NPWR Advisory Committee

MEETING MINUTES

P-20W Research Data System Advisory Committee Meeting

Meeting is subject to the provisions of the Nevada Open Meeting Law – NRS 241.020

Name of Organization:	Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation for a New Nevada (OWINN) - P-20W Research Data System Advisory Committee
Date and Time of Meeting:	May 22nd, 2018 at 9:30 A.M.
Place of Meeting:	Nevada Department of Education Board Room 700 E. Fifth Street; Carson City, NV 89701 Conference Line: (888) 363-4735 Participant Code: 9319340

Committee Members Present: Mary Harmon, Linda Heiss, Glenn Meyer

Others Present: Will Goldschmidt (DBDriven), Sarah Echo (NSHE), Tuhin Verma (NDE), Daniel Boersma (DBDriven), Paul Durado (DBDriven)

I. CALL TO ORDER & WELCOME
Linda Heiss, Chair

Linda Heiss: Meeting called to order at 9:30am. Welcome to the second NPWR Advisory Committee meeting. Zach, would you please call roll.

Zachary Heit: Yes, chair.

II. ROLL CALL - CONFIRMATION OF A QUORUM
Zachary Heit, Senior Economist, OWINN

Zachary Heit called roll and confirmed there was a quorum present (Glenn Meyer via telephone).

III. VERIFICATION OF PUBLIC POSTING
Zachary Heit, Senior Economist, OWINN

Zachary Heit affirmed that the notice and agenda for this May 22, 2018 P-20W Research Data System Advisory Committee Meeting were posted according to Nevada's Open Meeting Law pursuant to NRS. 241.020.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT(S)

(Public Comment will be taken regarding any item appearing on the agenda. No action may be taken on a matter discussed under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. The Chair of the P-20W Research Data System Advisory Committee will impose a time limit of three minutes. Public Comment #2 will provide an opportunity for public comment on any matter within the Committee's jurisdiction or advisory power.)

The first public comment session was announced by the Chair, Linda Heiss, and after reading the statement above into the record, the public was invited to speak. No comments were made. Hearing none, the Chair closed the session and proceeded to the next agenda item.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Information/Discussion; For Possible Action)
Linda Heiss, Chair

Linda Heiss asked Committee members if they had an opportunity to review the February 12, 2018 NPWR Advisory Committee Meeting minutes. A motion was made to approve the minutes and the agenda by Mary Harmon. It was seconded by Linda Heiss. All were in favor; none were opposed. The motion was carried unanimously.

VI. NPWR STATUS UPDATE (Information/Discussion)
Will Goldschmidt, Project Manager, DBDriven

Linda Heiss: Will Goldschmidt is here to present an update on the status of NPWR from DBDriven.

Will Goldschmidt: Good morning, everybody. It's a pleasure to be back. So, we're going to run through the status update meeting today. I want to give an update on where we are through the fiscal year, do an annual recap, and talk about some report development and where we are and what we've got going on. Any questions about the agenda for today? No? Alright.

First, we'll run through the budget and talk about what we've completed and the status of operation and maintenance. Then a deliverable update and then the FY19 priorities. I've got a slide in the presentation, but I think there will be an agenda item to walk through as well.

I've broken this down into the two components of the contract. There's a firm fixed price portion. We're right on track with that portion. We've invoiced all the way through April. With May and June left, that's 17% of the contract left. So the FFP is exactly where it should be to date. For the T&M portion, the authorization was for \$237, 655. We have billed through April 30th for a total of \$189, 797. That leaves about \$47,858 left. On our current pace, we do expect to have some current funds at the end of the fiscal year. We do not expect to consume 100% of the funding. We're working with Zach on the priorities that Nevada would like to have for the remaining work that we have before we close out the year.

So, Paulo is working on getting all the projects done by the end of the year. I'll have a better update probably around first of June, maybe first week in June on what the leftover might look like. But, we're in a good place. You can see that 17% is where we should have been and we're at 20%, so we're just slightly behind the burn rate that was expected. And considering when we started, I think we've done really well.

So, where does that bring us for the year? This is our status report update. We have delivered a total of eight reports for FY18. We currently still have three reports in progress: Most Common Degree Report, Positive Deviance Report, and the ROI Report.

