

Minutes are intended to note: (a) the date, time, and place of the meeting; (b) those members of the public body who were present and those who were absent; and (c) the substance of all matters proposed, discussed and/or action was taken on. Minutes are not intended to be a verbatim report of a meeting. An audio recording of the meeting is available for inspection by any member of the public interested in a verbatim report of the meeting. These minutes are not final until approved by the Committee at a future meeting.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE WORKFORCE TRAINING & PROGRAMS COMMITTEE
(AB 450 - Chapter 246, Statutes of Nevada, 2021)

College of Southern Nevada
Student Union, West Charleston Campus
6375 W. Charleston, Las Vegas
Tuesday, June 7, 2022, 3:00 p.m.

Video or Telephone Conference Connection from the Meeting Site to:
Desert Research Institute, Reno
Stout Conference Room
2215 Raggio Parkway
and
Great Basin College, Elko
Diekhans Center for Industrial Technology, Room 203
1500 College Parkway

Call to Order: Ms. Crystal Abba, serving as the Committee's Co-Chair, called the meeting of the Community College Workforce Training & Programs Committee (Committee) to order at 3:00 PM.

Members Present:

Ms. Crystal Abba, Co-Chair
Mr. Derrick Hill, Co-Chair
Ms. Stacey Bostwick
Ms. Myisha Boyce
Ms. Jhone Ebert
Mr. Chris Trolson
Mr. Ryan Woodward
Dr. Federico Zaragoza

Members absent: Mr. Kurt Thigpen.

Also in attendance were Daniel H. Stewart, NV Governor's Office, NSHE Vice Chancellor Constance Brooks, NSHE Deputy General Counsel Tina Russom, NSHE Acting Vice Chancellor Renée Davis and NSHE Research Analyst José Quiroga.

1. **Information Only – Public Comment:** None

2. **For Possible Action – Consideration of May Meeting Minutes:**

Co-Chair Hill moved approval of the minutes for May 11, 2022.

Members Bostwick and Trolson seconded the motion.

There was no discussion on the motion and the minutes were approved by all members.

3. Information Only – State Coordination of Community Colleges:

Co-Chair Crystal Abba expressed her gratitude to the techs and staffs at the CSN, DRI, and GBC campuses who coordinated the meeting, as well as the members of the AB450 Committee for their efforts and support. Co-Chair Hill thanked the Committee members for their dedication to this very important initiative. He said he looks forward to making recommendations to further the educational opportunities for students in our community and state.

Member Dr. Zaragoza arrived at the meeting

Co-Chair Abba referred to the report included in the reference materials, entitled "Patterns of State Coordination and Governance of Community and Technical Colleges and Other Less-than Baccalaureate Institutions." She reminded the group of their discussion at the May meeting regarding the SB391 Study, which is what the work of the AB450 Committee was modeled after. Dr. Aims McGuinness, who at the time was affiliated with NCHEMS, kicked off the work of the SB391 Committee, with a governance study that provided an external perspective as to what were the best practices and trends relative to governance and community colleges over ten years ago. Co-Chair Abba reached out to Dr. McGuinness and requested he update the report. She feels this updated report would have been an ideal way to kick off the work of the AB450 Committee, but the findings of the report also offer a nice way to close out this work.

Co-Chair Abba emphasized the primary takeaway of this report is that a System-wide structure has a number of advantages over those states who have a fragmented or loosely coordinated higher education system. She recalled that during the SB391 work over a decade ago, Dr. McGuinness said the Nevada System of Higher Education and its tightly coordinated governance structure is, in a way, the envy of the nation. She said this is due to the fact that we are able to quickly collaborate and work together to orchestrate policy changes and initiatives, and she feels the work that the AB450 Committee is doing with the Workforce Incentive Grant exemplifies that. She said that if we did not have a centralized approach to higher education in the state, she is not sure we would have been able to pivot as quickly as we have with this committee, in terms of finding a way to expand the free college opportunities as requested by the Governor.

