



Nebraska Workforce Development Board
Meeting Minutes
December 6, 2019, 9a – 12p
Nebraska Educational Telecommunications (NET)
(AKA Terry M. Carpenter Telecommunications Center)
1800 North 33rd Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68503

Agenda item 1. Call to Order

Chair Mark Moravec called to order the meeting of the Nebraska Workforce Development Board (the Board) on Dec 6, 2019 at approximately 9a at Nebraska Educational Telecommunications (NET), 1800 North 33rd Street, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Agenda item 2. Roll Call

Yvette Montes Jung called roll and determined that quorum was established.

Members in attendance

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Senator Joni Albrecht | 10. James Hanson, Jr. |
| 2. Greg Adams | 11. Tate Lauer |
| 3. John Albin | 12. Susan Martin |
| 4. Troy Brooks | 13. Mark Moravec |
| 5. Brian Deakin | 14. Kyle J. Nixon |
| 6. Jason Feldhaus | 15. Don Nordell |
| 7. Lindy Foley | 16. Bradley Schroeder |
| 8. Michael Geary | 17. Jennifer Sedlacek |
| 9. Allan Hale | 18. Becky Stitt |

Members absent

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Governor Pete Ricketts | 7. Terri Ridder |
| 2. Kyle Arganbright | 8. Dannette Smith |
| 3. Elizabeth Babcock | 9. Carol Swigart |
| 4. Phil Bakken | 10. Paul Turman |
| 5. Gary D. Dixon, Jr. | 11. Lisa Wilson |
| 6. Anthony Goins | |

Nebraska Department of Labor (NDOL) Board support staff in attendance

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Katie Thurber, General Counsel | 4. Deb Andersen, WIOA Policy Coordinator, Office of Employment & Training |
| 2. Erin Cooper, Workforce Services Administrator, Office of Employment & Training | 5. Wendy Sieler, Employment Services Program Specialist, Office of Employment & Training |
| 3. Dawn Carrillo, WIOA Program Analyst, Office of Employment & Training | 6. Yvette Montes Jung, Staff Assistant I, Office of Employment & Training |

Agenda item 3. Notice of Publication

Yvette Montes Jung announced that the Notice of Public Meeting was duly published, in accordance with the Nebraska Open Meetings Act, in the Beatrice Daily Sun, Grand Island Independent, Lincoln Journal Star, North Platte Telegraph, Omaha World Herald, and Scottsbluff Star-Herald and on the State of Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar.

Agenda item 4. Approval of Minutes

Chair Moravec called the Board's attention to the draft minutes from the last meeting of this Board held on September 13, 2019, which were included in the Board Members' meeting packets as Handout 1. The minutes were also emailed to Members of the Board on December 4, 2019. Chair Moravec asked if the Members had additions or corrections to the minutes. No additions or corrections were provided.

Chair Moravec opened the floor for public comment on the draft minutes. No public comments were made. Vice Chair Bradley Schroeder motioned to approve the minutes of the September 13, 2019 meeting of the Board and Michael Geary seconded the motion. Members of the Board in attendance voted on the motion by voice vote. The vote carried unanimously.

Chair Moravec reminded the Board that agendas, minutes, and packets provided during meetings of the Board are available on Board's webpage, which is accessible at <https://dol.nebraska.gov/EmploymentAndTraining/LCRWP/WIOA/NWDB>.

Agenda item 5. Old business

a. 2019 – 2020 Meeting Locations

Chair Moravec addressed the Board regarding the 2019 – 2020 meeting locations. During the September meeting, the Board agreed to hold the meetings at the Bennett Public Library in Downtown Lincoln. Following the September meeting, it was determined that location would not work due to facility restrictions against early access to the space for meeting set up. Chair Moravec called the Members' attention to Handout 2, a list of the proposed alternate locations. It was proposed that three of the four 2019 – 2020 meetings would be held at the NET facility with the June 2020 meeting being held at the Administrative Services Building at 16th and K Streets.

Chair Moravec asked if there were concerns with the alternative locations. No concerns were voiced. Becky Stitt motioned to approve the alternative locations and Senator Joni Albrecht seconded the motion. Members of the Board in attendance voted on the motion by voice vote. The vote carried unanimously.

b. WIOA Update

Chair Moravec introduced Deb Andersen, who provided the Board with an update on the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) Annual Statewide Performance Report Narrative for Program Year 2018. Deb called the Board's attention to Handout 3, a copy of the narrative and provided the Board with a quick overview of the purposes of the narrative and its contents. Deb advised the Board that the Board's Evaluation and Review Subcommittee would be evaluating the narrative and providing the Board with a report on its evaluation during the March meeting of the Board. Deb also mentioned that Scott Hunzeker would be providing

additional information on the Subcommittee's plans for the review during his Subcommittee report.