Our system uptime is easily above 99.6% because 99.63% is the lowest number we have had to date through the FY, so I know it's above that. We're working on a current redesign of the website right now. I have a slide coming up on that. We've closed out 17 bugs within the system. Many of them you would not know were there, but we've identified them in our testing and we've gone back and resolved those. And we've applied just short of 600 patches to date to the 26 servers that support the NPWR application.

Our priorities remain the Power BI reports. The next milestone we have is the monthly status report for May. We're currently working on the OWINN logo update and the agency links update and potentially some color palette work. Are there any questions about the annual recap?

Hearing none, this is just a quick review of the reports that we have had on the schedule for FY18 and the status of each. The ACT Benchmark is in production. Average Wage by Industry is in production. Wage by Education Level in production. Most Common Degree we expect to be ready for your review towards the end of this month or early/first week in June for sure, and then in production by June 15th. CCR went out in March and it's complete. The Remedial and Development, we cancelled the report. We didn't end up developing it after our last trip. Student Completion and Workforce Part One went out in March, Part Two went out in April. Positive Deviance, we've done everything we can do and we're ready to show it. This is an amazing report. It's very much like the Education Dashboard report in how you can drill into the numbers. So, I think while we're here we want to demo that report on where it sits along with the STEM report for which we have an update. Then we can get final approvals while we're here and we can push to production before we leave, or we'll have it ready as we roll in on Monday. STEM Dashboard just got a green light to push to test this morning, so we think we've got your titles resolved. We've got the titles all fitting on those. We are working on the new ROI report and there have been some changes. There was a decision to pull the cost of living calculations out, which should speed up the work and simplify the report.

So, we've made some updates to the NPWR website. I don't really have much to say to this. We shrank the size of the OWINN logo and reordered the agency links.

So, I have just a couple of other non-reporting items. The MSDN licenses were resolved. We did get the licenses from NDE. We're still on schedule to replace the Logi XML software in the summer. So that means that Logi XML license fee will go away. We're replacing it with .net code that we're building, which will make the architecture of the system simpler. It'll be easier to maintain, and it reduces your annual licensing costs. So, it's a win-win, I believe, for both of us.

Mary Harmon: Do you know when those licenses are up?

Will Goldschmidt: I believe it is July 1st because I believe it technically started when we went into production on July 1, 2015. But I'm not 100% percent. That's a great question, Mary. I'm not 100% positive on that.

Mary Harmon: So, are we going to have to renew it?

Will Goldschmidt: No. I don't think so.

Mary Harmon: If they don't renew the Logi, and they want to use money for reports, are we going to have to go to Board of Examiners to move it to a different category?

Tuhin Verma: No. The money is in the correct category.

Mary Harmon: Ok, because I know sometimes that software renewals are in a different category than your contracts and if we wanted to take that money, and I don't know how much it is, then you would have to get approval to move money to a different category.

Zachary Heit: So, it was justified to use that budget category for the contract amendment projects because the services that were being provided were using a software component that was approved, so we've been using that money for the report updates.

Will Goldschmidt: So, last updates. I don't really have any updates on data or onboarding. The only piece of data that I am keenly aware of that we do need is the non-high school graduate information from NDE to close out the Positive Deviance report, otherwise Positive Deviance is done, and it looks really good. It's amazing. I'm just going to say, comparing it to a usability standard, it is so much easier, so much simpler to use than our previous report. So, I think that wraps up our update.

VII. COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH AGENDA (Information/Discussion; For Possible Action)
Linda Heiss, Chair
Zachary Heit, Senior Economist, OWINN

Linda Heiss: We'll move on to talking about the collaborative research agenda. I have some notes on these suggested reports. So, walk down the list report by report.

Zachary Heit: Yes. The intention of the table that all of you have is a list of potential reports that this committee can consider and rank by priority so that if there is money available for new report development, this research agenda would be available to move quickly on. Development of a collaborative research agenda is also a duty that this committee has been tasked with so that in the future when we're building a budget or considering grant opportunities, this committee will have recommended certain reports and this agenda can be considered when pursuing those activities.

So, Linda if you have some notes so if want to start the discussion? Also, this is an agenda item for possible action, so if we do get a list of rankings on these reports, or if there's additional items we want to add to it or wish to remove, we can finalize the notes and this committee can vote to approve the research agenda or we can table it and consider all comments and notes to prepare a more final list for future consideration.