Co-Chair Abba gave a summary of the report, which talks about the trends in community college governance, with the most recent era (2010-2020) focused on Tennessee and Utah. She noted that in 2020, Utah consolidated 16 institutions under one system in order to ensure they had strategies in place to unite with the Utah Governor's office. This is a nice example of the nationwide trend, moving toward centralized systems and away from decentralized systems. She added the report discusses the significant impact of the pandemic on trends as it relates to centralization, and that we are seeing the emergence of a more systematic and integrated approach to community colleges. Dr. McGuinness notes in the report that states with highly fragmented and largely uncoordinated institutional networks face extraordinary challenges in developing the needed collaboration among institutions. The key is to ensure clear pathways for students that provide links to external partners, particularly as it relates to economic development and workforce development.

Co-Chair Abba shared that one of her favorite statements from the report is the fact that, "A system is more than the sum of its parts." The report also highlights a challenge we are facing here in Nevada, which is that the finance policies of systems tend to foster inner-institutional competition rather than collaboration, as they reward enrollment growth or credit hour production. She noted Nevada is seeing some of these challenges related to the funding formula and competition for weighted student credit hours. She said this supports the direction the Committee is going, in terms of recommending a holistic study of the funding formula in the coming biennium.

Co-Chair Abba reiterated that the key takeaway is that systems are now playing a far more dynamic role in leadership of serving the link between the full range of system capacities from community colleges to research universities to the future competitiveness of the state's economy and workforce. Systems have a major responsibility to partner with the Governor's Office of Economic Development and key economic development partners for workforce education, and other state agencies, as well as business and industry. She highlighted the synergies that occur between all of these groups, which correlates with the makeup of this AB450 Committee, and she praised the Governor for appointing individuals that represent all of these areas. This committee exemplifies that network between higher education and the need for strong partnerships with the Governor's office when it comes to economic development and workforce.

Member Bostwick stated that after reading the report, she would like to point out several ideas that are important in light of what the Committee is working on and the need to fund a "new normal," in terms of what has been happening with enrollment, employment shifts, and diversification of our economy. First, is the idea of return on investment, with some institutions in our state struggling between the high-cost programs and the ability to offer them - especially since they have incredible value for both the individuals who receive the training and for the employers. This is a challenge that needs to be considered.

Member Bostwick noted the report states that funding follows the regulator and vice versa, which brings up her second point which is the need to fund flexibility. Since we are predominantly state funded versus local, we have a state board versus local. She wonders if locals should have more participation in terms of funding, so they would have more "skin in the game." She added that we lose flexibility with such narrow streams of funding that force us into an academic calendar.

Lastly, Member Bostwick highlighted the need for collaboration. She said that although we are within one system, she is not sure there is incentive to collaborate across the state's geophysical boundaries or across two- and four-year institutions. In light of the previously mentioned competition for funding, she recommended it would be good to consider collaboration as part of funding or how funding is incentivized.

4. For Possible Action – Work Session:

Co-Chair Abba referred to the Work Session Document included in the Committee's reference materials. She noted this is an accumulation of the previous months of meetings and will result in a final report as required by the AB450 legislation which requires the final report be submitted to the Legislative Council Bureau no later than August 1st. She explained that following the Work Session, her team will draft a final report that will be sent to all Committee members and then to the Governor's office.

She asked Daniel Stewart to start off the Work Session with comments from the Governor's office.

Mr. Stewart thanked both Committee Chairs and the entire Committee for their time and hard work during the last six months and assured them that the Governor appreciates their service. He noted the Committee put in real work, under real time constraints, addressing very real issues, and despite being thrown a few curve balls, still managed to move forward. He reported the Governor's office supports all of the action items proposed and asks for the Committee's vote to approve them. Should the Committee vote "yes," his office will continue to work with the Governor's finance office and the legislature to make these ideas into reality.

Mr. Stewart reported the Governor's office is prepared to do even more to build upon the Committee's good work. The Governor's office has heard the comments and concerns of many of the Committee members and stakeholders, including general critiques of the State's funding formula for community colleges as well as specific concerns about the reach of the proposed WIG Program. His office is aware that no scholarship program will be a perfect solution unless programming and capacity issues are addressed and wrap-around services are available. To that end, the Governor's office does not want to see this as the end of the conversation for possible ways to increase capacity, enhance programming, and provide wrap-around services.

Mr. Stewart announced that the Governor has created a sub-cabinet for workforce development which includes agency heads for GOED, GOWINN, DETR, NSHE, the Dept. of Education and Veterans Services. Therefore, at least three members of the AB450 Committee or someone from their agencies will be serving on that sub-cabinet and their first meeting will occur shortly. Their first task will be to identify possible solutions to addressing capacity programming and wrap-around services for community colleges. It is also understood that the WIG money may not reach every student who needs help. The Governor's office hopes to extend the program if it proves successful, but for that to happen, they will need a track record to build on. WIG will reach students that current programs have missed. With the continued efforts of the sub-cabinet, we can continue to strive to reach all students in need.