Next, Chair Moravec introduced Erin Cooper, who provided the Board with an update on a recent Federal review of Nebraska's Rapid Response Services. Erin called the Board's attention to Handout 4, an overview of the outcome of the Federal review. Before taking the Board through the overview, Erin explained that the purpose of Rapid Response Services is to promote economic recovery and vitality by developing an ongoing, comprehensive approach to identifying, planning for, responding to layoffs and dislocations, and preventing or minimizing their impacts on workers, businesses, and communities.

c. Subcommittee Roles and Responsibilities

The last item of old business was subcommittee roles and responsibilities.

Chair Moravec reminded the Board that WIOA places more emphasis on the active involvement of state workforce development boards in their respective workforce development systems. He continued by further reminding the Board that the Board's Subcommittees were restructured in February 2019 in response to that increased emphasis. He stated that restructuring does not seem to be working based on the concerns mentioned during the September meeting and concerns raised again during the past week. Chair Moravec continued by saying that during the September meeting of the Board it was agreed that a meeting would be scheduled for him and Vice Chair Brad Schroeder to meet with the Subcommittee chairs to discuss roles and responsibilities. Instead, it was decided to have an open discussion among all Board members about the required functions of the Board as a whole and how the Board wants to handle its fulfillment of those functions. Chair Moravec directed the Board's attention to Handout 5, a listing of the required functions of all state workforce development boards. After allowing time for review of the information in Handout 5, Chair Moravec asked Board Members if they feel the Board's Subcommittees necessary in order to fulfill the responsibilities listed in Handout 5 and opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Joni Albrecht asked how the Board would know what its responsibilities are without Subcommittees and what the Subcommittees have done to date. She went on to say that she appreciates hearing the Subcommittee reports during each meeting of the Board. Chair Moravec remarked, saying that was a good question and asked in response if the duties of the Board would be dealt with by the Board during its quarterly meetings in the absence of Subcommittees. Deb Andersen indicated that approach would be an option.

Michael Geary, chair of the Strategy and Innovation Subcommittee, stated that his Subcommittee has experienced issues getting together for various reasons. Setting that aside, Michael stated that he is not sure that the members of the Board's Subcommittees are clear on their respective responsibilities. Michael commented on the characteristics of the Subcommittee reports that have been given during past meetings, that some have been very detailed while others have been very general in nature. Michael went on to say that if he were organizing his business for effectiveness, he is not sure that he would sub-optimize its talent into subcommittees in the way that the talent among the Members of the Board has been segregated based on the structure of the Board's Subcommittees. Regarding the Board's Subcommittees, Michael indicated that he would instead have the full Board identify top priorities, fully engaging the intellectual horsepower of the entire Board. The full Board would work on those priorities until it becomes necessary to have working groups take over in order to move things forward. Michael stated that having subcommittees that work exclusively on a fixed set of the Board's duties does not make the best use of the full Board's knowledge, fragments that knowledge, and does not allow the best ideas

to come forward. Michael acknowledged that there needs to be some mechanism that allows matters to be addressed at a very deep level by working groups with the top priorities identified by the full Board.

James Hanson, Jr. provided comments and started by acknowledging the mindshare that is lost by having the Subcommittees but went on to say that Board Members were appointed to the Subcommittees because of specific interests and strengths that they may have. James indicated his biggest concern with not having the Subcommittees is how to get the entire Board to participate in some of the things that need to be done. He stated that some of the required functions of the Board are functions he does not want to deal with because he does not have strengths in those functional areas. James went on to say that he would much rather have Board Members who have strengths in those functional areas shepherding activities and reporting to the full Board on those activities. James said that if each of the Board Members is required to participate in fulfillment of every required function he feels the Board would lose the outcomes that are really needed.

Brian Deakin provided comments as well, saying that he appreciates the remarks that had been made, especially those about the difficulty in getting together and meeting. Brian stated that it can be difficult to get full participation in virtual meetings and suggested that some Subcommittee meetings could be held in conjunction with meetings of the full Board, as breakout sessions during Board meetings or meetings that follow the adjournment of Board meetings. Board Members have already committed half a day or more, travelling to and attending Board meetings, so it would be good to capitalize on the fact that Board Members are together. Whether the Board decides to continue with the Subcommittee structure or do something completely different and focus on initiatives, Brian said the Board should take advantage of the time it spends together.