Linda Heiss: So, starting with some of the notes I took, on the Veteran's Report, NSHE does have veterans data flagged. Basically, we have a veteran, yes or no, flag. The problem I see with using NSHE data is the report wants to look at veteran's earnings within an industry. If we do it based on NSHE data, we only have earnings for individuals who attended NSHE. And I think that would be kind of misleading in that there are probably a lot of veterans in industries where no post-secondary education is required. So, I think we need to somehow get the veterans data and not use the NSHE data there. So, I would recommend that we amend the data availability note by taking NSHE off. I know the Veterans' Office wants to do veterans reporting. They've indicated as much to us. So, if there's even a way for them to come up with a list of veterans statewide, but I'm not sure how well organized their data is.

Will Goldschmidt: If I may interject, we can take any files that they can give us with just name and date of birth, and within the NPWR system, we could then flag everybody that we have inside the system and match it to that data.

Mary Harmon: Veterans' Affairs does not currently have a system. They are currently trying to get one and they don't have an automated system.

Linda Heiss: Yeah, I think they have excel spreadsheets, but I think what Will is saying is that they could take the spreadsheets. But I think we would not only want to flag everyone that is already in the system but start a whole new table because I bet there are a lot of veterans that aren't in our system.

Will Goldschmidt: So, I'm thinking we are creating a whole new table in that we're essentially creating a dataset of every known veteran in Nevada. And we're using that to flag our ETL. We are open to meeting with Veteran Affairs. If we can get their data in any form, then we can create a table.

Linda Heiss: I believe it's Kat Miller that heads that office. If we can set up a meeting, we can discuss data and this report, then we can figure out where to go from there.

The Disabilities Report we absolutely cannot access disability data. I cannot access disability data. It is completely protected under HIPPA. So, that one has got to come off.

Will Goldschmidt: Is that because it falls into the HIPPA category?

Linda Heiss: Yes.

The AP and Dual Enrollment Report, NSHE has already done a dual enrollment report. It's already up on the NSHE site. Sara did that. It would be easy for us to replicate that with an AP version, so we will just assign that to us (NSHE) and we can put that on our list to do.

I think the Apprenticeship Report should probably go to the top of the list, because I cannot tell you how many times I am getting asked for apprenticeship stuff. That's one of the most popular topics out there.

Zachary Heit: Just background on that. So, OWINN is the State Apprenticeship Administrator (SAA) office with the State Apprenticeship Director and we help with the State Apprenticeship Council. With that data, we are exploring and discussing with the Department of Labor, to see how we might be able to export data out of RAPIDS, their registered apprenticeship database. We are trying to see if we can use the data from RAPIDS to put into the NPWR system and creating a report out of it. It is a report being pushed by our office and we're trying to get a lot of stakeholder engagement, so that's probably why you're getting a lot of questions about apprenticeship.

Glenn Meyer: I'll second that too from an NDE perspective. So, with work-based learning is a big thing coming up. New graduation requirements allow for work-based learning. Also, dual enrollment and CTE. I think those three are the big three at least from the K-12 perspective.

Linda Heiss: And that brings up a point I was going to bring up later. NDE wants to identify CTE kids who are dual enrolled and CTE kids who are enrolled in CTE courses. And I explained to them that they actually already have the course level data in SAIN and they can see it. The problem is that it is not consistently numbered or consistently labeled, so literally have to go through all of it. I did that with math, but this is a much broader list of courses now. I had asked Zach to add to the list a CTE/Dual Enroll and a CTE Course Enrollment report that we can automate for the CTE people to use. Because they're coming to me, but they already have the data, so let's set it up for you to do it.

Glenn Meyer: Yeah, the problem like you said is that data is not standard so it's different in every district and those course names and course numbers are all different. So, it would be very difficult. So, what we're doing, is we're also embarking on a project to standardize all of our course codes. We're starting with CTE and we'll add these dual credit courses as well, so we'll have an easy way to identify them statewide. But we don't have the ability to do that right now. So, we are hoping by next school year, the 2019-20 school year, we're hoping to implement those standard course codes for those dual enrollment courses. Which will then allow us to then pull it right out of SAIN or out of Infinite Campus. But we're not quite there yet. We are relying on your information for now.