Mr. Stewart stated the Governor's office remains committed to reviewing the current funding formula for Nevada's community colleges. The Governor's office absolutely supports the interim study on the formula and looks forward to seeing the results. He is ready and willing to consider and support possible changes as soon as the next legislative session and beyond, once concrete, realistic proposals are made, and will remain open to all recommended solutions. Mr. Stewart asked the Committee members to forward their ideas to him and assured the group that Governor Sisolak is committed to making community college training programs free and available to more Nevadans. Nevada will never reach its full potential until community colleges reach their full potential and they will be a major player in helping Nevada diversify its economy, expand its workforce, and better the quality of life for all Nevadans. He said the Committee has an opportunity to make meaningful steps in the right direction and asked the Committee members for their support on the items in the Work Session.

Co-Chair Abba referred to the reference material under Item 4 which includes the 43-page Work Session document. She explained that the document provides historical context for each of the five items, including the discussion that occurred and the impetus behind each recommendation. These five items were generally outlined at the

May meeting and the Committee members were offered an opportunity to include additional items. A lengthy discussion she had with Member Bostwick resulted in an additional item with regard to the IACs and Workforce Advisory Boards. She cautioned the Committee that due to Open Meeting Law restrictions, any new recommendations to the Work Session Document would require an additional meeting.

Co-Chair Abba noted that Item 1, the Workforce Incentive Grant (WIG), is an excellent opportunity to establish a pilot program that expands the free college opportunities for citizens of this state. On two prior occasions, the Committee discussed the framework for WIG and at its May meeting had a detailed conversation on the mechanics of the program, including initial and continuing eligibility, reporting requirements, and various programs that would be eligible. She said many of the Committee members provided feedback and her team did their best to address the recommendations and suggested improvements with the program in terms of expanding either the eligible programs or other criteria.

Regarding the framework of the Work Session document, Co-Chair Abba noted that within each action item, there is a box for the action of the Committee and noted the action is not for approval of the language within the Work Session document, but for approval of the reference material in each case. She reminded that under the Open Meeting Law, these are the documents that have been noticed to the public and for the Committee to take action on. Co-Chair Abba asked Ms. Davis, NSHE Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, to outline additions and changes made to the proposals since the May meeting, based on the Committee's input.

Ms. Davis explained she would only be reviewing areas where substantive updates were made. She noted the Overview and Eligibility section for institutions did not change, but there was a change to the wording on page 46 of the document with regard to the requirement to not previously have earned a bachelor's degree and how that relates to Pell Grant eligibility. Based on the guidance and eligibility requirements outlined in the American Rescue Plan, Pell Grant eligibility is used as a way to identify low-income students. Students who have a bachelor's degree are not eligible for the Pell Grant so that requirement has been left in to ensure transparency to students that the program relies on Pell eligibility. It is recognized that there are individuals who hold a bachelor's degree but may want to retrain. Moving forward, there is the hope that these and other groups of students can be included once we move beyond the ARP Fund requirements.

Ms. Davis noted that, based on suggestions made by Member Ebert at the May meeting, slight revisions were made to Attachment A (lists of eligible programs) with regard to the teacher pipeline. She explained that there are Early Childhood Education programs at all seven of NSHE's teaching institutions and Member Ebert pointed out that these programs are often a pipeline to get students into a bachelor's degree program to ultimately become teachers. Ms. Davis stated Early Childhood Education programs are now included in item 2 for every institution's eligible programs as shown in Attachment A.

Ms. Davis noted that items 1 and 2 of the eligible programs list for every institution are nursing and teaching, but the rest of the programs vary by institution. Referring to page 47, she noted no changes were made to the award amounts or categories, but more explanation was added with regard to cost of attendance and how students can use the funds. The dollar amount of the awards is set up to cover the registration fees and,

in most cases, will cover some additional fees as well, but it depends on the program. Ms. Davis said this is important because her team will be including this in the application for the ARP funds. Also on page 47, she noted that under Continuing Eligibility, verbiage was added to remind campuses that timely communication with recipients is important with regard to what they need to do each year for continued eligibility.