James Hanson, chair of the Policy and Oversight Subcommittee, commented in response stating that it is very important that Subcommittee meetings have intended outcomes. If a Subcommittee is meeting without a planned outcome or deadline, that is a lot different from a Subcommittee that has very specific deadlines. James stated that the Policy and Oversight Subcommittee is overseeing the development of the state plan and has very specific goals and deadlines that must be maintained, requiring the Subcommittee to meet regularly by Webex. James indicated that the Subcommittee has met only once in person (the Subcommittee's first meeting on March 8, 2019.) James concluded by saying that the meeting needs of individual Subcommittees may vary based on their respective responsibilities.

Vice Chair Bradley Schroeder stated that it is important that Subcommittee members are very clear on their individual responsibilities within their Subcommittees. As a business representative on his Subcommittee, Vice Chair Schroeder said that he could act as an advisor, helper, or someone providing input on ideas. Because the Subcommittees comprise a diverse group of individuals representing business, workforce, education, and partner agencies, Vice Chair Schroeder said that it is important that each Subcommittee member understands how their individual role fits in with those of other Subcommittee members. Vice Chair Schroeder stated that each Subcommittee member's areas of expertise should be clearly understood by other Subcommittee members. He also said that the Subcommittee members should know and understand what they are working toward at all times and what is expected of each member as they do so.

Chair Moravec asked if the Board Members feel that the Board's current Subcommittees are necessary; or could they be narrowed down, having the full Board focus on two or three top priorities, as Michael Geary suggested.

Brian Deakin responded, saying he is not certain it is an “either or” situation, that a blend of the two approaches might make sense. He suggested that a structured Subcommittee might be needed to address certain Board functions that require a systematic approach; and for the Board’s functions that are more nebulous, the Board could organize around initiatives, identifying those initiatives, establishing ad hoc task forces to move things to completion, and disbanding those task forces upon completion of their respective initiatives.

Chair Moravec then asked if there is a way to refine the structure of the Subcommittees to make them more effective.

James Hanson, Jr. responded saying a task-oriented and project-driven focus is key. Using the activities of the Policy and Oversight Subcommittee as an example, James stated that the activities of Subcommittee are currently very structured because of activities relating to the state plan and timelines associated with its development and submission. James indicated that the activities of Subcommittee will change in focus and be less structured once the state plan is submitted and subsequently approved. James also indicated that the Subcommittee has a list of activities that it must complete. James went on to say that in the absence of Subcommittees he is concerned that a subset of Board Members would be tasked with accomplishing the majority of the Board’s responsibilities and experience burnout over time. James said he feels that having established Subcommittees with defined areas of responsibility would prevent that burnout. He also said that each Subcommittee could function in the manner that best suits its overall responsibilities and current focus.

Troy Brooks commented saying he likes the idea of holding Subcommittee meetings on the same day as Board meetings and possibly having breakout groups that come back and report to the full Board. Troy stated that at his company they had subcommittees that were organized to address specific issues and met on a regular basis. The subcommittees continued to meet regularly after the issues had been resolved, did not really know why they were continuing to meet, and were no longer effective. Management decided that the subcommittees did not need to continue meeting once they had resolved the issues at hand. When new issues arise, subcommittees are reactivated to address those issues. This approach frees up teammates to participate on other subcommittees and they avoid burnout resulting from attending regular meetings that are held without purpose.

Chair Moravec commented on the roles and responsibilities of Subcommittee chairs, referring to concerns raised by Terri Ridder. Terri indicated that she was unsure of her responsibilities as chair of the Evaluation and Review Subcommittee. Chair Moravec asked Deb Andersen if she had additional comment on the concerns raised by Terri.

Deb acknowledged that the nature of the Board’s required functions varies, with some being calendar based while others are not, which has led to confusion for some Subcommittee chairs. Deb pointed out that some of the Board’s responsibilities are technical in nature and driven by Federally established timelines, such as the Policy and Oversight Subcommittee’s responsibilities relating to state plan development and submission. Deb indicated that other responsibilities of the Board could be considered open-ended, such as the Strategy and Innovation Subcommittee’s responsibilities relating to career pathways. Deb stated that while there are no Federally established timelines relating to the Board’s involvement with career pathways there is a requirement that the Board be involved with the development of strategies that support career pathways. Deb mentioned that Federal reviewers asked about the Board’s efforts regarding career pathways during the Federal review conducted in May 2019. Deb went on to say there are career pathways activities occurring across the state but the Board is not currently involved.