Linda Heiss: Our information is also in the SLDS. So, you guys can access NSHE data in the SLDS.

Glenn Meyer: Right. And what I haven't had a chance to ask you yet is dual enrollment a data element that is in SLDS now?

Linda Heiss: No. So, what we would have to do, and this was the report I was thinking of, you guys would have to add a CTE flag into your data that you're uploading to the SLDS because at this point there is no way for us to identify who is a CTE student, so we can't even start the report until that is done. Once we do that we can link those CTE students to the NSHE data, and identify who was taken a course at NSHE prior to graduation and just in the reporting, assign them a Y flag. And then if they wanted specific courses, to know if this was a CTE course at NSHE, we can come up with a secondary report where we say, "Ok, we've identified these courses as CTE courses and so we want a list of what students took one of those courses." And we can do that all within the SLDS. It's just a matter of writing the code so the system pulls it and flags it however we want to.

Glenn Meyer: Ok.

Linda Heiss: I don't know where that is on the priority, but I think that would be a really simple report to do. But the first thing you would have to do is get us the CTE flag because we can't do anything until we have the CTE flag.

Glenn Meyer: Ok. And that's an easy lift.

Will Goldschmidt: Glenn, I think we might be able to help you with the dual enrollment flag, because we've created a couple of scripts that allow us to look at graduation, enrollment and we could run a script that could identify high school students who are in the NSHE system prior to their graduation, and we could just set the flag. We have a students table that we could just set that flag in, for every high school student anyways. I think we could do that in the 99 percentile.

Linda Heiss: Yeah. And then if their CTE people identify specific courses they want to know they were enrolled in, then that could be a secondary piece.

Will Goldschmidt: Absolutely. We could do some group forcing where we just go through and if there's a way to extract it out of a name or we could just…

Linda Heiss: Well no, you could just directly link to NSHE.

Will Goldschmidt: Not for CTE though.

Linda Heiss: Yeah, because if a student is flagged as CTE in the regular data that comes from NDE then we already have them matched, then you say, "Ok, these kids that have a CTE flag in the NDE data, were they enrolled in an NSHE course linking the NSHE enrollment for any term less than any term they graduated in." That's why we need NDE to set the flag then we could do that easy.

Isn't there already a CTE flag in SAIN, Glenn?

Glenn Meyer: Yes. We can send the CTE flag. That's a piece of cake.

Linda Heiss: And then the last note that I had was Financial Aid Breakdown. I think that's a report that NSHE is going to have to do and we can do it. The Feds recently came out with a mandate about financial aid data and so we are trying to determine if the act of de-identifying that data can get us around that mandate regarding privacy. But, we can also do this report which also eliminates the need for a work around. So, we'll (NSHE) just take that one on.

Then the K-12 Diploma Type Report we already do that one.

Zachary Heit: So, I have a working table here, and going through all the notes real quick. Veterans Report that will be a discussion between Linda, myself, and Kat Miller and I can set that up. We'll get something scheduled to discuss that report.

Then, the CTE Report. There's a general CTE Report idea, but in order to start that NDE would have to set a CTE flag and send it into the SLDS. And then a piece of that will be a Dual Enrollment component.

Linda Heiss: And then another piece of that would be post-secondary enrollment after graduation in CTE.

Zachary Heit: Ok. So, kind of confirming that they go from CTE to CTE. Are we looking to make a focus of that component to look at CTE students and see if they're continuing into post-secondary education with the CTE specialty/focus?

Linda Heiss: We'll have to pull Patrick into that discussion because I'm not sure what their federal reporting requirements are. I think it's basically just reporting if they continue CTE enrollment after graduation.

Zachary Heit: Ok. Because I can foresee a situation where you would want to look at a student taking the IT course sequence in high school and if they're a completer, wanting to see if they continue IT studies and course work into post-secondary.

Glenn Meyer: I think the real value in this data is once you can get down to the course level or at least the discipline, just providing the CTE flag is a good first step. We will have to eventually tie that CTE flag to some standard course information about what CTE courses that student took in high school to see if they entered that similar field in higher ed.

Zachary Heit: Ok. Then the Disabilities Report was a no. Nothing was mentioned about the High School Behavioral Report. Is there interest in that?

Linda Heiss: I don't think from the NSHE standpoint there is.