Ms. Davis referred to the Allocation of Funding section on page 48, noting that this wording was added to note that it will be based on proportion of enrollment overall, meaning the largest share will go to the largest institution, which is the College of Southern Nevada. She pointed out the addition of a Reporting and Accountability section, also on page 48. While NSHE is always evaluating programs, this was highlighted because, not only is the Governor looking for reporting, but it is also part of the ARP requirements. This will begin the first spring that eligibility for the program begins and after that it will cover the next full academic year.

Member Bostwick asked if it refers to overall enrollment or just enrollment in the programs eligible for WIG. Ms. Davis replied this is for overall enrollment, but her team will be looking at it further.

Member Zaragoza asked for clarification that this is limited to credit programs and credit certificates. Co-Chair Abba replied that it is limited to credit programs only, because Pell eligibility is key in terms of being eligible for ARP funding.

Member Ebert thanked Ms. Davis for adding in the changes she suggested with regard to Early Childhood Education. She noted that moving forward, the Department of Education team stands ready to help advertise the WIG program when its ready to roll out.

Seeing no other comments from the Committee, Co-Chair Abba asked for a motion regarding Item 1, endorsement of Appendix A, Workforce Investment Grant proposal:

Member Zaragoza moved approval.

Co-Chair Hill seconded the motion.

Item 1 of the Work Session document was approved unanimously.

Co-Chair Abba referred to Item 2, the letter of support for ARP funding for the WIG program. She noted Item 1 that was just approved is contingent on receiving federal funding through ARP and will be subject to the consideration of IFC at their August meeting. She asked Ms. Davis to describe what work has been done with the Governor's office with regard to the formal application that is necessary, as well as the letter of support. Co-Chair Abba added that although Senator Chris Brooks announced his resignation, the Legislative Council Bureau advised it would be appropriate to include him until he formally resigns at the end of the year.

Ms. Davis reported that the NSHE team has been working with the Governor's Finance office on the application process. They have drafted the application template but will be making the slight revisions to the WIG summary as previously mentioned. The deadline is August 1st, but her office will be submitting sooner so that any challenges can be dealt with prior to the deadline.

Co-Chair Abba explained the Committee is being asked to endorse the support letter as part of the packet NSHE will be sending to IFC. She added both her signature and

Co-Chair Hill's signature will be applied to the letters which would be distributed by the end of the week.

With no questions from the Committee, Co-Chair Abba asked for a motion regarding Item 2, Appendix B, letter of support to IFC for ARP funding for the WIG pilot program:

Member Zaragoza moved approval.

Member Bostwick seconded the motion.

Item 2 of the Work Session document was approved unanimously.

Co-Chair Abba referred to Item 3, letter of support for Workforce and Economic Development Investment Fund. She reminded the Committee that the purpose of the Workforce Incentive Grant is to incentivize enrollment in key programs, however many of the eligible programs are already at capacity of face limited capacity. The Workforce and Economic Development Investment Fund would not be available until the next biennium; however, it does provide an opportunity for community colleges to utilize those funds to address any capacity issues within those programs. She pointed to the letter of support included as Appendix C, which is addressed to the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board of Regents as they have their quarterly meeting this week and will be considering the biennial budget request for the Nevada System of Higher Education. Within that biennial budget request there are a number of items for special consideration that include the Workforce and Economic Development Fund. She stated that if the Committee approves the letter of support, she will relay this to the Board of Regents during their formal meeting Thursday and Friday.

Member Woodward asked if there is another group outside of a third party that could review the funding formula. Co-Chair Abba reminded him that is Item 4, and the group is still discussing Item 3.

Member Bostwick noted that part of the Governor's Office of Economic Development is workforce development, aligned to emerging and growing industries in Nevada. From her experience going through session, she recommends highlighting "at capacity" or labeling it with "at capacity" in some way because there are lots of items with the workforce label that end up in front of legislators and therefore it has the potential to get lost in the mix. This should be a team effort to educate legislators on the purpose of the separate workforce funds, with a very targeted effort toward capacity. She would like to recommend it as an amendment. Co-Chair Abba said she will mention it specifically to the Board of Regents when she presents the items this week and will have that conversation with CFO Clinger. She does not anticipate any objection to clarifying the intent of the funds. Since the Board meeting is in two days, there is no time to revise the letter, but it can still be noted on the record.

