

**STATE OF NEVADA**  
**GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF WORKFORCE INNOVATION**  
**FOR NEW NEVADA (OWINN) P-20W RESEARCH DATA**  
**SYSTEM (NPWR) ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Friday, January 14, 2022 – 10:30 a.m.**  
**Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation**  
**SAO Auditorium**  
**500 E. Third Street**  
**Carson City, Nevada 89713**

**TELECONFERENCE: 669-900-6833**  
**Meeting ID: 829-3021-1560**

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**Present:** Glen Meyer (Chair), Jose Martinez, Nancy Olsen, Isla Young

**Absent:** Laxmi Bokka

**Also present:** William Goldschmidt, DBDriven; Dan Boersma, DBDriven; Craig Moebus, DBDriven; Andres Feijoo, (OWINN); Chelsea Galvan (GOWINN);, Elisa Cafferata, DETR; Latonia Coleman, DETR

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

**Chair Meyer** called the meeting to order and welcomed participants.

**2. ROLL CALL - CONFIRMATION OF A QUORUM AND VERIFICATION OF PUBLIC POSTING**

**Andres Feijoo** took roll call as reflected.

**3. VERIFICATION OF PUBLIC POSTING**

**Mr. Feijoo** affirmed that the agenda and notice for the meeting was properly posted, pursuant to Nevada's Open Meeting Law NRS 241.020.

#### 4. FIRST PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

#### 5. \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION - APPROVAL OF AUGUST 28, 2020 MINUTES

**It was moved by Isla Young and seconded by Jose Martinez to approve the August 28, 2020 draft minutes as presented. Motion carried.**

#### 6. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ONLY - HARDWARE REFRESH

**Dan Boersma**, DBDriven, stated that the current hardware was initially procured in 2014 for installation. The original contract called for a hardware refresh approximately every four to five years.

Details for the current physical hardware operating at the Reno Data Center were reviewed:

- 2 Heavy physical servers running 33 virtual servers
  - 15 Dev Test-7
  - 9 Production
  - 2 Matching
- 2 High-availability paired SonicWall Firewalls
- 3 Juniper/Cisco switches
- 1 Buffalo TeraStation NAS
- 4 spare hard drives

The initial O&M contract called for the hardware to be refreshed every four to five years, which would have necessitated the refresh in the 2019/2020 time frame. However, due to budget cuts, the 2017 O&M contract removed the hardware refresh requirement and this refresh remains pending. Firewalls have been refreshed; a NAS has been added; switches have been increased. In terms of the P20 consortium road map, the VLDS code base will continue to support on-premise implementations, with rollout this year and beginning of 2023. The code base will support a native cloud environment. Options include procurement of hardware or transitioning to a native cloud environment. One advantage of the native cloud option is that it eliminates the need for a hardware refresh every five to six years.

**Chair Meyer** stated that this discussion item blends into planning for the next biennium to ensure placement of an enhancement module to be able to refresh the hardware in one of two ways, including: Replacing the hardware or migrating the system to a cloud-hosted environment and setting up a payment schedule. The legislature will be made aware of what the life cycle looks like and why a cloud-based approach is recommended. The cloud space also provides the ability to add resources as received provided the funding is available to do so.

**Nancy Olsen** noted that the budget build for the next biennium will take place between now and September of next year. The legislative session takes place subsequently. She inquired as to whether there might be issues with the current hardware during that period of time. **Mr. Boersma** said that the hardware is not in danger if imminent failure, however hard drives have been failing over the past year. Hard drives have been pre-staged to complete a quicker refresh, if necessary.

**Ms. Olsen** asked about the possibility of one-time federal fund availability prior to the budget build. **Mr. Meyer** stated that there have been no specific earmarks from education's perspective. It would not be advisable to do a hardware refresh now if the decision is made to migrate to a cloud-based system in 15 or 16 months. Funding will be sought to supplement maintenance of the system prior to the July 2023 date.

