

**STATE OF NEVADA**  
**NPWR ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
555 E. WASHINGTON AVE, SUITE 4900  
LAS VEGAS, NV 89101  
T: (702) 486-8080

**STEVE SISOLAK**  
GOVERNOR



**GLENN MEYER**  
CHAIR

The meeting is subject to the provisions of the Nevada Open Meeting Law – [NRS 241.020](#)

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| <b>PUBLIC ENTITY:</b>  | <b>Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation (GOWINN) - P-20W<br/>Research Data System Advisory Committee (NPWR)</b>   |
| <b>DATE AND TIME:</b>  | <b>Thursday, October 13, 2022, at 2:00 PM</b>  |
| <b>LOCATION:</b>       | <b>North:</b><br>755 N. Roop Street, Suite 201 - Conference Room<br>Carson City, NV 89701<br><br><b>South:</b><br>2080 E. Flamingo Rd., Suite 210 - Bristelcone Conference Rm.<br>Las Vegas, NV 89119  |
| <b>TELECONFERENCE:</b> | <b>1-669-444-9171</b><br><br><b>Meeting ID: 820 8057 3104</b><br><br><b>ZOOM LINK:</b><br><br><a href="https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82080573104?pwd=TENhaldERnpxaIFUyeUpsSU13S01XQT09">https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82080573104?pwd=TENhaldERnpxaIFUyeUpsSU13S01XQT09</a><br><br>(Members of the public that wish to observe the meeting may access this link) |

## TRANSCRIPT

Chelsea Galvan: Start the recording. Perfect.

Nancy Olsen: Thank you.

Chair Meyer: Alright, everyone. Welcome to the NPWR Committee's meeting. And so, this is October 13, 2022, Nevada P20W Research Data System Advisory Committee meeting. I call this meeting to order. For the record, my name is Glenn Meyer. I'm the chairman of the NPWR Advisory Committee.

Just a reminder to everyone, if we could kindly request that if anyone who speaks today, please state your name first for the recording as we are recording the meeting today. Also, if you have a cellphone, I urge you to please mute that like I am doing right now. I'd appreciate that as well. Thank you, everyone. And we're using Zoom today and we're not in the room we're normally in. So, for individuals to speak, I'm not sure, I probably should have asked this first. Can everybody hear me okay?

Chantel Rundell: Yes.

Chair Meyer: Okay. Great. Because Nancy is our microphone today and she is at the far end of the table. So, I just wanted to make sure you can hear me. If -- if you are going to use your own mic on your computer, just let Nancy know so she can mute those so we don't get feedback across computers. With that, Ansara, if it is not -- yes, there she is.

Unknown: Just in time.

Chair Meyer: Just in the nick of time.

Ansara Martino: Oh, awesome.

Chair Meyer: Hi, again, Ansara. Would you mind taking roll call today, please, and confirm a quorum.

Ansara Martino: Oh, yes, sir. Glenn Meyer?

Chair Meyer: Here.

Ansara Martino: Lisa Levine?

Lisa Levine: Here.

Ansara Martino: Jose Martinez?

Jose Martinez: Here.

Ansara Martino: And Chantel Rundell?

Chantel Rundell: Here.

Ansara Martino: And the above numbers count for the quorum, and we do have a quorum, Mr. Chair. I also like to verify attendance for pending members, Nancy Olsen?

Nancy Olsen: Here.

Ansara Martino: Fred Wagar can't attend today. He had a conflict. Charles Daniels from Department of Corrections or his designee, and Margaret Chappel or her designee from DHHS. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ansara Martino from the Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation for the record. I, hereby, affirm that this October 13, 2022 NPWR P-20W Research Data System Advisory Committee [inaudible] has reached a quorum.

Chair Meyer: Great. Thank you, Ansara. Would you please verify the public posting for the meeting?

Ansara Martino: Certainly, sir. Ansara Martino again for the record with the Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation, I affirmed that the agenda and notice for this meeting was properly posted pursuant to Nevada's Open Meeting Law NRS 241.020.

Chair Meyer: Thank you. Okay. We'll continue on to the next agenda item, which is public comment. So, members of the public are invited to provide comment at this time. Reminder, no action may be taken on any matters during public comment until the matter itself has been included on the agenda as an item for possible action. Public comments will be limited to three minutes per person.

Any public comment here in Carson City? I see none. Do we have any public comment from any one on Zoom today? Okay. Hearing none. Are there any public comments that were e-mailed or were sent to the GOWINN staff on behalf of the entire advisory committee meeting today?

Ansara Martino: No, Mr. Chair. Ansara Martino for the record with the Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation. There were none received via the GOWINN office.

Chair Meyer: Thank you, Ansara. Alright. We will move on. Next, agenda item number five, we -- this is for discussion information. We have Lisa Levine, the executive director of GOWINN, and Ansara Martino, the senior program administrator officer of GOWINN.

Lisa Levine: Thank you, Chairman. Lisa Levine for the record. I just want to say really briefly this is my first NPWR advisory board meeting since being [ph] at the Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation, so very excited. The more I learn about NPWR, the more excited I get about how powerful this still can be with really pushing about it forward so that we have policy-driven evidence from [inaudible] solution that we're proving and that we can see all the interventions that are happening and the outcomes and the effects that all of that puts up.

I can tell you that you all have gotten us to a really good place. So, please consider me your champion because I really want to help move this along so it could be fully utilized both our government agencies but also by our research community. Just doing some meetings the last couple of days with [inaudible] town and also last week via Zoom. There's a lot of community support behind this. The more people understand what it is and the power that it can really equip them with in terms of research tool, you can just see the research questions coming to life, whether they're from the scholarship community. We just got back from a meeting with [inaudible]. We created a wonderful job presenting to the Governor's Workforce Development Board Meeting yesterday. So, you think about it as a tool not just for education workforce, but really the world is the oyster.

So, you know, whatever I can do to be helpful, we are rolling out a research forum in December, which, of course, all of you, I hope will participate in, attend, very excited about it. We're going to host one in Reno at the DRI [ph] campus, December 6, and the Vegas DRI [ph] campus, December 8. We'll definitely send you save the dates so that you have it and you can put it on your calendars.

Behind that, the whole idea is that we really get the scholarship community's feedback from the whether or not this is going to be a tool that they can utilize for their research, how they can help do data analysis with all of the different data that we're going to be able to access and also in the hopes of being able to formulate a research agenda before the legislative session that is not based on our office's guidelines but based on the research community's guidelines in the sense of UNR, UNLV and all of our [inaudible]. So, we're going to come on that.

Also I wanted to give a shout out to my team at the Governor's Office of Workforce and Innovation and also thanks to our leaders in the entire advisory board for identifying some funding opportunities out there and [inaudible] can get some more backup on that. Do you want - Kristen -- yeah.

Kristen Dwyer: Yes, absolutely. So, we have two funding opportunities. One was for the Item Mark [ph] project. GOWINN will be receiving that funding as a subgrant from Governor's [inaudible] -- Governor's reserve and that will encompass pay for the DB driven staff time to implement the I Mark [ph] project. So, I know that will be in the agenda item later, but we need to talk about the language and the agreement. And the other opportunity is actually one that Nancy had forwarded to us. So, thank you for funding that --

Lisa Levine: Thank you, Nancy.

Kristen Dwyer: -- one, yeah, for the co-reg initiative -- yeah -- initiative. And it was democratizing [ph] our data, a challenge to invest in data and evidence-based policy opportunity. And so, Craig spends [ph] crazy data up at night with me and onto the next day writing possible letter of intent and just proposal for the project that would already support the work that NPWR does. And Craig is going to talk a little bit about the content of that. And if we were -- if the committee does get the grant, it would be administered by GOWINN and it's not that much money but it would give us an tier [ph] that we could [inaudible] \$300,000, if I'm not mistaken.

Lisa Levine: So, our agency have actually a lot of money.

Kristen Dwyer: Yeah.

Lisa Levine: [Inaudible] but really exciting for the queen [ph] because thank to Nancy for providing that between Kristen [ph] and Ansara and Craig, we got that in [inaudible] that we got, so really impressive. And then I definitely I want to highlight the NPWR position within the Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation. As all of you know, this job has been vacant for a well over a year. We're coming on for said vacancy across all state agencies as all of you well know the pain of that.

But this is something that is really big priority for me. We have a small team [ph] with the Governor's Office of Workforce Innovation and as we really pick up full steam ahead with NPWR really trying to fill that position. So, it actually is posted right now. And it's my understanding that Kristen Dwyer might be very interested in that position, very hopeful that she's going to apply for that position. I have full confidence in her abilities. And so, I just wanted to make sure you all are well aware of that, so more to come.

And then just last but not the least in terms of the summer [ph] community outreach we've done, researchers at UNLV as well as Graham [ph], they're already interested in piloting this, another research grant so that we can just pilot work that at Kings [ph] in terms of research program, things of that nature. But I just wanted you all to know that this is the top priority for our office. So, a lot more to come in terms of policy. Thank you.

Chair Meyer: Alright. Thank you. Other discussion under agenda item number five? Hearing none, we will move on to agenda item number six. This agenda item is for discussion. And we would like to discuss the -- just the annual meeting schedule for the upcoming year. Craig Moebus is going to help us with that as well, but we're also talking about scheduling our meetings for the next year.