Glenn Meyer: Yeah. I think this is from a K-12 education perspective. I think this report might be a little premature. We're going to have much more robust data on this in the next year or two when we start we some of the new data collections we're doing with the expulsions and the chronic absenteeism. So, I think we're just a little ahead of the game right now for that one.

Zachary Heit: So, it's looking like at the moment it is something being handled internally at NDE right now, and possibly in the future it might be something interesting to connect to longitudinal research if desired.

Will Goldschmidt: So Glenn, what I was thinking along that report was, I know internally, you have all the behavioral information already, and you're already running internal NDE reports on behavioral pieces. I was thinking that at some point, particularly if we get the DMV data, that we would run that same time of report but more from the perspective of longitudinal for all the kids that were high school, that had from 0 to whatever behavioral issues…looking at the long-term outcomes of those issues. So, looking at what point is the tipping point of where they're not likely to go to NSHE, but also they're not likely to any type of CTE training following on, or comparing their average wages. It's about better understanding what is the long-term effect of those behavioral flags, whether it's absenteeism, expulsion, etc.

Glenn Meyer: I agree that that is valuable information, but the only thing is that we only have a few things on behavior that we collect right now. We have attendance, so we could look at that. We could also use suspensions and expulsions, because we collect that right now also. And then incidents involving weapons or drugs, so we have the information. But that's pretty much it from a bucket perspective. Not that that's not valuable. I think that would be very valuable. I just think that we will have more granular behavior types or incidents that we could then correlate to outcomes in the future. But I don't have any opposition to doing that right now with what we currently collect, but I think it's a lower priority than the CTE and dual credit reports.

Zachary Heit: Ok. Moving onto the Financial Aid Breakdown Report. It sounded like NSHE was doing that. Then the AP/Dual Enrollment Report. So, the Dual Enrollment Report is done/completed and then possibly looking at adding AP data.

Linda Heiss: And NSHE will do that.

Zachary Heit: Ok. Apprenticeship Report was listed as one of the high priorities.

I didn't hear anything regarding the General Assembly Members Report. To provide some background, in order to get some more engagement from legislators with NPWR, it might be of interest to do a report that looks at education outcomes filtered down to assembly and senate districts. That way they can use NPWR to pull up their district information and find even more value in the system. At a best practices conference on SLDS, Michigan demoed a GIS visualization that filtered down to legislative districts because there was interest in doing that. We would just have to map all the schools to a legislative district and make an Education Dashboard type of report with those filters.

Linda Heiss: Yeah. That would be cool.

Zachary Heit: And then the Career Earning Report.

Linda Heiss: We get asked for that a lot.

Zachary Heit: Ok.

Will Goldschmidt: Is that the 2, 3, 5 year earnings report?

Linda Heiss: Yes.

Will Goldschmidt: I think we are actually close to having that wrapped into our ROI report. We are a lot closer to that report than we may have thought. It's not its own report since it is wrapped into the ROI report, but all those elements are basically in there.

Linda Heiss: Yeah. Because every time I present that report, Workforce Part II, they say, "Don't you have in five and ten years?"

Will Goldschmidt: So, obviously that's an issue of the data. We have the five and ten-year data, but the cohorts won't match up until later down the line. You may have the two year earnings for someone that just recently graduated, but you won't have 3 and 5 and 10 year data until much later.

Zachary Heit: Ok, and the K-12 Diploma Type Report is already done.

It's not on this list, but I wanted to add to the discussion. We had a meeting with Bob Potts from the Governor's Office of Economic Development. We talked about updating the Supply and Demand Report with GOED In-Demand Occupation projections.

Linda Heiss: We already did.

Zachary Heit: Is that with GOED's projections or with DETR's?

Linda Heiss: We did the ranking. We asked for his projections file and what he gave us were the DETR projections and the GOED rankings. Since we already had the DETR projections we added the GOED rankings to our report.

Zachary Heit: Can we set up a call with Bob and we discuss that as well?

Linda Heiss: Yes.

Zachary Heit: Ok. Good.

Linda Heiss: The issue with that is part of the Supply and Demand Report is to let our students know what the demand is and what they can make in an industry. He's looking at it from the workforce side, we have to look at it providing comprehensive data to the student and to the departments that are developing the programs. So, just because the Governor says I want this to be our number one industry, doesn't mean the jobs are there yet, so we can't tell our students, "Get a degree in this, because the Governor wants that to be the number one industry." So, there's a bit of a conflict there and so we have to bare that in mind, that we have to give them an honest picture and what's going on in the market versus what we want to have happen when you graduate.