Michael Geary advised the Board that he and Deb Andersen had a conversation about career pathways a week prior to the Board meeting. He said that he had told Deb that he felt that some of the most productive work coming out of the Board had occurred in relation to career pathways and the Nebraska Career Education Model developed by the Nebraska Department of Education. Michael related a personal experience with career pathways. Michael's son told him that he did not want to go to college. Instead, he wanted to be a firefighter. His son's high school counselor walked his son through the career pathways model, which result in his son's dual enrollment in high school and community college coursework. Michael commented that if Federal reviewers feel that career pathways isn't a strong enough focus of the Board that the Board's previous work on career pathways is certainly something the Board could revisit. Michael concluded by saying that if the Board were to look at the people who should be consuming the Board's past work on career pathways, or byproducts of that work, it is very likely that positive stories would be found out in the field.

Chair Moravec commented in response saying that there are currently some very effective career pathways programs in the state. He commented further that the Board does not need to reinvent the wheel. Blueprint Nebraska, for example, is an initiative started by the University of Nebraska that includes a career pathways focus and works toward some of the end goals of this Board. Chair Moravec went on to say he feels the Board would be most effective if it combined its efforts with the efforts of other entities or initiatives. He suggested the Board connect with successful career pathways programs across the state, find out what they are doing, get updates from those programs, and try to tie it all together to eliminate silos that exist due to a lack of communication or awareness.

Senator Joni Albrecht responded to Chair Moravec's comments. She mentioned several groups, initiatives, and collaborations across the state that focus on workforce and workforce development issues, including the Nebraska Legislature's workforce development task team, the Aksarben Foundation, and Blueprint Nebraska. Senator Albrecht said there are 18 groups across the state with which the Board can coordinate and collaborate to fulfill its responsibilities, including career pathways. Senator Albrecht also said that she feels the groups are coming together the way they should and need to and are recognizing that they have to do something to maximize their efforts. She said the Board should be knowledgeable of the efforts of those groups if the Board is required support career pathways. Senator Albrecht stated that when she thinks about the Board's Subcommittees and their close work with the Nebraska Departments of Economic Development and Labor that representatives from the Departments should be attending the meetings of those groups to learn about the efforts of the groups, share information about the efforts of the Departments, and report back to the Board.

Chair Moravec suggested that representatives of the groups and initiatives mentioned by Senator Albrecht be invited to speak to the Board once or twice a year to learn about their efforts and to give the Board an opportunity to offer the Board's support and involvement in those efforts.

Kyle Nixon responded saying he thinks that is a good idea. Kyle indicated that he chaired one of the Blueprint Nebraska industry councils, the Manufacturing Industry Council. He said that he is aware of the workforce development activities mentioned by Senator Albrecht. During Blueprint Nebraska meetings and Manufacturing Industry Council meetings, workforce development was a major focus of discussions, as is the case at many other meetings he has attended. Kyle said that workforce development is on everyone's mind. Kyle also said that he feels we are far from all coming together. Kyle said there are numerous successful workforce development initiatives, many of which overlap. Kyle also said that a huge part of what the Board can do is figuring out how to bring those activities together.

Lindy Foley mentioned the Nebraska Partner Council, which includes in its membership representatives of the WIOA core partners and state-level representatives of some of required one-stop partners. Those partners are responsible for workforce-related initiatives across the state. Lindy stated that while the Subcommittees include representatives from the Council in their appointed membership the Council feels that more could be done to connect the work of the Council with the work of the Board. Lindy suggested that the Council be invited to report to the Board, in general, and to the Subcommittees regarding Subcommittee-specific topics.

Chair Moravec commented that he felt the Board had identified one of its first goals, establishing connections with and among existing workforce-focused groups and initiatives. Chair Moravec also said that he felt that implementation of this goal might be appropriately assigned to the Strategy and Innovation Subcommittee. Chair Moravec asked if there were additional workforce-focused groups or initiatives not yet discussed about which the Board should be aware.