With no questions from the Committee, Co-Chair Abba asked for a motion regarding Item 3, Appendix C, letter of support for Workforce and Economic Development Investment Fund:

Member Zaragoza moved approval.

Member Trolson seconded the motion.

Item 3 of the Work Session document was approved unanimously.

Co-Chair Abba referred to Item 4, letter of support for a study of the NSHE Funding Formula, included in the packet as Appendix D. The letter is addressed to the Chair of the Board of Regents and Senator Chris Brooks, who is Chairman of IFC. She noted the Committee has had a lot of discussion in regard to the challenges with the funding

formula and it is long overdue for a study. Speaking to the earlier comment by Member Woodward regarding an outside, third-party review, she noted that an external third party completed the past study and traditionally, such studies are done by subject matter experts. She expects the same format in this case.

Member Zaragoza asked if all the supporting documents will be included with the letter to provide context for the request. Co-Chair Abba assured him everything would be included.

Co-Chair Abba asked for a motion regarding Item 4, Appendix D, letter of support for study of the NSHE Funding Formula:

Co-Chair Hill moved approval.

Member Boyce seconded the motion.

Item 4 of the Work Session document was approved unanimously.

Co-Chair Abba explained that a study of this nature requires formal legislation, so the approved letter will kick off the process and during the 23rd Session, NSHE will seek a sponsor of a bill that would formalize the study.

Co-Chair Abba referred to Item 5, letter of support with regard to the Institutional Advisory Councils and Workforce Advisory Boards. She pointed to the two reference materials provided, Appendix E (proposed revisions to Board policy for IACs and Workforce Advisory Boards) and Appendix F (letter in support of the proposed revisions). She noted that Appendix E is the proposed Board Handbook revision request. For IACs, the proposal includes a briefing paper providing background on how IACs were created (going back the SB391 study), the discussion of separating community colleges into a separate system, and the resulting creation of the System Within the System, which is essentially the community colleges. Institutional Advisory Councils were created with the idea they would advise the president. She noted the revision strikes out the current provisions governing IACs for the community colleges and delineates a charge that was too broad. This will reframe the committees to put the president in the driver's seat and will facilitate for better flow of communication from the committee members (community representatives). It will allow presidents to better utilize their IACs to suit the needs of their college and any strategic initiatives or objectives that they may be trying to achieve.

Co-Chair Abba explained the role of Workforce Advisory Boards is to provide community colleges with information from industry that is pertinent to making sure that individuals who graduate within specific programs have the skill sets necessary to support the workforce in their particular field. Workforce Advisory Boards are intended to advise the college on critical matters that need to be included in the curriculum to make sure that students graduate with the right skill sets and are appropriately prepared. Page 30 of the proposal outlines what is essentially already in place, and this is done to ensure individuals from the public understand that our institutions are committed to making sure that when students graduate, they are appropriately prepared for their field. It provides that institutions can establish these Boards to support the programs and provide information necessary to ensure that those programs are meeting the needs of employers in those specific areas. She noted many of these advisory boards are in place now to meet accreditation requirements within individual programs.

Co-Chair Abba referred to Appendix F which is a letter of support to Chair McAdoo supporting this recommendation which is to be considered by the Board of Regents at its quarterly meeting this week. She pointed out there are also letters of support in Appendix E from each Chair of the current IACs, supporting the ability of each president to take hold of the process in such a way that they determine how to frame their IAC in a manner that will best support their individual institution, including defining membership, terms, and addressing many of the more minute items that were in the strike out language.

Member Zaragoza affirmed that the College of Southern Nevada's IAC fully deliberated this item and is in full support of this motion. They feel it is going to be an enhancement across the NSHE system.

Co-Chair Abba asked for a motion regarding Item 5, Appendix F, letter of support for proposed IAC/Workforce Advisory Board revisions:

Member Zaragoza moved approval.

Member Bostwick seconded the motion.

Item 5 of the Work Session document was approved unanimously.

Co-Chair Abba thanked the Committee for their hard work through what she feels has been a long, but fruitful process, especially in light of what will be a new, state-funded financial aid program. She assured the Committee members they will be notified of future outcomes including the outcome of the IFC meeting in August.

5. Information Only – Public Comment: None

Meeting Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 3:46 PM.