Zachary Heit: So is it possible to develop or use that report, and part of this might be part of the discussion with Bob and create one that meets the needs of the workforce perspective. One that lists out the in-demand occupations and lets us know how close the state is to closing the gap in meeting the projected growth and how much progress there's been over time.

Linda Heiss: So, what we did, and this is probably what Bob is looking for, and again, it's not specifically based on just his list. We took every single occupation in the state, mapped it to the degree programs, and so now we have a report that hasn't gone public yet. It will go public in June at the Board meeting. I'll present it there. It basically says here are all the occupations in the state. Here is the demand both statewide and regionally. So you can sort it by Vegas, you could pull it by Reno, Carson City, you can do statewide. Here is the number of graduates from NSHE, and it's by institution and statewide. So, if you've looking at the Vegas filter, you can see how many UNLV and CSN grads there were. Or if you're looking at statewide, you can see the total. Then how many stayed in the state. So, for nursing, 68% stayed in the state. So, if the demand is this, we graduated this many, this is how any stayed, here's what NSHE provided to that occupation. So, I think that's exactly what Bob needs. Then we took his list and cut all the occupations for which NSHE doesn't have any programs. Things like dealers, waitresses, service workers, etc. We made a top ten that actually require some post-secondary education, and we highlighted those. So those we have an actual chart, it's a bar chart, that explains how much of the demand we are meeting on Bob's list. So, we're basically done with that, but we just haven't taken it live yet.

Zachary Heit: Awesome. Would you be able to talk to him about it?

Linda Heiss: Yes. I can demo it for him. I just can't take it live yet.

Zachary Heit: I think the next step, is going through the table provided, adding those notes, and ranking the reports on the agenda as high priority. Like I said earlier, this might be something we table since we have some discussions planned with other partners, but…

Linda Heiss: Although I think we can easily set the priorities. The Apprenticeship Reports, the CTE Report, I think we could fairly, comfortably prioritize those toward the top. Even though some of these have notes, they would still not be on the top.

Zachary Heit: So, the three, maybe four reports that this committee can currently rank as a priority on this list are the Apprenticeship Report, the CTE Reporting, the General Assembly Members report, and the I guess the Career Earnings Report, but I guess that one was discussed as rolling that into the ROI Report?

Will Goldschmidt: It's in the ROI Report as a visualization, but I probably think that I can stand on its own and if we like what we see from the sample, we can push to make it its own report. From there, we could add more robust visualizations around it. Where on the ROI Report it exists as just one visualization.

Zachary Heit: Is that something that we could note as "For future consideration upon review of the ROI Report?"

Linda Heiss: I think it could stand on its own too. I would almost say just bump it to its own report. We get a lot of people asking for that.

Zachary Heit: The next step is, do we want to set a ranking for the four reports or just say those are the four priorities?

Linda Heiss: Maybe just say those are the four priorities.

Mary Harmon: Will, do you need them to be ranked?

Will Goldschmidt: No. We could work with that. We know those are the top four. So, we'll use what we've got in data availability and work from there.

Zachary Heit: So, this committee could list them and the process of developing these reports would depend on data availability and timeline, where one report might be able to get started right away while we're waiting for other elements to get finished, such as the CTE flag?

Linda Heiss: So, I'll entertain a motion to approve the research agenda with the four reports marked as priorities: Apprenticeship Report, CTE Report, General Assembly Members Report, and the Career Earnings Report. Also, approving the research agenda with the notes from this discussion added to the document.

Mary Harmon made the motion and was seconded by Glenn Meyer. The motion passed unanimously.

VIII. DATA PARTNER PLANNING UPDATE (Information/Discussion)
Linda Heiss, Chair
Zachary Heit, Senior Economist, OWINN

Linda Heiss: Next is the data partner planning update. Zach.

Zachary Heit: Ok. We'll be providing an update on the data partner planning. Tuhin Verma is here as well to discuss it. We had a meeting yesterday to update where we're at. We're looking at three partner planning projects. The major being the DMV data, the ETPL list, and the Adult Education piece.