- Senator Albrecht mentioned the State and Local Chambers Of Commerce, colleges, and labor unions.
- Kyle Nixon reiterated the involvement of the State Chamber of Commerce in workforce development and that its involvement continues to increase.
- Susan Martin mentioned a task force on workforce development issues headed by Nebraska Senator Kate Bolz, which includes Blueprint Nebraska, community colleges, the University of Nebraska, and labor unions and organizations.

Senator Albrecht stated that she feels the Board needs to share information on its activities with the public to insure that it is known that the Board is resource.

Brian Deakin mentioned sector partnerships in Nebraska. Brian said that as the central Nebraska sector partnership worked to establish the partnership they found that many groups and individuals had been working for more than a decade to address workforce issues but not in a connected manner. Brian also said that one of the responsibilities of the Board is to promote one-stop shopping. Brian said further that he sees a lot of good work on workforce issues but much of it is duplicative. There are different groups and organizations doing the same thing but not talking to each other. In its effort to connect the dots, Brian said the Board could take a draconian approach and say that all workforce development efforts must approved by the Board. Alternatively, the Board could investigate, learn what is happening, and invite folks to collaborate. Brian suggested that the Board, as one of its goals, work to align existing groups and initiatives in order to eliminate duplication of effort. Brian said he believes that if the Board brings these groups together it would be much more effective in meeting its responsibilities and making a difference across the state.

Chair Moravec agreed with Brian's comments regarding duplication of effort across groups and initiatives, as well as communities. Chair Moravec also agreed that the Board should be working to bring everyone together and align workforce development initiatives and activities across the state to minimize the duplication. He said that Blueprint Nebraska probably has one of the largest groups of leaders across the state and would be a good group with which to coordinate first. He also said it is incumbent upon the Board to coordinate with Blueprint Nebraska and share information.

James Hanson, Jr. commented that the Board had not yet discussed the involvement of the local workforce development areas. James said that the local areas need to be involved, that their efforts filter up to success at the state level. He pointed out that the local areas serve as liaisons between the Board and local communities.

Kyle Nixon commented, saying he hears the same idea at many meetings—it is important to bring everyone together and align workforce development initiatives and activities across the state to minimize duplication of effort—so it is apparent that everybody wants this.

Brian Deakin agreed with Kyle and said the same question is always raised at meetings: Who should take the lead? Brian said that the Board could be the entity that brings everyone together and that doing so would fulfill its mandate if the Board acts as a clearinghouse and works to connect groups and initiatives by areas of focus.

Jason Feldhaus asked for clarification as to whether the Board's Subcommittees would be retained. Jason commented on Brian's suggestion that Subcommittee meetings be held in conjunction with meetings of the Board, that he agreed with that approach but felt that the Board's discussions resulted in additional work for the Board. Jason asked if the additional work would be facilitated by the Subcommittees.

Chairman Moravec responded saying he felt the work discussed falls under the purview of the Strategy and Innovation Subcommittee and asked if the Subcommittee agreed with that statement. The Subcommittee agreed. Chairman Moravec then asked if the Policy and Oversight Subcommittee and Evaluation and Review Subcommittee felt that their responsibilities are well defined. The general response from the Policy and Oversight Subcommittee was that its responsibilities are well understood. The Evaluation and Review Subcommittee indicated that its responsibilities are not well understood. Based on the responses of the Subcommittees, Chairman Moravec asked if there should be only two Subcommittees, rather than three, and asked if a motion was needed to that end.

James Hanson, Jr. asked if an outcome on the issue was needed that day.

Chairman Moravec reminded the Board that the purpose of the discussion on the roles and responsibilities of the Board's Subcommittees was to receive input from Members of the Board regarding their roles and responsibilities, including the roles and responsibilities of the chairs of the Subcommittees, and purpose needs to be the Board's focus. Chair Moravec called on Board Member Commissioner John Albin, asking if he agreed.

Commissioner Albin said that he agreed but did not feel an outcome would be achieved that day. He suggested that Board think about the role it wants NDOL to have in the work of the Board. Years ago the work of the Board was performed by NDOL with rubber-stamp approval by the Board. Commissioner Albin said the current iteration of the Board's work structure falls at the other end of the spectrum, with the Board coming up with innovations and NDOL executing. Commissioner Albin also said that he thinks the greatest successes will come from somewhere in the middle. Commissioner Albin acknowledged that each Board Member likely has ideas about how Nebraska's workforce system should operate. He reminded the Board that the idea under WIOA, and WIA before that, is to push decisions out to the business community, with the business community acting as leaders. It is important that the Board not lose sight of that idea. Commissioner Albin also acknowledged that the Board's current work structure probably pushes too much to the business side considering each Board member's responsibilities outside of the Board. As it evolves, the Board should determine how NDOL staff can best serve the Subcommittees and make the Board most effective in the process. Commissioner Albin said he thinks NDOL staff can do almost anything the Board needs them to do, but the Board needs to come up with a better strategy on how to best utilize NDOL staff in a way that makes the Board most effective and ensures the best use of the Board's time.