We have legislative sessions coming up in the spring. So, we know it's going to be a busy time for everybody. So, we'd like to get our -- kind of our annual calendar of meetings out there and on the agenda so we can all plan ahead and make sure that we don't have any conflicts. And if we do and we have to reschedule, we have plenty of time to do that. So, I think we're required as a committee to meet at least quarterly, four times a year. And so, if anybody has any recommendations of meeting more frequently than that, we're open to that discussion as well.

I think we've had a couple of offline conversations just about the fact that we have a lot of interest straight within NPWR and we potentially have three or four additional state agencies that are looking on coming onboard. And so, we may -- we may want to meet more frequently, depending on what happens with those agencies and whether or not our onboarding folks need to make some more decisions a little quicker than quarterly, we can up that schedule. Again, it will be a challenge at least the first half of the year with the legislative session going on, but we can certainly do that. Do we want to try to set actual calendar dates at this point or you just want to solicit that offline with the members?

Kristen Dwyer: If we can at least try to get like a general range, I don't have -- as GOWINN team, you know, try to find real [ph] availability, whether it's here or, you know, some place else, and just help us facilitate that process for you if you all -- it's such a small group and you know your schedule, that would be great, if you have an idea [inaudible].

Chair Meyer: I would just throw out a recommendation that with the holidays and everything and prep for legislative session, the months of November and December are pretty tough. Since we're meeting today, I would -- I would say we want to do it probably our first meeting some time after the first of the year. And I think if we can do something in the beginning of January, that would be great before legislative session actually starts and we have a little breathing room, hopefully. So, can everybody just take a quick look at their calendar and see what's your first two weeks of January looks like?

Lisa Levine: How's Tuesday January 10th look like?

Nancy Olsen: Looks good.

Chantel Rundell: Looks good for me.

Lisa Levine: Perfect.

Ansara Martino: Thanks, Chantel.

Chair Meyer: I heard it's not [inaudible] January [inaudible].

Ansara Martino: [Inaudible].

Chair Meyer: I'm going to ask her 11 and 10. Actually, I have a meeting between 10:30 and 12. So, any other time that day --

Ansara Martino: [Inaudible]

Chair Meyer: And then if we look at it at three-month out, we're looking at April, some time around beginning of April.

Female Speaker: [Inaudible] legislative [inaudible] but maybe -- maybe not Fridays [inaudible]. Is that a viable option do you think?

Chair Meyer: I'm available on Fridays or most Fridays. Actually, that's my day I try to keep as clear as possible. So, in case something like this comes up --

Female Speaker: [Inaudible]. Yeah.

Female Speaker: Yeah.

Female Speaker: Yeah.

Female Speaker: No Fridays.

Female Speaker: Friday is a terrible --

Female Speaker: Or actually Friday [inaudible].

Female Speaker: We just normally don't work Fridays. So, you know, we flex our schedule --

Female Speaker: Some others do.

Female Speaker: Maybe -- maybe we can change it accordingly but just thinking of committee meetings and not knowing maybe we could set it up for Friday that month -- yeah.

Female Speaker: Yeah. Just Friday morning.

Female Speaker: Yeah.

Chair Meyer: Yeah. Let's --

Female Speaker: It's seventh or the 14th?

Female Speaker: Yeah.

Chair Meyer: Let's -- let's look at the --

Female Speaker: I think it's 15.

Female Speaker: Actually, it will be the 8th or the 15th.

Female Speaker: In April?

Female Speaker: I got 7th.

Chair Meyer: Yeah. April 7 --

Female Speaker: What are you looking at?

Female Speaker: Oh, you got Saturday on here. Sorry. Okay. I don't -- I have Saturday on my calendar, but she goes [inaudible]. Yeah.

Chair Meyer: Yeah. So, the 7th sounds good tentatively.

Female Speaker: I'm only available in the morning on Fridays.

Chair Meyer: Okay. Will 9:00 a.m. work?

Female Speaker: Yeah.

Female Speaker: That works.

Chair Meyer: Okay.

Female Speaker: I think [inaudible].

Female Speaker: Don't say that.

Female Speaker: [Inaudible].

Female Speaker: You'll never know.

Chair Meyer: [Inaudible].

Female Speaker: Okay. Thank you for telling me.

Female Speaker: We like [inaudible].

Female Speaker: Yeah.

Chair Meyer: Yeah. There's just some conversation about travel from Vegas and not sure how early they could get here. So, we're looking at potentially 10 o'clock then on the 7th instead of 9.

Female Speaker: Yeah.

Chair Meyer: Is that still okay with everyone?

Chantel Rundell: That works for me.

Jose Martinez: Yes.

Chair Meyer: Great. Okay.

Female Speaker: And I might actually on the committee but then who knows.

Female Speaker: I doubt it.

Female Speaker: We'll try it.

Chair Meyer: Alright. And then if we -- if we stick to the three- month calendar, we're looking at July. We know the first week, it's bad with the fourth is on Tuesday this year. So, we'll have a lot of folks out, I'm sure on that Monday, and then it's a short week. Travel is difficult usually on



holiday week. So, looking at possibly to the next week and we got the 10th. Session may be over [inaudible] hopefully.

Female Speaker: And that was June, right?

Chair Meyer: July.

Jose Martinez: I'm available any day of the week except Tuesday.

Female Speaker: It's not working.

Chair Meyer: Okay. Wednesdays are bad for me.

Female Speaker: How's that Monday, July 10th?

Chair Meyer: [Inaudible] that works for me.

Female Speaker: It's fine for me.

Chair Meyer: Either morning or afternoon.

Chantel Rundell: I'm not available on Monday afternoon. So, did I hear Monday at 10?

Chair Meyer: We could do 10 o'clock, yes.

Chantel Rundell: That would work for me.

Chair Meyer: Okay. So, July 10th at 10:00 a.m. The last one of the year would be around the same week in October, first or second week. We got the second Monday, the 9th. What's the -- Nevada Day falls on Saturday. So, Friday, the 29th would be the holiday. So, Monday the second probably okay or we go later in the week.

Female Speaker: And this is October 2nd?

Chair Meyer: Yes.

Female Speaker: Oh, is it?

Chair Meyer: Oh, I'll just throw a day, how about Thursday, October 5th?

Female Speaker: Sounds fine to me.

Chair Meyer: Morning or afternoon?

Chantel Rundell: Morning is better.

Chair Meyer: Okay. 10:00 a.m.

Chantel Rundell: That would work for me.

Chair Meyer: Okay.

Female Speaker: What time is [inaudible]?

Chair Meyer: Alright. We'll go beyond regular scheduled meetings providing we can get rooms and everything for those dates. We'll have more communication about it as we get closer to those dates. But we'll hit for those for now.

Female Speaker: Yes.

Chair Meyer: And then if we need to add additional meetings, we'll do those and [inaudible] fashion we'll just [inaudible].

Jose Martinez: Is that a two-hour --

Chair Meyer: Yes. Usual -- we usually finish before two hours, but we can work out to that [inaudible]. Yes, Ansara?

Ansara Martino: Probably Monday when we're down at the office, we'll send out the meeting invitations so that will be at everyone's calendar.

Female Speaker: Thank you.

Ansara Martino: And then add to work on [inaudible].

Female Speaker: I will say that Thursday time is a little rough for us only because that seems to be our federal meetings hit that time, but we can make it work.

Chair Meyer: Is the fifth -- on October 5th, is that the only Thursday we have?

Female Speaker: I -- yes.

Female Speaker: Yes.

Female Speaker: And I don't know for sure that it will be an issue. We have an every other month at 11:00 a.m. meeting with the feds.

Chair Meyer: Okay.

Female Speaker: And I don't know what month it will fall in being every other month by then.

Chair Meyer: Okay. Okay.

Female Speaker: So, we'll see.

Chair Meyer: Okay. Well, as we get closer, if it doesn't workout for you, let us know and we'll see if we can --

Female Speaker: Yeah. And usually, what we try to do is just split, you know --

Glen Meyer: Okay.

Female Speaker: -- one -- one does one thing and one does the other.

Jose Martinez: And if I may suggest to also alternate sites, that will be awesome.

Female Speaker: You don't want to come to this beautiful setting?

Female Speaker: Are you offering your house?

Jose Martinez: Sure.

Female Speaker: There you go.

Chair Meyer: We would love -- we would love to come up.

Female Speaker: Oh, so we'll carpool --

Female Speaker: Yeah. [inaudible].

Female Speaker: Where is [Inaudible]? Is it just --

Jose Martinez: [Inaudible].

Female Speaker: No, it's Reno.

Jose Martinez: [Inaudible].

Female Speaker: Yeah.

Female Speaker: Did they move?

Jose Martinez: No. This is [inaudible].

Female Speaker: Oh, that's [inaudible].

Jose Martinez: I'm not sure. [Inaudible].

Female Speaker: Absolutely, yeah. I can always [inaudible].

Chair Meyer: Alright. Any other discussion about the meeting schedule? No? Okay. We will move on to agenda item seven. This is a discussion informational item for program activities update regarding onboarding data refresh and matching research and cloud migration. I believe this is going to be led by Craig Moebus from DB Driven? Does anybody have any intro besides that or [inaudible] correct me? No? Okay. Take it away, Craig.

Craig Moebus: Thank you, Chair. Craig Moebus, DB Driven, for the record. So, first of all, we'll talk about the onboarding. There's a lot of activities going on within the entire system with the onboarding current partners additional datasets as well as for onboarding additional agencies.

