local workforce and that they lacked diversification. He said in the sector council, in response to that comment they had focused on that and had put together some people who were doing some amazing things, looking at diversifying the workforce instead of pulling a workforce externally. He said that they were now hoping to grow a potential workforce in the state and they were beginning to do some exciting things in cooperation with Rancho High School.

He discussed unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) which had also been in the news in Nevada. He said from a workforce development perspective they were excited about the opportunity that they saw coming and were looking at some ways and things that they needed to be doing to have that workforce in place. He referred also to the economic side and noted that they needed to ensure that they were not limited there. He asked for the support of the GWIB and asked members if they were not familiar with what UAS were about to become informed and provide support to the Aerospace and Defense Sector Council. He said members could contact the members of the council if they needed any information as many were experts and they would be happy to share any information. He asked members of the GWIB to become informed and aware of the political implications and also the great economic benefits it could hold for Nevada.

He referred to the members of the council and noted that they were still looking for some industry leader representation and asked members if they knew anyone who would be valuable to the council to please notify him. He noted that their next meeting would be March 22, 2013 and he invited any members to come if they were interested.

c. Information Technology Sector Council, Frank Woodbeck, Director, DETR and Acting Chair

He advised that the Chair of the Information Technology Sector Council had to step aside due to health reasons and he had stepped in as Acting Chair for a temporary period. He said they were looking at the industry plan in place for the IT Sector Council and bringing that plan forward. He said that the strategic plans all had an end date of September 30, 2013 and would be presented to the GWIB at the December meeting. He said they would formulate the plan of action for training investment to recommend to the GWIB at that time.

d. Clean Energy Sector Council – Dr. Thomas Piechota, Vice President for Research at the University of Nevada at Las Vegas on behalf of Chair, Eric Dominguez

He said one of the discussion topics that the Clean Energy Sector Council had had was a definition of their council. He noted it is clean energy but also a sector council more broadly defined than clean energy alone. He said it encompassed what could be called a green sector council and brought in other industries associated with the green sector, whether sustainability-related industries, water-related or others generally associated with the field. He said their council was comprised of members representing the public and private sectors and representing the major utilities like the water authorities, the energy purveyors and the gas companies.

He said some of their highlights included identifying some of those key workforce needs in the community and with an initial focus being in the energy-related areas. He acknowledged that one of the major training needs out there now was identifying some of the training and certification needs whether in the solar panel installer certification areas, energy manager and the associated certifications with that area, lead certification where the state ends up being one of the top states in terms of lead certified buildings. He said there was a certain workforce need associated with that. He said they also wanted to identify some of the opportunities and were working with GOED in terms of identifying what those economic development opportunities in the supporting workforce needs were in those areas, for instance one of the interesting areas was renewable energy companies that might come to Nevada and some of the ancillary industries associated with that, e.g. call centers. He indicated that they were working on their strategic plan and their council would be having a meeting on March 29, 2013. He said they were in the process of forming several subcommittees in

education, economic development and legislative areas to help inform that strategic plan. He said they were always looking for additional input for members of the council with a certain emphasis on people from the private sector and indicated that they were also looking for members to represent those areas as members on the council itself.

- e. **Mining and Materials Sector Council** – Earl McDowell speaking on behalf of Dana Pray, Chair
He advised that the Chair could not be at the meeting as she had another meeting to attend. He confirmed that this sector council had just begun to be organized and their first official meeting took place in March 2013 in Elko. He said that the Chair and other individuals had done an excellent job in identifying people to serve as members on the sector council. He said they had approximately 15 people with the council at the present time and many of them were working within the industry. He said the members were excited about serving on the council, working together and putting a strategic plan together. He said the next meeting would be on April 16, 2013.
- f. **Manufacturing Sector Council** – Earl McDowell speaking on behalf of Ryan Costella, Chair
He advised that the Chair was out of the country and so he would speak on his behalf. He said that the Manufacturing Sector Council was doing a great job. He said their membership was 22 and it had a good balance of business leaders. He said one of the things that they were working on in manufacturing was finding qualified workers to work in the manufacturing area as many of the qualified workers of the baby boomer generation were retiring. He said another issue that the council was looking at was credentials and getting people certified in those areas. He said that in the past nine months they had been able to have certification programs aligned to the National Institute for Metalworking Skills (NIMS) for careers in machining. He indicated that they were also working on their strategic plan and they hoped to have that organized for their next meeting on May 1, 2013 at 10:00 am at the DETR office in Las Vegas and Reno.
- g. **Logistics and Operations Sector Council** – Earl McDowell speaking on behalf of Chair TBD
He stated that there was no Chair at the current time but they did have 10 members. The first meeting was held in early March 2013. He asked the members of GWIB that if they knew anyone that would be suitable as a Chair for the Logistics and Operations Sector Council to contact him. He said the current members were excited to begin work. He noted that the next meeting was scheduled for April and he would advise the date in due course.
- h. **Tourism, Gaming and Entertainment Sector Council** – Chair, Katherine Jacobi and President and CEO of The Nevada Restaurant Association
She said that at the present time they were looking at opportunities and connecting the dots. She said some actions in the works were concentrating on certification. She said that the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services, the Washoe County Health and Southern Nevada Health had partnered with the PBS (Public Broadcasting Service) to provide online training for certification as required by the health departments for their food handler's card. She said their next meeting was scheduled for April 26, 2013 at 9 am and they would be working on their strategic plan.