Chair Moravec concluded discussions by saying Deb Andersen would work to get a representative from Blueprint Nebraska to present to the Board. He also said that a meeting with Subcommittee chairs might be held regarding Subcommittee structure.

Agenda item 6. New business

a. Subcommittee Reports

The next order of new business was subcommittee reports.

- *Evaluation and Review Subcommittee*

The report for the Evaluation and Review Subcommittee was provided by Subcommittee Member Scott Hunzeker. Scott advised the Board that the Subcommittee would be meeting prior to the next meeting of the Board regarding review of the WIOA Annual Statewide Performance Report Narrative for Program Year 2018.¹ The Subcommittee will report to the Board on its review at the March meeting of the Board.

- *Policy and Oversight Subcommittee*

Subcommittee Chair James Hanson, Jr. provided the report for the Policy and Oversight Subcommittee. James advised the Board that the Subcommittee continued work on the State Plan Strategy Workshop. The workshop was scheduled for and held on October 29, 2019:

- 160 workforce system shareholders invited
- 68 individuals registered
- 59 attended

James stated that a summary report on the information collected during the workshop would be provided by email to the Board and all individuals invited to and attending the workshop. James said comments on the report could be sent to Deb Andersen by email.

Following the workshop, a workshop-evaluation form was sent to all attendees. The response rate to the evaluation request was low, with only 10 responses received from the 59 attendees. Responses received were positive and supportive of the purpose and outcomes of the workshop, as well as the facilitators' conduct of the workshop. A sample of the workshop evaluation form, along with a summary of the responses is included to the workshop summary report.

A debriefing session was held after the workshop with the workshop facilitators, the Policy and Oversight Subcommittee, and the state plan partners. During the debriefing, one of the workshop facilitators, Dr. Marjorie Kostelnik, described in general terms an evaluation methodology that could be used for development of state plan content. Following the debriefing, Dr. Kostelnik offered to meet with the Policy and Oversight Subcommittee and state plan partners to discuss in detail the components of and use of that methodology and would do so at no cost. James indicated that the Subcommittee and state plan partners would be meeting with Dr. Kostelnik on December 11, 2019.

¹ The narrative is accessible at <https://dol.nebraska.gov/webdocs/getfile/5f7f3553-0007-42bd-8fb6-03036370ac2c>.

James concluded by recognizing Board Member Phil Bakken for his offer of resources toward the conduct of State Plan Strategy Workshop, which would not have been the success it was without Phil's support of the purposes of this Board.

- *Strategy and Innovation Subcommittee*

Subcommittee Chair Michael Geary provided the report for the Strategy and Innovation Subcommittee. Michael advised the Board that the Subcommittee would be meeting during the week of January 13, 2020 with representatives of Nebraska's Homeless Continua of Care to hear discussion on the Continua's request that the Board enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Continua.

- b. *Member Updates*

Chair Moravec asked Members of the Board for updates on their respective industries or organizations and local workforce development area activities for the Members who also serve on local workforce development boards. Members of the Board provided updates as requested.

Agenda item 7. Public Comment

Chair Moravec opened the floor for public comment. No public comments were made.

Agenda item 8. Next Meeting – Date and Time

Chair Moravec reminded the Members of the Board that the next meeting of the Board is scheduled for March 6, 2019 from 9a to 12p and will be held at Nebraska Educational Telecommunications (NET), 1800 North 33rd Street, Lincoln, Nebraska. If the date or time of the meeting changes, Members of the Board would be notified by email. Members of the public may confirm the dates and times of the meetings of the Board by checking the Upcoming Meeting section of the Board's webpage. The Board's webpage is accessible at <https://dol.nebraska.gov/EmploymentAndTraining/LCRWP/WIOA/NWDB>.

Agenda item 9. Adjournment

Chair Moravec asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Jason Feldhaus motioned that the meeting be adjourned, and Brian Deakin seconded the motion. Members of the Board in attendance voted by voice vote on the motion, which carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at approximately 11a.