So, within DETR -- DETR and I actually owe -- Chantel, I owe you and Krista [ph] an email back and I'm sure you reached out and I haven't had the chance to reach back down. But Title I data, there is an issue on their MIS -- on DETR's MIS provider side. So, they're still -- that provider is still working through the issues. So, they were not included -- that additional dataset has not yet been onboarded, but it is still in the pipeline. ETA is unknown while that provider works through the issue.

Regarding NDE, so the first -- the first one is early childhood data. We have completed the early childhood demographic data. It's already been onboarded. We are meeting with the early childhood folks to figure out which detail data they would like to onboard. But there's good partnership between early childhood, Jatima [ph] with Andy E. [ph], and then we're working to help update that till [inaudible] tool for that.

And then speaking of Jatima [ph] as well, we're also onboarding Edward Glenn [ph], a non-graduate data assessment foster care peer review [inaudible] and direct certifications that are listed there, of course, as IT migrant data [inaudible] roadmap teacher data. And I'm working with Jatima [ph] I believe the majority is already onboard. It's just a matter of making the updates [inaudible] make them available to the world [ph].

This will play in nicely of potential of coming research agenda items to have those additional data elements in next call [ph]. So, that's great.

Nancy Olsen: Shall I wait for a -- Nancy Olsen for the record. Shall I wait for questions or can I ask now? How far back were the early childhood data go?

Craig Moebus: Early childhood data is not too far back because the system is coming in from multiple systems.

Nancy Olsen: Okay.

Craig Moebus: So, essentially, the childhood data that we're getting is going to be [inaudible] coming from Glenn.

Nancy Olsen: Okay. Starting with you?

Chair Meyer: And I believe we've been collecting early childhood data for the last two and a half years, I think.

Nancy Olsen: Okay.

Chair Meyer: So, not a lot of history yet but --

Nancy Olsen: Got it.

Chair Meyer: -- it's to come.

Nancy Olsen: Yeah.

Jose Martinez: I have another question. Jose Martinez for the record. Teacher data, what does that include?

Chair Meyer: Great question, Jose. So, we're looking at some of the teacher information that we have available in our Opal [ph] teacher credential system. So, there's information in there about how many credential teachers we have, what credentials they hold, what courses that are so that they can teach. We have years of experience in subject areas. We have -- what else do we have? We have some demographic information, but that's voluntary at this point. So, it's a little hit and miss.

What else is in there that we talked about adding? I think that's the majority of it. I think there's also some Praxis [ph] assessment scores in there. I'm not sure if we're going to include that information or not. That information is somewhat confidential in some instances but we do have that relayed [ph] in the system. So, it's something we could potentially look at, include [ph] it as well. Thank you.

Jose Martinez: Well, there's a grading [ph], you know, a little bit of interest now with being normal students and teacher credentials, what courses they are allowed to teach or available to teach, what are the data elements that has become -- has come up with the -- with the -- related to that human [inaudible] in that stuff [ph] I think.

Chair Meyer: Good, yes. Well, we definitely have that information in there, so that's something we can absolutely make available [inaudible].

Nancy Olsen: Nancy Olsen for the record. I know there's been a lot of interest in -- through the equity lens on ethnicity is -- would that be a possible consideration?

Chair Meyer: It's possible for the data that we have. Again that's voluntary information and so not every record has that information but we'll have to look and see what kind of percentage rate we have with that information to see if it's a viable sample size. So, we could -- we could potentially do some reporting with that information as well.

Female Speaker: What were the DMV matching [inaudible] if they help the 200 demographic side that you're not necessarily collecting it or a self-selection data that maybe DMV can match that and add it?

Chair Meyer: It's a possibility. I am not sure if DMV collects that information, they probably do.

Female Speaker: But yes, the DMV main [ph]? Yes.

Chair Meyer: But it's another one of those items that the more agencies within our arm [ph], the more opportunities we have to populate [inaudible] mentioned as everybody or almost everybody, at least what's [ph] on volunteer basis. So, then he doesn't have it, he -- maybe DWS has it or maybe the DMV has it. And so the more datasets we get, the more chances, improve that we will have raising at the [inaudible].

Female Speaker: Okay.

Nancy Olsen: I know we've gotten research request for that information. I remember seeing those and at that point saying, we can't fill [ph] that.

Chair Meyer: Yes, we did a lot. In fact, we just talked one today in those changed [ph] government suite [ph], so yes.

Jose Martinez: Mr. Chair, I'm sorry.

Chair Meyer: They would have.

Jose Martinez: Jose Martinez for the record. I was having [ph] comment on that gender missing in our area [ph] that is in [inaudible] which required state agencies to report in sexual orientation, gender identity, et cetera. So, I would imagine that every state agency would have report that data in your [inaudible] environment.

Mary Acorns [ph]: That's not, sorry, Mary Acorns [ph] for the record. I'm not sure if I'm supposed to be talking about, isn't that and is that part of what they already provide the DETR or they have changed their data sharing agreement or wonder, you know, based on what they already provide to them, if they needed to provide additional information?

Jose Martinez: Not sure. We'll have to take a look at that agreement and see how it's worth [ph] it. I think, if I remember right, it's been a long time since I looked at it but I think rates [ph] [inaudible] specifically stated in there but we'll have to take another look. It's something we'll want to make sure that isn't in the other agreements we managed [inaudible] so.

Craig Moebus: Craig Moebus for the record. As far as onboarding, so we had been in July, the GOWINN team and Lisa had a meeting with the DMV as far as requiring the DMV data for NPWR purposes for matching. So, there's agreement in place and we're prepared to receive the

first DMV production data load on the 15th actually -- yes, on the 15th. So, from the matching perspective, [inaudible] so.

Jose Martinez: That's a huge victory for us. I just have to say, yhat's a big one. We've been working on that for I think since day one of NPWR, so that's great news [ph].

Craig Moebus: Yes and I'll say too from the research that I could do, I could only identify one other state that had. So as far as nationwide, on -- that's often [inaudible].

Female Speaker: That's a wrinkle [ph].

Female Male: That [inaudible] that's the way.

Jose Martinez: Lisa what DB tripping [ph] used to make for free, right?

Lisa Levine: Lisa Levine for the record. The Director of the DMV, when we had our meeting, I'm sure some of you were on it, we -- many of you were, was very helpful and happy to be partnering with us, so to your credit as well.

Chair Meyer: That's great to see that, that's perfect and then --

Jose Martinez: Sorry, so that would require a different or a new data sharing agreement?

Chair Meyer: I think so because the way it's going to work, I mean I have to -- like I haven't heard much since we first talked about it but are we still -- is DETR still providing DMV with the list?

Craig Moebus: So --

Chair Meyer: And then DMV's return [inaudible] results for those?

Craig Moebus: So, I don't know the specifics on how DETRs is getting it but there's a -- there was an agreement in place between DMV and DETR. And DETR is the conduit to which DMV is giving us the data because DETR already had that data. So from -- so from the technical perspective, it's coming still from DETRs. We're working with the DETR ITT1 [ph].

Chair Meyer: Okay, okay.

Craig Moebus: So, I don't -- I don't believe there's additional but I'm not --

Chair Meyer: Yes, that doesn't sound like it in that existing agreement between DETR and DMV exists and it allows them to share that data [inaudible].

Female Speaker: That was my question was on -- in reference to that, because I think I had talked to Craig separately about it and it -- the ethnicity was already part of what they provide to DETR in that load.

Craig Moebus: Yes. I'll have to double check with that load on the sort of demographic information that they're provided [inaudible].

Lisa Levine: Lisa Levine for the record. It's still might be helpful for it to be data sharing agreement but [inaudible] first [ph] innovation just, you know, recognizing that organizational structure reason [ph], lots of other things. So, Craig let's hold up on that.

Chair Meyer: Yes. I think it would be good too also look at our interlocal contract that we have right now between DETR and NSHE in the week and see if we want to add DMV to that interlocal contract. Even though we're not directly exchanging data, that would bring them on, that's a full partner in NPWR and allow them representation too on this board. So, I think that's why we want to operate. Hopefully, they will have unique [ph] for some of our data stuff that [inaudible].

Female Speaker: It didn't say that.

Craig Moebus: So, we'll say -- Craig Moebus for the record. Based off the discussions that we had, that GOWINN and potentially DMV with the thought process was the governance issue to onboard agencies, we wanted to make sure the program, we wanted to make sure we can capture the data. And then, streamline the process before we go after further agencies which is a, I believe, a discussion and action point later in the slide deck.

Chair Meyer: Perfect.

Female Speaker: It's number 10 on the agenda [inaudible].

Craig Moebus: I don't remember exactly which number.

Chair Meyer: Yes, number 10.

Craig Moebus: Sweet [ph] but short. For Department of Corrections, we -- I had been put in touch with the Deputy Director of Support services who is going to begin working with us as far as the technical onboarding, uncertain what data assets, excuse me, datasets they intend to provide. All that is still going to be flushed out and I'm working on establishing the initial kick-off meeting with her as well.

Department of Veteran Services, we met with the IT team and they are working. So, we've met with them, no ETA yet, but they're working to identify which datasets could come into NPWR and which datasets makes sense. I think a large part of the conversation, at least that we had, the [inaudible] we had going with the DVS team was a lot of the veteran transition programs, because that impacts outcomes and the workforce.