Earl McDowell confirmed that the first meeting for the new Agriculture Sector Council would be held May 20, 2013.

Bradley Woodring asked if members of the GWIB were supposed to be receiving written reports from the sector councils. Earl McDowell responded that he did have some that he would be sending out and he was correct in that members would be receiving copies of the reports in the future.

XII. LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD REPORTS

- a. **Nevadaworks** – John Thurman, Chief Executive Officer
- b. **Workforce Connections** – Ardell Galbreth, Executive Director

Nevadaworks – John Thurman, Chief Executive Officer

He referred to the report and noted he would answer any questions that members would have on it. He commented on ongoing efforts with Nevadaworks and noted that they were involved in the monitoring of the local service providers and making sure that they were spending in accordance with regulations and providing the services that they had agreed to in their contracts. He noted that on March 29, 2013 they were having an orientation for all the locally-elected officials that are sitting on the Works Board. He noted that they were having that meeting in Lubbock to review the WIA, how it functions, the flow of the funds, the responsibilities of the board members etc. He said there had been earlier discussion about the 25% requirement that went to training. He discussed a new course that he and his financial manager, Beth Wicks were involved in together with its possible impact.

Workforce Connections – Ardell Galbreth, Executive Director

He said the members would have their inputs in the packets from layoff aversion to where they were targeting specific populations such as youth with disabilities and foster care. He said he would like to have his colleagues expand on several items. He referred to the policy that the GWIB had approved earlier, also touched on by John Thurman. He said currently at

Workforce Connections this program year they were providing at least 34% to 35% of funds toward training. He said they did not see any significant impact that that would have on their service delivery and that would include funding partners and service providers. He mentioned to members that they had a policy at Workforce Connections that stated that their contracted funding partners and service providers were required to produce or direct at least 40% of their dollars into training services. He said that he had seen in the media that it was not intended to be punitive but he said on page two it did indicate that failure to comply would result in sanctions and those sanctions could include withholding funding from the local boards in the way of incentive awards and also up to and including decertification of the local boards. He said he was not sure if he was misreading that but wanted to go on the record that that was his understanding.

He said Workforce Connections had had an excellent quarter since the last meeting. He said they participated in a job shadowing program and he asked Mr. Byron Goynes to provide a brief summary of that event. He noted that in the packets they had a breakdown of the sector training initiative that they had provided and he asked Mr. Jaime Cruz to provide an overview of that.

Workforce Connections - Byron Goynes

He expressed thanks for the opportunity being given to speak before the board. He discussed National Job Shadow Day and stated for the past three years Workforce Connections had partnered with the Clark County School District Partnership Office to host National Job Shadow Day. He said over ten years ago Colin Powell, the former U.S. Secretary of State created this day around four objectives. He said these were: to increase high school graduation rate; motivate youth to stay in school and graduate with their high school diploma; encourage students to enroll in college; and to connect the business community and education community to develop a smart and educated future workforce. He said this year they had taken over 5,500 students out to area businesses on this day. He said this year to be consistent with the Nevada GOED and the plan for economic growth and diversification and Job Shadow Day they thought it made sense to focus on the eight industry sectors where anticipated job growth would be. He said they worked primarily with seniors who were usually asking where would the jobs be. He said what they also did was attend the sector council meetings and listened to the discussions of the Chairs and council members regarding the shaping of the future job workforce. He said one of the things they heard was the development of soft skills. He said they asked the sector council Chairs to partner with them in providing the job shadow sites for the youth. He thanked the Chairs for their support, and for providing the backpacks for the students for the Go to College Program. He said that eight businesses participated and one business opened multiple properties for the students. He said some of the people who participated included CEOs, HR managers, healthcare professionals, military officers, IT professionals and their staff. He reviewed some of the different businesses that participated for each sector council. He noted that 346 students, freshmen through seniors participated.