**Isla Young** asked whether the last funding request from the legislature was a multi-state agency ask or some other request. **Chair Meyer** stated that the equipment was originally purchased with federal grant funds. The Department of Education received a grant in 2012 and the funding was used to build the system and provide the hardware. When the grant ended, the budget was originally moved to DETR, who held the budget for two years. At the next legislative session in 2015, the budget was moved under the OWINN office, where it has remained. In 2019, due to budget cuts, the hardware refresh was removed from the budget, anticipating that it could be placed in the next biennial budget.

**Ms. Young** asked about pursuing additional federal grants. **Chair Meyer** stated that while he is not aware of any federal grants for this purpose currently, they will pursue any grant opportunities that become available. **Ms. Olsen** suggesting review of the infrastructure bill that passed in November for any opportunities.

**Elisa Cafferata**, DETR, commented that a number of funding streams are coming into the state at the moment. She requested that the P12 Consortium road map be shared with the group. **Chair Meyer** said the document is not currently prepared, but it can be updated and shared. **Ms. Cafferata** commented that the more shovel-ready a request is, the easier it is to make a case for funding. She expressed concern regarding the bullet point referring to the addition of four spare hard drives as a precaution in view of numerous hard drive failures. She asked about a communications plan for instances where there are problems with the data system and whether her team members are notified in such an instance. **Mr. Boersma** stated that the hard drives are rated, meaning that if one fails, it can be replaced with no loss of data. Hardware refreshes are included in monthly reports to GOWINN.

**Ms. Cafferata** commented that it would be helpful to have a potential budget in conjunction with seeking potential funding sources. **Chair Meyer** stated that the budget estimates will depend on whether a cloud-based program is pursued versus physical hardware. Timing is also a consideration. DBDriven is working on creating a cloud-deployable version, however this is not yet available. When that version is available, cost estimates can be developed. The estimate would be required in order to put together an enhancement item prior to the legislative session in February of 2023. **Mr. Boersma** said they could provide two estimates for physical hardware and for the cloud. **Ms. Cafferata** stated that they are beginning the budget build in February and would like to have the cost estimates as soon as possible. **Mr. Boersma** confirmed they would have it ready by the end of January.

**Latonia Coleman**, DETR, asked for clarification on whether the physical hardware is a cloud-based system. **Chair Meyer** stated that is not currently cloud-based. It is hosted in a data center and the hardware is owned and located in a data site in Reno.

## 7. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ONLY - ANNUAL SCHEDULE

**Craig Moebus**, DBDriven, provided a review of the annual schedule as follows:

- Annual match event
- Annual reports refresh
- No specific due date
- Historically has been completed between October and May
- Monthly match events between NDE and DWSS - Two matches monthly
- Remedial data file for the Nevada Report Card Program - Due August 31st
- Adult Ed Extracts (Work and education)
  - Currently annual file extract in September
  - Discussion to increase to quarterly match for the same file
  - Requires additional AE and DETR data refresh

By July 31st, the goal is for agencies to have data ready to be pulled through the system. In August, a match pool will be conducted with commencement of an entire report refresh evolution. The goal is to push out to stakeholders by the middle of October. There is still a question of how much time the stakeholders would like to conduct the validation prior to final push to production. The Data Ladder license expires annually and this occurs July 21st. Quarterly meetings have been established for partner agencies.

**Chair Meyer** stated that there will be further discussion regarding adding additional data elements to the NPWR system as well as discussion about other agencies becoming part of a consortium. This could affect the annual schedule, depending on upcoming decisions and events.

## 8. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ONLY - RESEARCH DEMO

**Chair Meyer** prefaced the presentation by noting that the NPWR system began as a federal grant project. One of the first goals was to demonstrate the functionality of NPWR to build momentum with the system and ensure support for sustainability moving forward. The attention first focused on creating dashboard reports with the research engine on the back burner. Next steps included increasing interest in the project and training users, with a plan to revisit the research engine. There is now a comfort level with the system and the next goal is to leverage the research engine component. Data requests are increasing, particularly as a result of the pandemic. The research engine tool will alleviate research work and place it in the hands of the requesters. Approval processes will have to be established.