Tuhin Verma: So, for the DMV data, we are planning to meet with them soon. Zach sent me some documentation from Minnesota where they have been successful in getting DMV data. So, I'm putting together documents and I will send it to all of you.

Mary Harmon: Minnesota or Michigan?

Tuhin Verma: Minnesota.

Mary Harmon: Because Michigan is another state…

Tuhin Verma: The one he sent was from Minnesota. He got it from the last conference that we had attended in the past a few months ago.

Zachary Heit: Right. So, at the SLDS Best Practices Conference in DC back in March, I was able to meet with one of the workforce reps from Minnesota and when describing our data partner planning efforts to bring DMV on board and its issues, they mentioned that they had actually resolved theirs and gotten DMV data as a link for their matching process. So, she sent some documents to me. One was a presentation that was a justification for using DMV data. Then she sent some of the working documents that allowed them to do the link with DMV data. I think what Tuhin is saying is he used that as a model and drafted a similar document for Nevada and our purposes.

Tuhin Verma: So, next week we are going to meet with DMV and talk to them about how other states have been able to get data and see what it would take for them to move forward with the onboarding process.

Mary Harmon: Is it the model similar to Michigan where we send the data over to the DMV and they do the match for us?

Tuhin Verma: It's not that model. It is a little different. We'll have multiple options for DMV. We just have to find the best way to get the data.

Mary Harmon: Ok.

Will Goldschmidt: We can do that. It just depends if they want us to do the match or if they want to do the match.

Tuhin Verma: So, that's the DMV data update. For the ETPL, I believe Linda, you and NSHE have a way to collect the data?

Linda Heiss: Yes. We can use the existing templates.

Tuhin Verma: So, we can proceed with that quickly. We can at least start the process. So, you can upload that data into the NSHE warehouse and send the data for matching.

Will Goldschmidt: This is the training provider data?

Tuhin Verma: Yes.

Zachary Heit: So, is that communicated to the ETPL providers?

Mary Harmon: Not yet. We were just in the infancy basically.

Tuhin Verma: And the adult education data was supposed to move under DETR, but it is now staying with NDE.

Mary Harmon: And if I remember correctly, they really don't have a system.

Tuhin Verma: They don't use the education system. They have their own siloed system.

Mary Harmon: The data they probably have is excel or something.

Linda Heiss: Do we want to add the Veterans to the data partner planning category or do we want to wait until we know what we're doing?

Zachary Heit: We can add them maybe after the discussion with Kat Miller and see where we're at.

Tuhin Verma: We had talked with Veterans Affairs before, and the problem before was that they didn't have a system. They were trying to build a system, but they didn't have money to build it. So, they don't know how long it's going to take to have a data system.

Linda Heiss: But they have records, right?

Tuhin Verma: They have records. But their ideal situation would be to have a data system which would give us the data.

Mary Harmon: The issue was that they thought we were going to perform the work and provide them a new system. They didn't have a system. We just wanted them to provide the data and they didn't have the data to provide to us.

Tuhin Verma: We could always add that to the list and check with them. We can always talk to them and find out where they are with their system.

Linda Heiss: And we could maybe take whatever records they have, spreadsheets, documents, and we loaded them and created a table, that may be a good first step. We could provide them a cleaner list if they let us put it in NPWR.

Will Goldschmidt: I would ask them to provide everything they've got and we could work with it, cleanse it, and give it back in a nice, clean format, that would be essentially your import.

Mary Harmon: The other thing is with these, we have to do data sharing agreements.

Zachary Heit: So, that's another thing Tuhin and I discussed. We have a data agreement drafted from 2015 and it just needs to be updated to include OWINN. It references the P-20W Council, which has since been abolished. So, it just needs to be cleaned up. We thought about presenting here as part of this agenda item, but it's just going to be better if we clean it up first and send it out for review. It's just not ready right now. The interlocal agreement, I think looks good.

Tuhin Verma: The only thing is we have to add the budget amount for NSHE.

Mary Harmon: Well, as soon as you start doing financial stuff it changes from a data sharing agreement to a contract. That needs to go in front of BOE.

Tuhin Verma: Yes. It's an interlocal agreement modeled off the same as DETR had it. It has a contract as the first part and then it has a scope of work, which has an attachment, which identifies the dollar amount.