Workforce Connections – Jaime Cruz

He referred members to the final part of the packet and the two pie charts. He said the first page had the numbers of Workforce Connections resources that were invested for training broken down by industry sectors. He said that these numbers reflected the program years which were from July 1, 2012 to January 31, 2013, roughly half of the year. He said it showed that 1200 participants had been trained across all the sectors and the breakdown was shown. He said the training included not only the certifications and classroom training but also on-the-job training provided by the employers. He referred members to the next pie chart which showed the total invested in the training activities and at the bottom the average amount invested per participant. He referred members to the last chart which showed the outcomes of the training which would be indicating how many of those people were placed into employment and he noted that of the 1200 trained, 879 were placed into employment and at the bottom it showed the average hourly wage that the participants were receiving.

XIII. GOVERNOR'S WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD COMMITTEE REPORTS

Youth Council – Maria Salazar, Chair

She noted that she had resumed the position of Chair of the council in the last six months. She said they were in a transition as they aligned with the new state economic plan and the sector councils. She noted as a result they had revised the strategic plan that had been developed several years ago. She said the revisions were included in the packets. She said she would like to review several of the revised items. She noted that the vision remained the same. She noted the priorities were that Nevada youth graduate from high school and prepare for post-secondary education, vocational training, military service and/or employment. She said they had identified a second priority which was to create pipelines to employment for youth and demand-driven occupations. She stated that the initiatives that they identified under those priorities were: to utilize data to target resources in the high schools with the lowest educational attainment rate and highest dropout rates and ensure in-school youth receive targeted career guidance services emphasizing secondary, post-secondary, career and technical educational training and employment opportunities; provide leadership that facilitates the implementation of a comprehensive system of workforce development programs in the demand-driven sectors; strengthen connections, partnerships with local businesses; collaborate with local school districts; and collaborate with other regional and statewide youth-oriented programs; submit collaborative statewide and/or regional proposals; serve as a resource and coordinator for the local workforce investment

board youth councils including overseeing special initiatives that focus on dropout prevention programs such as Jobs for America's Graduates; and disseminate information via the governor's youth website.

She stated that they were bringing the strategic plan before the GWIB for approval so that they could transition into aligning the activities of the Youth Council with the activities of the sector councils.

It was moved and seconded to approve the Governor's Workforce Investment Board Youth Council Strategic Plan. Motion Carried.

XIV. STAFF REPORTS

a. Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Analysis of Expenditures – Mark Costa, CFO, DETR

Mr. Costa indicated that he would be discussing an analysis of expenditures as at February 28, 2013 for the WIA and the information was included in the members' packets. He referred the members to the spreadsheet, extreme right, with the three program years, 2010, 2011 and 2012 which were still active and listed. He referred members to the totals for each of those program years. He noted on the left-hand side of the spreadsheet there was a list of entities which had funding allocated to them for those program years.

He referred members to program year 2012 and under administration and noted that those amounts were not totaled up entirely. He said the amounts should equal \$1,624,403.00. He referred to a second item which was under the rapid response in program year 2012 and he stated that they would be allocating approximately \$2 million in various types of contracts to Nevadaworks and Workforce Connections. He said those particular contracts were in the final stages of approval and noted that they were waiting for Board of Examiner approval.

b. WIA Performance Measures/Levels – Grant Nielson, Chief, Workforce Investment Support Services Unit, ESD/DETR

Mr. Nielson referred members to the last page in their packets, the chart regarding performances. He said every state had measures. He said the values were not the same but the measures were the same process. He said for adult and dislocated workers the performance was based on how many people had entered employment, how many retained employment for six months and their average earnings over that timeframe. He said for youth it was placement in post-secondary education or employment, attainment of a degree or certificate or literacy and numeracy gains during the period. He noted that they could see from the chart what the outcomes had been for the four rolling quarters ending in December 31, 2012.

XV. DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION – “HOW TO HAVE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE QUARTERLY MEETINGS OF THE GOVERNOR'S WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD”

Chair Mack referred to a letter he had made available to the members. He asked if members were agreeable to the current meeting times. Members in the north and south said the times were acceptable.

XVI. PUBLIC COMMENTS NOTICE – Read into the record by Chair Mack:

Members of the public will be invited to speak before; however, 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. Public comment may be limited to three minutes per person at the discretion of the chairperson.

Moshe Bialac – Nevada AFL-CIO

He referred to a meeting in which Collie Hutter talked about the need for an educated workforce particularly in manufacturing but also crossing all the sectors. He said he felt it showed the need for collaboration with the community colleges. He said he wanted to compliment Ms. Hutter and also noted that she was known as a manufacturing leader nationwide and he was happy to have her on the GWIB as a member.

Chair Mack asked if there were any more public comments from the north or south. There were none.

XVII. ADJOURNMENT – There being no further business Chair Mack confirmed the next meeting was adjourned.