Some of the issues that they started to flush out there is, some of that data is necessary [inaudible] just yet. They're just developing the system to track that. So, much like the early



childhood data it's a -- there should be groundwork to be built upon [inaudible] in the future. So, uncertain what they -- what they will bring into the system right now to identify.

For the data refresh and matching, so the report refresh is still ongoing. What happened was we identified an issue with the DETR extract. The DETR team has been very responsive in fixing this issue with us. But over the course of the software development life cycle and the code commotion essentially, we had to go with DETR and their test system, validate it and then it just got push through production.

So, we're waiting for it to run. We expect -- we should have that updated dataset by the end of the month. I have to double check internally to see if they receive it already but it was -- it was right there.

With this, we also have the Adult Education and Family Literacy Performance dashboard. So we have -- working with Nancy and Ariana [ph], they provided the updated business logic to make sure it matches the federal numbers. So, we're working through the report refresh evolution, we're coming -- we would plan on including the AE, the title of the dashboard essentially along with that. And after that set [ph], obviously we will require validation before we'd be allowed to push it to production.

And then we're also working with Dr. Gil, Gabriel Gil [ph] on developing -- on the CTE outcomes, essentially measuring meeting wages for CTE, completed separately [ph] across NSHE and DETR. Again with -- from the last advisory committee meeting, that meeting with Gabriel [ph] I think, this would be an internal report for the CTE folks just based off the size essentially. So with that, that will also be included in this report refresh evolution pending to your data as well.

In cross agency matching, so with the DETR data issue, we did not get a chance to kick off the beginning of the quarterly matching and data refreshes. However, with the work that we've been doing with Ken [ph] and Krista [ph] and Chantel and the team, along with the AE team, Nancy and Ariana [ph], I don't foresee us [inaudible]. I foresee being able to kick it off within this quarter. The extracts from DETR are in place to run now and so it's just a matter of we'll reach out and finalize the timing. So, we can start updating this on this point.

Nancy Olsen: Nancy Olsen for the record. January is fantastic.

Craig Moebus: Okay.

Nancy Olsen: Yeah, we're good with that.

Craig Moebus: Okay. And with that, from discussions with NSHE and Jose from the last advisory meeting and then along with Glenn and the NDE team, the -- I believe, unless anything has change, NSHE and NDE are also going to begin providing semi-annual or biannual refreshes for the data to capture prior necessary [ph]. I believe we talked about that. I don't know if [inaudible] further.

Jose Martinez: No, we're still [ph].

Craig Moebus: Okay.

Jose Martinez: Yes, we're fine. We're still on [inaudible] data latencies. Take me down [inaudible] right now, you know.

Craig Moebus: For the research, so NDE is sponsoring RAND Corporation researchers. I'm actually meeting with three researchers from that corporation next week to introduce some into the system. GOWINN is also sponsoring and is focused on researchers UNLV which we also like to bring in to the system. I want to see if they can meet maybe next week as well but essentially start having researchers walk through the system almost in the beta testing essentially prior to the research forum when that kick off.

Lisa Levine: Lisa Levine for the record. Just so everyone knows, we have a meeting with UNR next week, so excited about them potentially during the pilot as well, just letting to let you know all that [inaudible] yes..

Craig Moebus: So, you will start seeing e-mail notifications to the system which probably are going to be your spam letter. [Inaudible] seeing my e-mail the same thing. And then, like Lisa mentioned, the GOWINN is sponsoring the research or I don't know sponsoring some metro [ph]. That is being --

Female Speaker: I'm hosting it.

Craig Moebus: Hosting the research forum on December 6, up here.

Female Speaker: TRI [ph].

Craig Moebus: And then December 8th.

Female Speaker: Yes, the TRI [ph].

Craig Moebus: Okay. So, that will be -- that will be exciting. And then with that because we also do have additional partners who are onboarding, we did want to put in just little security reminder about the security that the system has right now. Just because the researcher has access into the portal, it's progressively permitted. So, it doesn't grant them access into the data.

Agency controls the data release. Data that's returned to the portal will never contain PII. Random -- the USPIs are separate now, to be different for each data package. So, we can never reconstitute a database. And data results are moved from the research portal after 10 days. So, the researcher, once the results are complete, they will have 10 days to get it where they will have -- or they will have to resubmit the [inaudible] the access.

Chair Meyer: And Craig, have we established who those approvers are for the agency?

Craig Moebus: I'll have to double check. I believe we have. So from the system perspective, I see -- I see agency representatives from every agency.

Chair Meyer: Okay.

Craig Moebus: From the -- as far as outside of that [inaudible]. I know that you and -- I believe that we established them at the last meeting or at least identify them at the last meeting file [ph].

Chair Meyer: The last meeting?

Craig Moebus: Yes, yes, yes. So, that is just heading now into the system.

Chair Meyer: Okay.

Craig Moebus: Yes, sir.

Lisa Levine: Lisa Levine for the record. Just in the conversations we had with those folks and the community, who might not be as data savvy as some of the folks who is sitting at this table, I anticipate that more knowledge and (inaudible) about NPWR with those questions about the security surrounding the data as our agency partners of NPWR. You know, if we can work on some type of collaborative language, so you could have explained that since it's not just DB Driven, it's also many of you obviously, it's your organization's data. I think that would be really good thing to work on potentially for this meeting.

Chair Meyer: Sounds [inaudible]. We still have the video of two out the door [ph]?

Craig Moebus: We do have the video on the What's Up Craig?

Chair Meyer: We do have the second. There's two of them actually but one on the functionality of [inaudible].

Female Speaker: Exactly.

Lisa Levine: Lisa Levine for the record. I can tell you that when we -- when Craig presented the [inaudible] to the government for personnel [ph] report, this was -- it was a lot of excitement. But for folks who don't know necessarily how data matching works, where the data comes from and just the mechanics of that, this can seem like something that unless there is a real thorough explanation with collaborative partners, that cannot, you know, there can be a lot of concerns associated. So, we want partner on that because I promise you we already got a lot of questions, yes.

Chair Meyer: That's a great idea and the reason I'm asking about those videos is because we produced those ones, first to the NPWR.

Lisa Levine: Okay.

Chair Meyer: And so, they're very -- well, the example was, is education workforce space. But now what we're looking at remaining other agencies, potentially Veterans Affairs, corrections, you know, some agencies that have some pretty sensitive data, it may -- it maybe something we want to alert that and say, hey Jamie [ph], reproduce, you know, can we produce some new one.

That's a little more detail and also represents more of the community now that's part of it or -- so yes. I think that's the thing that someone should take a look at. Security is always going to be a major topic when we start talking about sharing data across agencies and we can't stress enough that the architecture of NPWR at its core was built to address those very issues.

So, that no PII who lives in NPWR permanently, that data comes in for the matching and then -- and then -- and then gets remove after the matching process takes place. I think there are some and Craig, you can correct if I'm wrong, but I know there are some -- there are some functionality that we built in the system since its inception where we do maintain some datasets with personal information. But again, those datasets are maintained on the NPWR system itself. Those data [inaudible] are pulled from the exposure databases at the -- at the agencies that they come from at the source.

Craig Moebus: So for -- within the system right now the PII is not [ph] and all those -- all that links them would be the cross-off with the USPI and agency internal. So from the system perspective, right now there's no PII. With the -- with the -- which is coming -- which is after this with the implementation of the IMR, that would represent a change in that -- in that therapy specialist, essentially where the matching engine [ph] is right now which is separate from the rest of the research portal. The matching engine [ph] has been compartmentalize the section essentially where PII would reside in that in order to achieve PII [ph].

Lisa Levine: Lisa Levine for the record. We'll definitely talk maybe offline about some suggested language and maybe we can work on that and then bring it to the future board meeting.

Craig Moebus: For sure.

Lisa Levine: It will be great. Thank you.

Craig Moebus: Sounds good. And one of the two things, just listed on here in the research, but as we're -- as we're bringing in the researchers, I know I started working to team up in some of the other agencies about building out the Lexicon Management tool, I'm sorry about building out the data dictionary just to make sure that as the researchers come in, it's very obvious what data elements they're going. Since DB Driven has been the customer of the researcher portal space, it has a little bit of an IT feel for some of it. So, we're working on that fence [ph].

For the cloud migration, so the Phase 1 portion which was migrating the public portal and then the power BI. That is currently out of development and is in test for validating the configuration. I expect that portion we can push to production -- to the production environment by the end of the year. That's very exciting.

Phase II which represents the cloud migration of research portal, the reporting portal, private reporting portal, excuse me and then, the governance components which is the CRM. We're kicking that off and we've been doing the work towards that too, so. That has the projected date of June 2023 and then Phase III, essentially we're agreeing everything regarding the data in the final -- in the final phase, so. But that was it for the activities, Chair [inaudible].

Chair Meyer: Thank you, Craig. And a little discussion about the agenda item 7. No? Okay. We'll move on to agenda item number 8. We have some strategic target agencies and I want to note that this item is for possible action. So, I believe Lisa and DB Driven are going to present this piece.

Female Speaker: New [ph] part.

Chair Meyer: So Lisa --

Lisa Levine: Good. I can't see without you.

Craig Moebus: So for the first strategic target at one of the advisory committee meetings earlier this year, one of the representatives of DETR had made mention about why don't we bring additional title data in, in addition to the Title I. So, I don't know what, if those sets within DETR had been identified, but I just wanted to keep that as a reminder which is why it was the first bullet.