**Mr. Moebus** provided a demo of the software, originating with the researcher portal. This serves as front door access to NPWR data and is granted only to authorized users. A user may be authorized for many different research purposes, each compartmentalized to itself. Data approved for access in research purpose A is not available for access in research purpose B, et cetera. There is a governance process, which serves as the backbone of the NPWR system and requires interaction between the researcher and the agency. The system is conformed to NPWR's governance process, which was developed as part of the implementation and uses a 12-step process. An overview of steps, functions, search scenarios and outcomes of the data request tool was provided.

**Mr. Moebus** stated that when the information request is submitted, a notification goes to the agency stakeholder indicating that the researcher has requested approval. The stakeholder approves or rejects the request. **Chair Meyer** commented that this is part of the process that the committee needs to establish. Decisions need to be made on identifying the individuals responsible for approving and receiving emails for the system and developing accompanying procedures.

**Ms. Young** asked about the timeline for approval of the information request. **Chair Meyer** replied that it will be up to the Committee to establish this timeline and other governing policies. **Ms. Olsen** added that adult education and K-12 data exist as two different agencies in the system.

**Ms. Olsen** requested clarification that the resultant file provided to the researcher is deidentified. **Mr. Moebus** confirmed this understanding, adding that the results are shown as a CSV file, a column consisting of a half-random identifier. Configuration options were reviewed.

**Mr. Martinez** asked about the time frame parameters for the data to be available to the researcher. **Mr. Moebus** explained that this is a configurable option of the system and can be set according to NPWR's preferred time frame.

**Ms. Young** posed a scenario where a researcher requests information from pre-K to job placement and asked how tracking of an individual student is possible, given that data will be derived from multiple agencies. **Mr. Boersma** stated that during the matching event each year, they create a crosswalk table to identify the unique identifier in each system. The system then creates a universal ID for the individual. The same person, possessing different IDs can be linked across multiple datasets.

**Ms. Olsen** asked whether the results will suppress data such as ethnicity. **Mr. Boersma** explained that the system does not suppress data. The raw data exists in an unfiltered state. When a report is created, the results provided will be in response to the sorting requested.

**Ms. Young** inquired whether researchers are required to share back the results and analysis they capture. **Mr. Boersma** said is up to the Agency to decide the parameters they wish to set. For example, in Virginia, they require the opportunity to review and approve analysis prior to publication. **Chair Meyer** added that in NDE, as part of the data sharing agreement, there is not a formal validation process. However, any data that a researcher or vendor produces must be provided to the Agency prior to publishing externally.

## 9. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ONLY - NON-GRADUATE K-12 DATA

**Chair Meyer** stated that currently in the system, the Department of Education exposes the entire K-12 enrollment population as part of the match process. All students are matched and receive a unique identifier, which could potentially match them across agencies. Higher ed is used as a crosswalk between K-12 and workforce. Workforce uses the Social Security Number as an identifier and last name only. Not included is date of birth, first name, middle name or any other data elements that can be matched directly to K-12. K-12 does not have Social Security Numbers, so this cannot be used as a match. At this time, NSHE is used as the crosswalk between K-12 and higher ed. NSHE has full name, date of birth, gender and other information required to match correctly with K-12. They also have Social Security Numbers in most cases, because of financial aid. They are able to crosswalk data into higher ed.

As efforts continue to add other agencies, the goal is to fill the gap so that students who graduate from high school in Nevada and go to higher ed in another state or into the workforce can still be matched. This specific agenda item involves adding additional K-12 data. Currently, the only data provided to NPWR besides the enrollment population is information for graduates. Data provided includes graduation status, diploma type, ACT score information and some course information. This applies to graduated students only. For undergrads, only enrollment information is available. There are no assessment scores, attendance records, course grades or transfer information. In order

to leverage the research capabilities of NPWR, the Department of Education would like to expand the data set provided to NPWR to include payload information for K-12 non-grad students. They would like to include state assessments, attendance information, mobile learning, semester grades and GPA. During the last Committee meeting, members agreed to start including this data, but education has not yet moved forward with the process. NDE will work with DBDriven to begin expanding the dataset to include these undergrad data elements.