Mary Harmon: So, I don't know if there's going to be financial implications with that, DMV, ETPL, Adult Ed, I don't know.

Zachary Heit: I'm thinking we'll just pursue what we currently have with the four agencies…

Mary Harmon: And keep tacking everybody on as they come along as a contract amendment.

Tuhin Verma: And this does not need to go before the full BOE, it's just an interlocal.

Mary Harmon: It depends on the amount. I think it's $30,000.

Zachary Heit: It's $50,000 and the way it was explained to me is that it is cumulative. So, we could have a contract amount at $50,000, and we write an amendment for $30,000, it goes before the full BOE because it's already reached that $50,000 threshold. So, we'll just need to talk to some people to find out the NSHE piece.

XIII. PUBLIC COMMENT (Information/Discussion)
(Public Comment will be taken regarding any item appearing on the agenda. No action may be taken on a matter discussed under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. The Chair of the Advisory Committee will impose a time limit of three minutes. Public Comment #2 provides an opportunity for public comment on any matter within the Committee's jurisdiction or advisory power.)

No public comment was given.

XVI. ADJOURNMENT (Information/Discussion)
Chair

Meeting adjourned at 10:46am.

NOTE (1): Persons with disabilities who require special accommodations or assistance at the meeting should notify Joan Finlay, OWINN, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. through 5:00 p.m., in writing at 555 East Washington Ave, Ste. 4900; or call (702) 486-8080 on or before the close of business, Friday, May 18, 2018.

NOTE (2): Agenda items may be taken out of order, combined for consideration by the public body, and/or pulled or removed from the agenda at any time. The Chair may continue this meeting from day-to-day. Pursuant to NRS 241.020, no action may be taken upon a matter raised during a period devoted to comments by the general public until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.

NOTE (3): All comments will be limited to 3 minutes per speaker. Comment based on viewpoint may not be restricted. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under the public comment period unless the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an action item. Prior to the commencement and conclusion of a contested case or quasi-judicial proceeding that may affect the due process of individuals, the Board may refuse to consider public comment. See NRS 233b.126

NOTE (4): Please provide the secretary with electronic or written copies of testimony and visual presentations if you wish to have complete versions included as exhibits with the minutes.

NOTE (5): Supporting public material provided to members for this meeting is posted on OWINN's website at gov.nv.gov/OWINN/ and may be requested from the Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation (OWINN) at 555 E. Washington Avenue, Ste. 4900, Las Vegas, Nevada 89104 or by calling Joan Finlay at 702-486-8080.

NOTE (6): NOTICE OF THIS MEETING WAS FAXED, E-MAILED, OR HAND DELIVERED FOR POSTING TO THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS:
Notice of this meeting was posted at the following locations on or before 9:00 a.m. on the third working day before the meeting: DETR, 2800 E. St. Louis, Las Vegas, NV; DETR, 500 East Third St., Carson City, NV; DETR, 1325 Corporate Blvd., Reno NV; NEVADA JOBCONNECT, 3405 S. Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas, NV; NEVADA JOBCONNECT, 4500 E. Sunset Road, Henderson, NV; NEVADA JOBCONNECT, 2827 N. Las Vegas Blvd., North Las Vegas, NV; NEVADA JOBCONNECT, 1929 N. Carson St., Carson City, NV; NEVADA JOBCONNECT, 172 Sixth St., Elko, NV; NEVADA JOBCONNECT, 480 Campton St., Ely, NV; NEVADA JOBCONNECT, 121 Industrial Way, Fallon, NV; NEVADA JOBCONNECT, 475 W. Haskell, #1, Winnemucca, NV; NEVADA JOBCONNECT, 4001 S. Virginia St., Suite G, Reno, NV; NEVADA JOBCONNECT, 2281 Pyramid Way, Sparks, NV; CAPITOL BUILDING, 101 N. Carson Street, Carson City, NV 89701; GRANT SAWYER OFFICE BUILDING, 555 E. Washington Ave., Las Vegas, NV; LEGISLATIVE BUILDING, 401 S. Carson St., Carson City, NV; NEVADAWORKS 6490 S. McCarran Blvd., Building A, Unit 1., Reno, NV; WORKFORCE CONNECTIONS, 6330 W. Charleston Blvd., Las Vegas, NV. This agenda was also posted on the internet through OWINN's website at gov.nv.gov/OWINN/.