For the -- we also -- so when -- in doing the research with GOWINN and within [inaudible] over the past few months, both for the Coleridge Initiative and then just in general for looking at who, you know, who could provide value to NPWR, who can NPWR provide value for.

I think, speaking with Lisa and with Nancy [ph] here, I think there would be a good partnership potentially with the Governor's Office of Economic Development. If you look at a lot of the new products that -- if you want that what they have produced, it seems to be some parallel reports that could have -- that could -- could have bring value to both partnerships.

And then as we -- as we start to bring in additional researchers, social service is a -- is typically a very sought after dataset. So, we anticipate a full onboarding of the entire Department of Health and Human Services, specifically Aging and Disability Services, Child and Family Services. Because right now from DCFS, they're feeding the data to the Early Childhood which is coming at the review and then, Welfare and Supportive Services.

So, essentially all the attributes that Glenn is providing with additional detail data around those attributes because what Glenn through NDE is providing is a flag of this kid had for [inaudible] because it's this. There's no additional, it's a flag and nothing else is an attribute. That was the [inaudible].

Lisa Levine: No, that's great, Craig, Lisa Levine for the record. Just to add to this, you know, you are all the expert. I'm coming into this a little bit late but with DETR, right, we only have LEAP [ph] records right now. So, we're waiting to onboard Title I but you can imagine that if

we were to get Title III and Title IV, that would be very significant to the work that we're trying to do with this.

And I will say and I don't know if this is something else they talk about yet but some of the scholarship meeting that we had with researchers at the university, [inaudible] were interested in unplugging the insurance data. It's something to think about. I'm sure we have DETR on the line, so I just wanted to talk about [ph] for the record, if it's something that we could talk about. Because at the end of the day, I think the more, the better to [inaudible] will be.

DHHS, we spoke about just all that programming data, I believe we did. GOED, that's a natural one. I also wanted to add what about business and industry, just kind of the work that they're doing. And I think right now we have a board of apprenticeships, so that something to think about as the Labor Commissioner. They're interested in partnering with us.

And then one of the meetings, we have actually flagged this and it's a really good point, when we talked about central services in the state of Nevada with a decent amount of central services that are outsourced to the nonprofit community, so thinking about ways that we can bring them in. You know just from -- off the top of my head, I think that would be Southern Nevada.

We [inaudible] to think and may serve a huge amount of the population. So, certainly they partnered with DWSS but their data is different than DWSS's, so just something to think about for the next three years strategic plan if something worked out. So, that's it for me. Thank you.

Nancy Olsen: Nancy Olsen for the record. I -- from what I understand which is limited to Commission on Postsecondary does not collect data from the private and for-profit postsecondary, is that correct?

Lisa Levine: Lisa Levine for the record. I did not know.

Nancy Olsen: Okay.

Kristen Dwyer: Kristen Dwyer for the record, that's a -- we're in a conversation [inaudible] too, so we sort of [inaudible] at that same thing of GOWINN. What -- there's this whole population of individuals who then goes to that side, who's kind of keeping track of all this. So, it's something that has brought to our attention this week.

There are no weird looking app but definitely something that ties into, you know, say with some of these other grants that we have and other options that there's this whole other population out there. That's something that we've been discussing and looking at too.

Lisa Levine: Lisa Levine for the record. You would think that they would though because in order to go screw [ph], you certainly have to put forward a decent amount of data and detailed applications, once you got admission. So, I don't know the answer but I will find out.

Kristen Dwyer: Okay, yes, thank you.

Chantel Rundell: Chantel Rundell for the record. To Lisa's point about the additional title data, we are actually attempting to provide not only Title I data but also Title III data. That goes back to what Craig was speaking to. We had a problem with our MIS vendor but we are, I believe, very close to getting that. So, that we can ensure both of those titles, Title IV data has their own MIS system. And I don't -- I don't believe that they have representation here.

The other thing as far as possible, unemployment data, I do not believe that there is representation currently from unemployment but we could certainly reach out to the deputy administrator and see if she would be interested in the kind of data that maybe could be included in NPWR.

Lisa Levine: Lisa Levine for the record. Thank you. I feel like people [inaudible] watch our advisory board meetings to see all the collaboration that's happening here. So, I just got freak out. Thank you very much. That's awesome.

Craig Moebus: That goes to [inaudible].

Chair Meyer: Okay, any -- any more discussion on this item? Is there any action more [ph] we take at this time?

Lisa Levine: Lisa Levine for the record. This is my first [inaudible], so I'm learning. I apologize for my ignorance. Do you have to vote on something like that to Chantel's point or [inaudible] Title III comes forward, like you got to vote or does that just happened? Is there already a partner? I don't -- yes, I'm not sure what the process is.

Chair Meyer: Yes, so we would -- we would call for a motion to include that data in NPWR system. I'm not sure if we're at that point yet. Yes, we may -- we may need Chantel to do just a little more research on her side before we know if it's something that's even doable or not before we -- before we take a vote, yes.

Female Speaker: And that's -- I understand Mr. Chair, just for my notes and that was for Title I. Is that correct?

Female Speaker: Title III -- we're on Title III and IV. It has to [inaudible].

Female Speaker: No just three for now.

Chair Meyer: Just three for now.

Female Speaker: Please [inaudible] getting that [inaudible] and I'm not sure we're ready over [inaudible].

Male Speaker:: Work [inaudible].

Chair Meyer: Sounds like we're moving on then to the next agenda item.

Male Speaker: I can see your hand up there [inaudible].

Chair Meyer: Is there --

Female Speaker: Oh no, that's my, sorry.

Chair Meyer: Okay.

Nancy Olsen: It was --

Female Speaker: Hovering thing.

Nancy Olsen: It was my cursor, sorry.

Chair Meyer: Nancy's hand cursor there is messing this all up here. Alright, we will move on then to agenda item number 9. So, this is the identity management resolution project. And again, I'm noting that this item is for possible action and I believe Craig Moebus has some discussion about this and [inaudible] as well. OK, Craig, you're on [inaudible].

Craig Moebus: So for the identity management resolution, again this was an item that was initially brought up for vote last time and then the Chair had directed agencies to do more research, and then -- and then convene the vote this time. So, identity management and resolution based on the current matching system, everybody or every individual within the NPWR system has a new USPI each year.

What that means is as agencies validate such as NSHE and NDE and DETR and AE [ph] as you validate your data, that means numbers changed, historical numbers changed which then can bring into question when you're going in front of folks who will get the reports, why these numbers are changing. So, to solve this, there's a process called identity management resolution which ultimately persists the USPIs, what this represents.

So, it supports cross program and cross agency matching. It accounts for demographic changes. So, I give the example of myself and when I'm in -- when I was K-12, so I'm half Asian, half Caucasian, when I was K-12 I identified as one and I always mark myself as one. When I want to -- higher education, I mark myself as the other. It all depended on which one.

So, this -- and then for example, name changes for marriage, so if you get married or adopted or whatever, it accounts for any demographic change essentially. The benefit to this is historical reports numbers do not change. It would make this kind of time consuming effort by agencies to validate historical reports because we will always be able to match that to the -- who the individual is.

And then, typically every several years with agencies, there will be a rebaseline. So, eventually we could reset and rebaseline and start over again. Again, the change within the system, that means within this compartmentalized section there is going to be a retention of PII in order to make sure that you can match that to the individual, PII will have to be retained.



That PII, that is the only part that will change. That PII will never be accessible to any other part of the system. That PII requires physical and manual efforts to bring it out, out of that portion which only approve and authorize folks have and it's in a locked box essentially.

So, what that would represent is I have the three sections highlighted. And one of the section, so you see here it's kind of small, the section two, which I'll just move right here. So within the impacts of the scope of work which is where we working with GOWINN, the places that we could identify, we talked about the retention of PII. We identified three changes that would have to happen, Sections 2, 3.2 and 3.3 and I highlighted sections essentially that would change.

Within Section 2, the -- really there's just an addition to -- the red letter blocking at the end is the addition. To increase the bounty for federal and state reporting requirements, USPIs will persist for each matched individual. Requires the storage of PII used to match. I think you can see it's so long, I won't read the entire thing.

I did -- I did remove, if you go little bit further up, the individuals will be matched anonymously, I simply moved anonymously because you have to know who the individual is to match them. So, I only removed the anonymously word but there was no change outside that. And then the -- so there's -- there's a suggestive verbiage change on what it could look like.

And then 3.2, recommend removing 3.2 entirely based on -- based on agency request. DB Driven and NPWR will host the data and we do host some data. So, that's why we removed that section since --

Female Speaker: It's a lot.

Craig Moebus: It's no longer [inaudible]. And then 3.3, the individual data is de-identified within the matched out note [ph] PII historic beyond the unnecessary match. So, the first part remains the same. The individual data is they identified within the matching server in the final output and the crosswalk table. That crosswalk table is what's brought in and what the crosswalk table is, is the crosswalk table is the USPI and then agency internal ID.

There's no PII within crosswalk table but the output of the [inaudible] ultimately is the USPI which put into crosswalk it was part of the system. PII does not leave the matching engine [ph]. Both PII's is -- will be maintained. I don't know, that's a weighing scale. [Inaudible] in one case. So, that represents the change or the retention of the PII to support IMR process.

Chair Meyer: Right, so [inaudible] discussion.