In response to a question from **Ms. Olsen**, **Chair Meyer** stated that this should also help CTE by providing significantly more information about all students, which could potentially be used to compare CTE students to non-CTE students.

**Ms. Young** asked whether there have been meetings with pre-K organizations, who would also like to have their data included. **Chair Meyer** said there have been internal conversations about this. Pre-K data is tricky, as the only available data is from state-funded pre-K programs and it is housed in various locations. The data is not yet collected at the state level, but this work is planned for the near future. The only data available for pre-K students in private pre-K institutions is the information sent from these institutions to the early learning department. The early learning department is working to obtain funding to build a pre-K data system to allow for easier collection via web interface. Work is also ongoing in terms of standardization for collection processes.

**Ms. Olsen** commented that the data would be a great research tool to track nongraduating students through the system. **Chair Meyer** added that there is also data available for drop-out students. Complete data records will reflect whether they go back to graduate or show up in the workforce and what types of jobs and wages they attain.

## 10. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ONLY - DMV SHARING FOR MATCHING

**Chair Meyer** stated that one of the goals is to match students who graduate or leave a Nevada K-12 institution, exit the state and return to Nevada in the workforce. The DMV holds data, such as full name, date of birth, gender and Social Security number. It is believed that there will be a higher match rate using the DMV than NSHE. Three to four years ago, the Governor's Office directed DMV to become part of the NPWR system for this purpose. Initial discussions took place, with technical challenges identified on the DMV side. A couple of meetings concluded with the DMV scheduled to do research before meeting again. The groups all went on to other priorities without finalization. This data will be important in terms of identifying students who do not attend Nevada higher ed institutions, which is a significant percentage of the population. When NPWR was originally built, there were strict state requirements on workforce data. This is one of the reasons why the data only includes last name and Social Security number. It would be helpful to revisit meetings with higher ed to discuss whether any of the laws have changed. There has been federal-level emphasis in terms of workforce and education linking systems and exchanging information. These have been accompanied by changes in federal laws. Revisiting this discussion may reveal additional data elements that could be utilized on the DETR side.

**Mr. Boersma** clarified that at this time, DETR only provides a Social Security Number and no name. The minimum amount of data for a good match is first name, last name and date of birth. If they could obtain first name, last name, middle initial and Social Security Number from DETR, this would have a significant impact on matching.

**David Schmidt**, Chief Economist with the Research and Analysis Division of the Nevada Department of Training, Employment and Rehabilitation, provided clarification on wage records

data. Available data is submitted by employers and commonly consists of last name and Social Security Numbers. First name can be hit or miss. Date of birth is not provided. They may be able to augment name information, but not likely date of birth.

**Ms. Olsen** asked for clarification that at the time the data was requested from the DMV, they asserted that the DOL rules did not allow them to share Social Security Numbers. **Chair Meyer** clarified that this was not established at that time. DMV's concern at the time was the strict confidentiality rules and cited the fact that there were governing laws and reasons why they could not easily share the data. It is, however, possible to share the data after jumping through some hoops and providing assurances with SSA. **Mr. Boersma** stated that one technical solution that might be acceptable to DMV was the following: DETR would provide the DMV with a file containing DETR ID and Social Security data. The DMV would then respond back with DETR ID, first name, middle name, last name and date of birth. If they could give DETR this information with DETR in turn providing it, that would provide the needed language. This would alleviate the need for the DMV to attach a Social Security Number. This was the essence of the original proposal, which did not gain traction subsequently. **Chair Meyer** summarized that in this scenario, the match would actually occur within the DMV before providing the information back to DETR, which would include matching of individuals with their full name and date of birth. **Ms. Olsen** noted that DMV and DETR would have to agree to have DETR re-disclose this into the system. **Chair Meyer** clarified that this agreement is already in place with DETR as part of the NPWR program.