Jose Martinez: I have a question. For the record, Jose Martinez. So, we currently -- we allow some institutions to share or to view the student ID from [inaudible] for other external purposes. Would this agreement prevent us from doing that for this amendment.

Craig Moebus: Negative. And so essentially just like right now, you don't have data about the match. That part is essentially the same and you'll -- you still not have data about the match

where you could see who the individual was or any of matched data. Because, you're all seeing is the view with student ID and then the detail later that you want [ph] before. So, that part will not change. You'll still be able to see that in this condition of more [ph] of the launching channel access [ph].

Lisa Levine: Lisa Levine for the record. It is fair to say that's kind allowed [ph] the researcher to see [inaudible] a little bit into mark of these individual [inaudible]?

Craig Moebus: Negative. So, what this allows is, this really is a benefits of agency. So as Jose, as you look at your five-year or not five years but your X years of data and you noticed that it changes every time that it reports, it's because a new match each time. What this would do is, as part of the IMR, agencies would be able to and I'll have to talk with the technical team.

But essentially once the match is validated and we agreed that c.moebus is equal to craig.moebus across all of them and all of those permutations, then I will be craig.moebus, I will be Craig Moebus until we rebaseline. And any data that eventually is matched to me will be mine until rebaseline. And then at that point that we rebaseline, then maybe c.moebus is not Craig Moebus, maybe it's Chris Moebus and we [inaudible] by that.

But it strengthens the match but it also means that if somebody is match incorrectly, so that's why I anticipate that there will be agency validation as I work with the -- with the software team. Once you validate, if we validate incorrectly, it's incorrect until it's rebaseline. Does that --

Lisa Levine: Yes.

Mae Tilton [ph]: Mae Tilton [ph] for the record. One of the things that we're looking at with our dashboard reports is that it as close as possible matches our federal reports. And so what Craig is describing would mean that if it stays the way it is right now, that data could slightly change because of a new match or match that drops off because there's a change. Whereas, if it locks, then it's always going to match our federal report which is for us a very good thing. We want that.

Chair Meyer: Just a couple of questions, so does this extend across the other who searched [inaudible]?

Craig Moebus: Negative. So if we look at matching right now, the output of matching is the USPI which is then brought to the crosswalk. That is the same output of the IMR is the USPI which response to the crosswalk. The difference is that USPI will persists. So right now, every time we match the USPI changes, with the IMR and the USPI will persist. That- I don't want to get that confused though because that does not impact when the researcher pools, even though the USPI persists, the hashed value that they see will always change based on the- so- so that part from the re- from- from the retail side, from the end user perspective, there's no difference.

Lisa Levine: Lisa Levine for the record. And that's important in terms of the personal safety and security of the end user whose data really belongs to in that regard, right?

Chair Meyer: Yeah. Very important. Plus, if it did not continue to change and it wasn't a new hash number every time, then the more requests a researcher makes, the more likely is they'll be able to identify an individual. The more data- different data sets they have over time leads to a higher probability of them being able to identify [inaudible]. So that's why I ask the question so it gets [inaudible] uploaded every time [inaudible].

Craig Moebus: Yes, sir.

Chair Meyer: So thank you. It's good to note that that number will continue to be hashed and updated every time.

Craig Moebus: Correct. But again, the- the output of a match is the USP and the crosswalk, which is then brought into the system. That is the same output of the IMR. The only difference is with the match, we flush it. We flush the PII, doesn't exist. With the IMR process, it still exists within that locked box.

Chair Meyer: Thank you.

Craig Moebus: Yes, sir.

Jose Martinez: Joes Martinez for the record. Is there process that, you know, the process, at least what you're saying is that after, you know, we do the data match and then it doesn't get reset until five years or whatever timeframe to decide it, and for whatever reason, like year one, year two or three, we as a group decide that, okay, this data is not correct, can we reset it? So, we have to wait the five years to come do it at that time if they hold their views/

Craig Moebus: So, in my opinion, that would be- that would be a vote or that would be up to- up to the advisory committee. From, I mean, essentially it would be restarting the match at zero, right? So I think I wouldn't- I wouldn't foresee it being an issue if, let's say the group agrees to a five year baseline. Or maybe in the beginning, maybe as everybody's comfort level, maybe you start with a lower level baseline so we get used to it. Of course, maybe, maybe not because then it's just you're doing the same thing. But, but yeah. So- so- so, from the [inaudible] lining perspective, that's just a technical evolution. Developers probably will be a little upset, but that's what we want. That's what we send Starbucks gift cards for Christmas.

Female Speaker: Oops.

Male Speaker: I'm glad we disagree with that as far as the- if- if the group decides as a baseline X number of years, but really it's X minus number of years.

Male Speaker: Yeah, I agree with that. I think it's important that if we identify an issue that's related to the match where, you know, we know that the integrity of the match is not what it should be. We should be able to baseline at that point, see if that corrects the issue and then start over from that one.

Craig Moebus: And- and I would say is if- if the vote is approved and if the IMR is implemented, it would- it would be incumbent on the agencies in the initial match to- to really do a- a good validation to ensure that, because that- that will help prevent this- this scenario that we're discussing. Thank you.

Chair Meyer: Okay. is there a motion to approve the changes in the SOW and to move forward with the IMR work?

Joes Martinez: Jose Martinez for the record. I move to approve.

Chair Meyer: Is there a second?

Lisa Levine: I'll second. Lisa Levine for the record.

Chair Meyer: Any furlough discussion? All those in favor say aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Meyer: Any opposed?

Female Speaker: Chantel, were you saying aye?

Chantel Rundell: Yeah. Sorry, I was saying, aye.

Chair Meyer: No- no pressure. Chantel. Any opposed? Anyone abstaining? Alright. Please let the record reflect that the motion carries. We'll move forward with the IMR.

Lisa Levine: Lisa Levine for the record. I attended a meeting a couple of weeks ago. It was in southern Nevada. They're putting on a digital government summit. There was a planning meeting for that and it was mostly local agencies, CIOs and CTOs. Some of the stuff they were talking about was a bit over my head because I'm not as integrated into the data conversation as all of you are clearly.

But Identity Management Resolution, the identifying number, this is stuff that they were all talking about that they have all been trying to work on. And then I meet with Craig and then Craig is talking about it and then this immediate match in my brain just from the language. But if there's a way that we can start kind of talking about this, just some of our external municipalities, it seems like that's something that these local government agencies have actually been very much trying to work on for a while now and we're doing it. You're doing it.

So, I don't know what that looks like, but I just wanted to plant that feed because, you know, the last thing we want is duplicate- duplicated efforts. And you all are leading the charge. So, it's something to think about.

Chair Meyer: Happy to share whatever we want. I get invited to that every year and I've never went. I need to go.

Lisa Levine: I should see you on the panel to talk about this.

Female Speaker: There we go.

Female Speaker: Yeah. Next.

Male Speaker: [inaudible].

Male Speaker: She's gonna pay [inaudible].

Male Speaker: Hasn't been invited to [inaudible].

Female Speaker: Did you have more discretionary funds [inaudible].

Male Speaker: He's lacking the tools.

Chair Meyer: No additional discussion on item number nine? We'll move on to agenda item number 10. This item is for the NPWR Governance process. I'm noting this item also may be for possible action. And whose item is this?

Female Speaker: Chris.

Chair Meyer: Back to Mr. Moebus.

Male Speaker: [inaudible].

Female Speaker: You need another water? Does anybody need a water? Do we need- no, it's not, but if you want a cold one.

Male Speaker: [inaudible] lukewarm.

Female Speaker: Yes. Anybody else?

Female Speaker: [inaudible] if you don't mind.

Female Speaker: [inaudible].

Female Speaker: Oh, you got those.

Chair Meyer: Quick water break.

Female Speaker: [inaudible]

Female Speaker: [inaudible] you need an extra hands?

Female Speaker: No.

Female Speaker: [inaudible].

Chair Meyer: For those of you online, just we're taking a quick 30-second break. So, if anybody needs to run down the hall or stand up and stretch, now is the time.

Female Speaker: We should do [inaudible]. They're just different. They're just not the same, sorry.

Male Speaker: [inaudible].

Female Speaker: It's not too late. Let us know. Do you want water? Sure.

Male Speaker: I still have some process.

Female Speaker: Okay.

Female Speaker: That's better. Better looking.

Chair Meyer: Okay. Looks like we are ready to move on. Everybody has refilled their water and we're ready to go. Craig, go- go ahead, please.

Craig Moebus: So- so for the discussion action, governance and onboarding process, this has really come about this year based on the traction that hand power has received. As everyone who has signed the onboarding process is aware of, essentially the same documentation, the same signatures have to be regenerated for every single agency that- that onboards. So- so looking at the bullets, the current process is labor intensive due to agencies being required to re-sign documentation for each onboarding agency.

This can be viewed as a barrier for interest. And the example would be DVS. The discussions with DVS and Department of Corrections started earlier this year in the February and March timeframe. And I believe they just [inaudible] and the final approval was received, but it was just received recently.

Female Speaker: I'm sorry. Can you repeat that?

Craig Moebus: All the final approval for DVS and POC.

Female Speaker: Oh. So, all the signatures are on the contract and it's just with the clerk of the board right now, just for the clerk's signature since there wasn't any like additional money exchanges or changes.

Craig Moebus: But- but it took over almost eight months. Six- six to eight months to actually bring them to the table. So, what this is, is for a recommended redesign of how to onboard agencies into the- into the NPWR System. And I think as, as NPWR continues to receive

traction, it will- it would be in the benefit of the program to expedite the onboarding process to be able to get folks in.

And so with that, I can- I believe in [inaudible] I just don't have it here, but what was- what was presented in- in what- what the Virginia system does in a- I presented it at the last two, I believe, one or two advisory committee meetings, is there's a three step process where the agency who wants to onboard or who wants to join the NPWR ecosystem, or in that case, the VLDS ecosystem signs a data sharing agreement, signs into the book of data governance, which has been recreated for NPWR and I'm sure we'll need to be reviewed.

But then after they sign into the- they sign into the book of governance, they sign into the data sharing agreement, and then a verbal vote is held at- at Virginia's version of an advisory committee. And then at that point, we can begin technical to technical onboarding within Virginia. So, I think- I think the- so there's a recommended redesign but I think just in general with the traction that NPWR has, redesigning the onboarding process will help bring in more agencies and help better not just the program, but hopefully the benefit of the data, bringing it back to the Nevadas.

Chair Meyer: Any- any discussion about that?

Nancy Olsen: Nancy Olsen for the record. Are we talking about specifically data sharing agreements being one agreement that is used by all the agencies involved?

Lisa Levine: Lisa Levine for the record. So, it's my understanding that what this would do is kind of streamline the process a little bit so that when we get new agencies signed on, it doesn't kind of make all the other data sharing agreements needing to be amended. So, that's where the book of governance comes in, right?

So you're adding partners. It doesn't mean that we need to go and now re-amend or amend rather all of these other data training rooms that we already have. Please correct me if I'm wrong. So that's why even when this was brought to me, it was like, well, if this is going to make it easier to bring an additional partner so that we don't then have to, you know, re-sign all of the contracts, then that makes a lot of sense.

Craig Moebus: And I'll say that in-in my capacity as the technical provider, like the data sharing agreements, I've just had some exposure this year into them, but I- I wouldn't be able to speak with any- any sort of authority as to that. It's- yeah.

Ansara Martino: Thank you. Ansara Martino for the record. So, periodically and the- the current interlocal contract between all the partners, it expires next year on June 30th. So, as we, you know, find out where- what was improved for the budgets, the next legislature, you know, legislative session for NPWR, we'll have to sign a new interlocal agreement for the exchange of funds that occurs between GOWINN and some of the partner agencies.

For example, GOWINN and [inaudible] pay for Sarah Echo's position. GOWINN and [inaudible] to pay for their Oracle OVI processor. So, some of the- some of the funding that goes

to other agencies to help run, you know, the NPWR system throughout the state. So, that should be, unless anything fiscally changes, like, you know, maybe we need to give a partner new money or Nancy would like to commission, she's got a grant, she would like to commission another CTE report like she did last year, then we would need to...

Nancy Olsen: [inaudible].

Ansara Martino: I think it was last year we did that.

Chair Meyer: We're working on it.

Ansara Martino: Oh, you're still working on it.

Chair Meyer: [inaudible]. That's good to go.

Female Speaker: That's Gabriel.

Female Speaker: That was Gabriel.

Ansara Martino: Oh, that was Gabriel. And then- then we- we would just only sign a new interlocal agreement and those cases. But the actual data sharing portion when you, like, when we brought on DMV and DEOC and DHHS, rather than have to circle around that same interlocal agreement, just so we can add the partner onto the data sharing portion, it would go through like this electronic book of governance as how Virginia calls it.

And then that would be as Craig was saying, they would sign on into the system and then then they would sign the data sharing agreement electronically. And then the committee here would be able to- members would be able to vote on, you know, making them an official partner.

Nancy Olsen: Okay. Nancy Olsen for the record. The reason that I was asking about that is because I know pre-pandemic we were starting down the road of doing a data sharing agreement specifically between adult education and [inaudible]. And at the time it was, well, NDE has our version of a data sharing agreement. [inaudible] has our version, and both had to be completed. It wasn't like we could just, you know, have one agreement. I mean, it was- it was putting both of them together. And so that's why I asked that as far as, you know, would we run into that same kind of thing.

Chair Meyer: I- I think some of the questions that come to mind about that, at least to me, is when we're talking about multiple state agencies, we're regulated by different federal laws in a lot of cases. So DWSS, for example has HIPAA and SSA compliance that they have to deal with. I know [inaudible] has SSA compliance. NDE has [inaudible] compliance. So- so, I'm not saying it can't be done, but that book of governance will have to be the- the- the least common or the greatest common factor right across all of those agencies.

So- so it will have to make sure that there's language in there that addresses all of those potential data regulations, federal and state regulations, so that it could be that one document that- that all



state agencies could share. That- that maybe a big task. Not sure. Depends on, you know, how many different regulatory data regulations are out there across the agencies that we're- that we're considering adding into NPWR.

But I'm hopeful if a state like Virginia can do it, I'm sure we can do it as well. So- so I'd be really interested to see what their- what that governance book looks like in Virginia and how we could- how we could try to mimic or do something similar in Nevada because like, I agree the- the re-signing of those documents every time. It seems to me [inaudible] yeah, inefficient to say the least.

And- and we all know how much time it takes. I mean, I know just to get a signature in the Department of Education is a minimum of three weeks. So, there's a month right there. If every agency involved, then the more agencies we get, the more circulation we're going to go through. We have eight agencies in there each three weeks. We're looking at, you know, seven months now to get a document signed. So...

Female Speaker: And that's not including the dash.

Lisa Levine: Yeah. Lisa Levine, for the record. Just something to think about too, in terms of that conversation in terms of time. Is that's just the time on the back end? So, now when we talk about having it acceptable on the end user side, and you think about speed to market, and if you're a researcher, right, and you have a project that you're doing, you want it to maybe happen back here that you're doing it.

It's two quarters behind that we have to get. If it becomes longer than that, then it may look worse than inefficient. It may work- look incompetent, which we are not incompetent. So, and just something else that I wanted to add listening to you Craig talk through the weeds on the book of governance aspect, it might be helpful too, even if it is really difficult to just kind of get all of the language into one document going back to that security conversation we had.

Like all of those federal regs that are out there on how we store- how we do data management, how we do data storage, right? And then also pulling the [inaudible]. Not a bad thing that we then have this in one place because I think that also kind of one bird, two- two birds with one stone is that the same, kind of goes into that security document too, right? So, I agree that it's not going to be easy, but I think what if we can get there, it'll make our lives a lot easier moving forward.

Chair Meyer: Yeah. And like, I think the architecture of the NPWR system is a big advantage as well, because we're not storing that data in NPWR. Each agency is still the source of their data and they're still in control of that information. And as long as they're maintaining their individual compliance regulations within their office, I'm- I'm not sure how that affects NPWR. We, you know, we at that point, we're- those agencies are redisclosing information to NPWR based on their regulations that they're under.

You know, we at NDE would never disclose something that, for example, would break FERPA regulation. But that's not NPWR's responsibility. That's NDE's responsibility to ensure we don't

expose that information through [inaudible]. So- so maybe- maybe that document won't be that difficult. It just needs to state that data remains- the so- the data remains within the- within the source division. And that division is still responsible for maintaining all the regulations and requirements associated with that data based on- on the regulations that pertain to their agency.

So- so it- it- it may be less difficult than we think just based on the way NPWR works. The fact that we're not storing that data and so we're not- we're not at risk of- of disclosing information that we shouldn't be disclosing from- from NPWR directly. So, we'll, we'll have to do some more- some more research on that. I think the Virginia document will be really helpful if we can get a hold of that.

Craig Moebus: And- and what's interesting is- is within the book of data governance, so there's the data sharing agreement, which I think is maybe more applicable to this conversation because when you look at the book of data governance, it's about how agencies are expected to- the expectations of the- of the agency and of- and being in partnership with the partner agencies, it is- it's the establishment of, you know, these X number of committees, who- which committees are responsible, how the data flows through.

And- and so it's not necessarily the data. I think maybe the- maybe the discussion is really about how do we have that universal data sharing agreement as opposed to the book of- I think the book of governance is very important that, but it- it's really going to fall then to let's build the universal data- universal storm [ph]. Nothing's ever universal, but let's build as big of a possible of a data sharing agreement within the system.

Female Speaker: Ariana Florence [ph] for the record. And to Lisa's point, if we put everything in that data sharing agreement, some agencies that may not have wanted to participate may feel comfortable enough at that point to join in because a lot of 'em are really scared to release any of their data.

Female Speaker: Yeah. I'm not- we were [inaudible].

Male Speaker: Yeah.

Female Speaker: And- oops, sorry- sorry. One tiny point, and I've just been holding this one also creating questions that start conversations not only data, but like what kind of questions can we answer with the data when we were talking about the researchers that we're bringing in, but actually aligning those questions. We do not currently have answers to these, but, NPWR could potentially come in and answer all of these questions for us, for us and for the board, so.

Lisa Levine: Lisa Levine for the record. Love that. Thank you. That's kind of my thought, too, with the research agenda. One, it positions it and it proves that this is a tool that's useful, right? Because maybe not everyone who's utilized data in the past or understands why data could be powerful. Research agenda kind of put some language that. But to your point, and also can it expose where there's opportunity for new data partners and it gives you a real reason for why, right? Because that research question, it's a policy question. There's obviously a reason that we

need to answer that question. We need the data to do it. We need that data partner and then hopefully the data partner that we're trying to identify [inaudible] grief. So, hundred percent.