**Ms. Young** addressed next steps with the DMV and whether this would involve a meeting with the NPWR Committee and DETR. **Chair Meyer** agreed that this approach would be his recommendation. **Ms. Cafferata** commented that if it were to be a meeting with the full NPWR Committee, there may be an issue with the open meeting law. As such, this would not be recommended as a next step. However, a group of technical staff having a conversation would be acceptable. DETR did work with DMV to do data matching for unemployment claims as part of their fraud protection work. There is now an existing relationship with DMV and these goals may be less of a hurdle. She shared that the Secretary of State has a requirement to do automatic voter registration, which will result in all state agencies sharing data with the Secretary of State. There may be a longer term data sharing strategy for the whole state to comply.

**Ms. Cafferata** clarified that the meeting with the DMV would not occur with the entire Committee, as per open meeting requirements. The last time a meeting was held, a group of technical individuals got together for discussion. She was the only Committee member involved in the meeting.

## 11. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ONLY - INTRODUCTION AND UPDATE FROM GOWINN - DATA NEEDS AND REPORTS

**Ms. Young** provided the update and addressed the replacement of Mr. Zach. The candidate should have a very strong understanding of the data and the system, have strong people skills and relationship building. They should be able to sell the power of the system and the state's goals for utilization. The recruitment period has just closed with four applicants. Interviews should commence in the next couple of weeks, with hiring planned for February, 2022.

GOWINN has a focus on NPWR with a goal to be as supportive as possible. Nevada will be benefiting from national expertise in regards to improving the state's use of data in the education, workforce and life outcomes for Nevadans. In conjunction with its partnership with the National

Governor's Association (NGA), Nevada is part of the Workforce Innovation Network and is provided access to experts from an organization called Mayer and Mayer. They will assist Nevada with planning and coordination of use of data to assist those at the policy and programmatic levels improve efforts in enhancing education, workforce training and integrated social services. Experts from Mayer and Mayer will survey Nevada's needs and wants for better data utilization and visualization. They will provide examples of best practices of integrated data systems from other states and make recommendations on effective use of the data. The plan is to obtain input from Committee members, those who use data for policy, budget purposes, programmatic and case management to benefit clients in education, workforce and social services and those who use data for research on long-term trends and outcomes. A survey will be distributed to solicit input. Mayer and Mayer will analyze the survey data and compile examples of relevant best practices from other states in terms of data systems, visualization, training and use. Once the data is complete, a meeting will be held to solicit input on the findings and recommendations.

**Ms. Young** stated that Nevada has been selected by the National Skills Coalition to participate in their academy. GOWINN has been working closely with other state agencies in this process, which looks at short-term credentialing at certification programs available in the state. There may be potential to capture this information within the NPWR system, as this would provide valuable data on individuals who do not attend formal postsecondary education but are obtaining training to move into the workforce. GOWINN is also working closely with the Department of Labor's Research and Evaluation Team. Goals include better utilization of data and communication between title programs.

## 12. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ONLY - GOWINN FUNDING FOR ONBOARDING

**Ms. Young** stated that conversations are ongoing with NDE and DWSS in regards to early childcare. There are also a number of upcoming meetings including with the Corrections director and executive staff in terms of workforce and possibility of data availability and integration. Communications continue with the Veteran's Committee in regards to workforce. There are efforts to identify opportunities to develop the most robust data system possible.

**Ms. Olsen** commented that in terms of DWSS and reports for WIOA, an important area of reporting is barriers to employment. Segments of the barrier component fall under DWSS, including foster care, low income status and similar factors and it is vitally important to have the ability to identify these individuals.

**Chair Meyer** commented that the Department of Education already has an agreement with DWSS regarding the sharing of information. Every two weeks, DBDriven performs a match for the Department of Education with DWSS. This includes SNAP, TANF and Medicaid eligibility data. That information is written into Infinite Campus, so that all districts have up to date information regarding student eligibility for programs. They would like to begin sharing the information with NPWR, in order to identify students who have been eligible for assistance programs. There is the potential to expose this data to NPWR and discussions have been undertaken. Remaining topics for resolution include how the data will be used.