Female Speaker: Right. Just- Ariana Florence [ph] for the record. You just brought up, when you brought up K- pre-K. I thought to myself how many of those people- those kids are participating pre-K end up in adult ed, you know, what's- what's the effect of early learning.

Female Speaker: I will be around by the time we get that answer.

Female Speaker: Maybe- maybe you will.

Female Speaker: Yeah, [Inaudible]. You will.

Female Speaker: Yes.

Chair Meyer: One of the things we frequently do in- in education from a technology side is in our national consortium, is we develop use cases and we publish those use cases. And- and I think that might be something that we may want to consider doing where we can take a look at some of the information and some of the reports that we currently have in NPWR and build some use cases out and say, here's- here's the data that we're collecting.

This is- this is the picture we're able to paint with that data. This is the particular use case that we're looking at. Good for- for pre-K example is a good one, right? So- so we're able to look at where a student went to pre-K . What- what the- what the quality rating of that pre-K institution was? How did that translate on that student's third grade reading assessment? How did- how did that student perform on standardized tests three through- grades three through eight? How did that student perform on 11th grade ACT assessment? What higher education institution or when did that student enter the workforce? What is that student's average wage, beginning, starting wage? Their wage in three years, five years. That's a use case, right?

And- and when you're in the Department of Corrections and you see- you read that use case, you're going to sit there and think about how- how can we insert correctional data in here or how does this information either benefit or allow us to contribute to that use case? When, you know, when do average age of- of, you know, people entering the correctional system, then historically, what- what does- what did their path look like up to that point, and- and post correction, right? So when- when those folks get out job information and- and recidivism and all of those things that, you know, we can tie those pieces together to health and human service information and- and education information and workforce information. And it paints- it starts to paint this really big picture of- of- of what that looks like. And so just a few simple use cases can really get those people that don't get it right now, you know, well, why would I want to be part of NPWER? Well, here are some use cases. Look through these and see if you can see where your information may enhance this use case or how you could use this use case to improve your own programs or increase your funding because those are the things people are looking for. When do we start that? Right now. Let's- let's do one more.

Female Speaker: Ariana Florence [ph] for the record. And- and not only use cases because the data that we do have already in the system, we sort of have an idea of what to do with it and maybe questions we could ask it, but for- specifically for the ones who are not in and we are trying to sell it to them, what kind of questions would they ask themselves that they could get out of it and just ask the questions for them because they would really like to know the answer once you've posted it. Oh, that would, you know, I want to know.

Chair Meyer: Okay. Great. Great discussion. I'm not sure if we have an action item we need to get vote on here. Unless we want to create a committee to research the Virginia governance book and- and do some- some research and see if that's something we want to- want to bring back.

Female Speaker: Mr. Chair, can I ask if- Craig, do you have access to the Virginia book of governance that you could demonstrate it for the community?

Craig Moebus: Yes.

Male Speaker: Craig, [inaudible].

Female Speaker: No, I didn't.

Craig Moebus: Yes. We'll- I'll bring it. I'll make sure. Well, we'll make sure to disseminate it and- and what we have done and essentially (inaudible) and then- but also to the data sharing agreement. I mean, I'm not- I'm not a board member, but- but I imagine that having- having people responsible for this would help drive the change of the re-design process.

Chair Meyer: Yeah. And that's- that's why I mentioned a work group because that- that work group, we wouldn't, you know, we wouldn't need a quorum there. They could do some research and then bring that information back to the board for us to act on.

Female Speaker: And I believe the work group can also include nonofficial members.

Male Speaker: Correct. Correct.

Lisa Levine: Lisa Levine for the record. Chair, you see that, I mean, kind of during the interim between now and January and the meeting on (inaudible).

Chair Meyer: Yes.

Lisa Levine: That's cool.

Female Speaker: Mr. Chair, if you- when you- when the, once the, I guess you identify the numbers of the work group. We can set up like Zoom meetings. So it would be, you know, easy for you guys and be able to have the meetings and do the research from your individual locations.

Nancy Olsen: Nancy Olsen for the record. We can also do teams depending on who's involved.

Male Speaker: Virtual platform.

Nancy Olsen: So, some of the agencies have Zoom, some don't.

Female Speaker: Got you. Okay.

Craig Moebus: And Craig Moebus for the record. (Inaudible) would love to support this as well. I don't think we could be a part- I don't know if we'd be a part of work group, but (inaudible) would love to help coordinate any- any discussions, any material, any meetings with Virginia.

Lisa Levine: lisa Levine for the record,. We should (inaudible).

Female Speaker: (Inaudible).

Craig Moebus: (Inaudible). Okay.

Lisa Levine: Thank you.

Chair Meyer: Okay. Any other discussion before I call for a motion? Okay. Anybody?

Nancy Olsen: Nancy Olsen for the record. One thing quick. I hate to even suggest it, but should we have (inaudible)? I don't know if we- we can't get a (inaudible) on a work group. Forget I said it.

Female Speaker: I was going to say.

Nancy Olsen: Forget I said it. Okay.

Chair Meyer: No, but what we can do is all of our agencies have a (inaudible). So, once we get, you know, some kind of draft or something we- any- any one of us could submit that to our (inaudible).

Female Speaker: Attorney.

Chair Meyer: (Inaudible). Again, we can do that before we...

Female Speaker: Send it to all the (inaudible)?

Chair Meyer: We could do that too, if- if you want it to take...

Female Speaker: Seven years.

Chair Meyer: Sorry. I'm not going to say that.

Lisa Levine: Lisa Levine for the record. I think we're thinking timeline wise, right, for the holidays. If we can have suggest language maybe by Thanksgiving and then that way before Christmas (inaudible) can agree. Maybe if we decide at one (inaudible) is- is worthy, that would be a good idea. We can figure that out after and then- and then vote on January that way we can have those going by next year. That's exciting.

Chair Meyer: Great. Alright. Anybody have a motion?

Lisa Levine: Make a motion to- Lisa Levine for the record. Approve a working group to work on governance, specifically book of governance.

Chair Meyer: Do we have a second?

Lisa Levine: (Inaudible).

Chair Meyer: Do we have a second?

Jose Martinez: I will second. Jose Martinez for the record.

Chair Meyer: Any further discussion? Alright. All those in favor say aye.

Group: Aye.

Chair Meyer: We heard you Chantel. Thank you. Any opposed? Any abstentions. Alright. Please let the record reflect that the motion carries to create a work group to look into creating a government book.

Female Speaker: Mr. Chair, are you going to ask for volunteers for the (inaudible)?

Chair Meyer: That's a great idea. Do we have any volunteers to serve on the work group? I- I will volunteer.

Female Speaker: I'll volunteer us.

Female Speaker: I'll bring volunteers.

Chair Meyer: Meetings on Fridays.

Female Speaker: Good, 4 p.m.

Female Speaker: I said she volunteered us. Okay. One- one of the other or both,

Female Speaker: It's okay.

Female Speaker: One or the other? Or both? Okay. Which one's doing better that day? Yeah.

Female Speaker: (Inaudible) Yeah. (Inaudible).

Chair Meyer: So you probably told Kristine [ph].

Female Speaker: It's okay. We'll be there (inaudible). I appreciate that.

Chair Meyer: Do we have any volunteers online? Alright, very good.

Female Speaker: It can wait a while.

Chair Meyer: That's okay.

Female Speaker: Teacher wait time.

Female Speaker: Yes.

Female Speaker: (Inaudible)

Chair Meyer: I don't care. I volunteer.

Female Speaker: I'm not on the board either.

Chair Meyer: (Inaudible)

Female Speaker: I would volunteer, Glenn, but I don't know that I would be volunteering then as a CTE person or probably not at that point. So I'm abstaining for this one. Sorry.

Chair Meyer: (Inaudible) we have to understand, Gabriel <laugh>. We may rope you in any way though. Just know that.

Female Speaker: We've got six volunteers. So, it's a good group.

Chair Meyer: That's a good group. Good group. Okay. We will move on.

Female Speaker: (Inaudible)

Chair Meyer: You just have to make sure we don't have a quorum.

Male Speaker: (Inaudible).

Female Speaker: You're not invited.

Female Speaker: Oh, actually, I have...

Female Speaker: Nancy's not a member. Nancy..

Nancy Olsen: No, they lost my waiver. It works out this time. So, I resent it.

Female Speaker: Okay.

Chair Meyer: Alright. We'll move on. Agenda item number 11. This is public comment. Members of the public are invited for final comments. Reminder, in the last (inaudible) taken all the meat (ph), restoring public comment until the matter itself has been included on an agenda as an item for possible action. Public comments will be limited to three minutes per person. Are there any public comments in Carson City? No public comments in Carson City. Do we have any public comments on Zoom? No public comments on Zoom. Were there any public comments that were e-mailed to the committee?

Female Speaker: There were none, Mr. Chair.

Chair Meyer: Thank you very much. Hearing no further comments, I hereby move to adjourn the meeting.

Female Speaker: Thank you everyone.

Nancy Olsen: Thank you. Alright.

Female Speaker: Yeah.

Nancy Olsen: I'm going to sign off of here. Goodbye, Vegas.

Female Speaker: Goodbye.

Nancy Olsen: Bye.