In response to a question from **Ms. Olsen**, **Chair Meyer** confirmed that it is possible to expand the DWSS up to 99. **Ms. Olsen** suggested exploring the inclusion of Title IV vocational rehabilitation data. **Ms. Young** agreed that having the data is crucial, as many students would not identify themselves as needing additional help. Most of the work taking place in the state at this time involves a human-centered, holistic approach to services. **Chair Meyer** added that there is also a



data exchange with DCFS to identify students who have been adjudicated into foster care. There is a current task force looking at the population of foster kids that are attending higher ed in Nevada and how they can improve services for these youth. Challenges include identification of such students. By the time they enter higher education, they have aged out of the foster system. Many do not want to identify as having been in foster care. Oftentimes these students have had IEP-structured education; it would be very helpful for higher ed to have access to this information. **Ms. Olsen** commented that having been in foster care and/or aging out of foster the foster care system is another barrier to employment.

### 13. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ONLY - DB DRIVEN UPDATE

**Mr. Moebus** provided a historical overview of NPWR:

- Request for Information (RFI) solicited in 2013
- Request for Proposal (RFP) issued in 2013
- Award issued in Spring 2014
- Project began May 1, 2014
- Project Go-Live in Summer 2015
- SSRS reports upgraded to PowerBI in 2016 and 2017
- Provides 11 public report and 1 private report
  - Public: Act Benchmark, average wage by County and others; Adult education dashboard (pending)
  - Private: CTE
- Matches
  - Biweekly & monthly matches for DCFS and DWSS to NDE
  - Annual match
  - Future discussion: Quarterly match for AE and DETR
  - Future discussion: Additional NDE to NSHE matches
- Research portal utilization

**Ms. Olsen** directed a comment to Ms. Young, stating that the possibility of a quarterly match with DETR may require a small budget consideration of a few thousand dollars.

### 14. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ONLY - REPORT STATUS

**Mr. Moebus** gave an overview of the current report refresh status:

- Currently in test
- Includes new dashboard for AE - This dashboard can be published separately if uses are identified that require network
- NSHE approved publish to production
- Pends approval from remaining stakeholders
- Approval deadline discussion - Recommended January 31

**Mr. Moebus** addressed another component of the current report refresh status evolution, the production of the adult education dashboard.

**Ms. Young** asked for clarification that the reports being run are just from the data pulled from state agencies. **Mr. Moebus** confirmed this understanding.

**Ms. Cafferata** addressed the contract, noting that typically, state contracts are four years with a renewal of four years. If this follows the typical state RFP requirements, a new RFP or sole source approval should be pending soon. **Chair Meyer** said he was not aware of being in the final year of the contract. **Mr. Boersma** stated that the four-year contract ended June 30, 2021 and is now in an O&M contract on a time and material basis as of July 1 of last year. **Ms. Young** stated that GOWINN will follow up on this.

In terms of the status of reports, **Chair Meyer** noted that there was a recommendation to have validations back to DBDriven no later than January 31st. There was no opposition expressed and it was noted for the record that the deadline for validation for approval of reports is January 31, 2022.

## 15. SECOND PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

ADJOURNMENT – The March 7, 2022 meeting was adjourned.

Notice of this meeting was posted on or before 9 a.m. on the third day prior to the meeting at the Grant Sawyer State Building 1st Floor Lobby at 555 E. Washington Ave., Las Vegas, NV 89101

OWINN's Public Meetings website - [http://owinn.nv.gov/GWDB/GWDB\\_Workforce\\_Meetings/](http://owinn.nv.gov/GWDB/GWDB_Workforce_Meetings/) and Nevada's Public Notice website at <https://notice.nv.gov/>, as required by [NRS 232.2175](#).

Supporting public material provided to Committee members for this meeting is posted on GOWINN's Website at: [https://gowinn.nv.gov/GWDB/GWDB\\_Workforce\\_Meetings/](https://gowinn.nv.gov/GWDB/GWDB_Workforce_Meetings/) and may be requested from: Chelsea Galvan at 555 E. Washington Ave. Ste. 4900, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101; or call (702) 486-8080