

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: September 14, 2018 at 10:00 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: Zachary Heit (OWINN), Will Goldschmidt (DBDriven), Daniel Boersma (DBDriven), Jose Martinez (NSHE), Patrick Bell (NDE), Tuhin Verma (NDE)

I. CALL TO ORDER & WELCOME
Linda Heiss, Chair

Linda Heiss: Meeting called to order at 10:05am. If there are individuals dialed in for the meeting, please mute your telephone so we don't get feedback and do not put the muting on hold because the hold music creates a distraction and other callers can't hear.

II. ROLL CALL - CONFIRMATION OF A QUORUM
Zachary Heit, Senior Economist, Office of Workforce Innovation

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

III. VERIFICATION OF PUBLIC POSTING

Zachary Heit, Senior Economist, Office of Workforce Innovation

Zachary Heit affirmed that the notice and agenda for this September 14, 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 May 22, 2018 NPWR Advisory Committee Meeting minutes. A motion was made to approve the minutes and the agenda by Glenn Meyer. It was seconded by Mary Harmon. 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: Item number six, an NPWR status update from Will.

Will Goldschmidt: Good morning, everybody. It's good to be back again. Alright, up on the screen is our agenda for the week. We had a career and technical education meeting this morning with Patrick Bell. I think that went really well. Do we want to out brief that?

Zachary Heit: We'll get to it in the agenda item on CTE.

Will Goldschmidt: Obviously, we have our stakeholder meeting to provide you with an annual recap of last year plus the first quarter updates. We have a DMV meeting scheduled for after this meeting to talk about adding DMV data to improve the matching process between the Nevada Department of Education students and the workforce records we have from DETR. We will be putting in a firewall and swapping out some equipment on this trip.

Dan Boersma: We're going to replace the existing firewall with two new firewalls.

Will Goldschmidt: Ok. So, there's going to be an outage during the day tomorrow while we're pulling old hardware out and putting new hardware in. We should be done fairly quickly tomorrow.

Alright. So, the Q1 update is going to be straight and simple. We don't have any time and material money right now, so we haven't spent any. For the fixed price contract, it is what it is at the 427K. We've invoiced two months for July and August. So, we're on track, we're just invoicing the monthly O&M. Providing the updates and there's some more stuff that's going on that we'll talk about, such as the matching which is going on right now.

We did push out the last two reports before the end of the last fiscal year. We put out the "Career Earnings Report" and the "Most Common Degree Report by Industry". We'll talk about all the reports that we did in just a second.

Again, no T&M money right now, but burning through the firm fixed price keeping the system running, swapping out the hardware which we're doing right now, patches every month, backups, data refreshes, and of course matching.

Real quick high-level overview. We delivered a total of twelve reports last fiscal year. The last two were the "Career Earnings Report" and "Most Common Degree", the last two to get into production. Then, we've got a report that is in process but not currently being worked on. That's the education ROI.

Our system uptime was 99.9% and that includes our planned downtime for backups and system updates. If we exclude the time that we had planned, the system was up 100% of the time. So the only time it was brought down and not available were the times we brought it down to run some type of software patching our backup.

A couple of FYI's, closed out 23 bugs and applied just short of 600 patches to the 27 devices that comprise NPWR. Here's a look back at the FY17-18 report development schedule. Everything is complete except for the education ROI report, which is on hold, pending a contract. Everything else is shown here. As you can see, we got kind of a late start. The first couple of items we pushed out were in November, so almost at the midway point, and then we got fired up on the Power BI reports because the contracts came through. And everything else essentially got pushed out from February 1st to the end of June. So, in four months we updated twelve SQL Server Reporting Service (SSRS) reports to Power BI. Those are all up and running in production right now.

Now, that brings us to our future priorities. Just a bit, these are the top priorities as identified by the council last year for FY19. I don't believe those have changed.

Couple of discussion items real quick. We're still on track to replace the Logi XML software as the data request tool. That's just something internal to the system. Currently, no one is using that software in Nevada except for us for when we pull the data for the refreshes. We do have a new enhancement that is coming out. For you, this would probably be NPWR version 2.0.

Glenn Meyer: Before we move on, that Logi XML, is that an upgrade or a replacement?

Will Goldschmidt: Replacement.

Glenn Meyer: And what is it being replaced with?

Will Goldschmidt: So we're taking out the Logi XML commercial software and replacing it with .net code that we're developing ourselves. For two reasons, one using Logi makes the technical aspects of using the system more complicated. There's some additional communications and synchronizations that are required on the back end between the data hub, the data adapters, and Logi XML in order to create the catalogs that identify which data elements can be pulled for research purposes. So, we're going to get rid of that complexity. Item two connects to the new query enhancement capability that we're going to provide on this next upgrade and the DRT that we're bringing out is more capable of supporting that.

Dan Boersma: Also, with that, Logi licenses just went up 700%.

Will Goldschmidt: The other reason is this new capability that the DRT will support, which is our ability to create explicit relationships. So, today in NPWR, we can identify a person within each of the datasets that are brought in. So we recognize, for example, that Will Goldschmidt has a K-12 record, higher ed record, and a workforce record. What we can't really do today, is build a query that would say, "Hey, I'd like to know if students with parents that made a certain amount of money, give me all of those students' school records." So, specifically, that gives us the capability to create linkages that are not just Will to Will to Will, but Will to Will's parents. Will's parents down to Will would exist. In the case of K-12 or Higher Ed, relationships between teachers and students can now exist. We can say, I only want to see students of teachers who have master's degrees and then see what all their scores were, and then compare that to bachelor's degrees and vice-versa. So, it allows us to create a linkage between people that are not the same person. Teachers, students, parents, children. From a querying-analysis perspective, this opens up a lot of new in-roads in your ability to add extensible data that you could not otherwise look at and do analysis on using NPWR.

It also gives you the ability to put in reference tables inside of the NPWR system and then when data is being pulled, those tables can be pulled with it. So, lookups are now possible, where before, you could only pull the value with it. Like if you put a code in we could only pull the code. Now you'll be able to pull the code, the lookup table that's connected to that, and we can pull that lookup data as well.

Glenn Meyer: Do we lose any functionality or flexibility by doing away with the off the shelf product and going with the hard coded solution?

Will Goldschmidt: No. No you're not losing any functionality. There's nothing you could do now with the commercial software that we will not be able to do in the new data request tool. And we will be able to do new things in the data request tool that the old one could not show us. For

example, we'll be able to show the structure for those explicit relationships. So, you'll have the capability in the data. You'll see that in the DRT, you'll be able to, for example, pull data on teacher attributes in relation to the students you're pulling data on.

Glenn Meyer: I guess my concern is more that the off-the-shelf product comes with a predetermined set of tools. If we're writing something to replace that and we want to enhance that and add additional functionality to it, then that's coding work. So, I'm just trying to see where's our trade off. Are we gaining more by being more flexible with the code and the code being able to do more things than we are by being able to be more quickly responsive using the off-the-shelf product by having to code for something that already exists in the product?

Dan Boersma: Right, so, I understand. One thing too though is that Logi was being used particularly for one small part of the application, and not necessarily iwhat it was originally designed for. And that particular product line is not supported long term with Logi. So, that commercial product is not going to see any new enhancements at all going forward. So, there's very little value in keeping the commercial product, even if we didn't increase fuction.

Will Goldschmidt: I see no value in the commercial product other than it makes the system extremely complex. It's going to be simpler. It's going to be more stable. And we're going to have more capability with the code.

Glenn Meyer: Ok.

Will Goldschmidt: And there's no charge as we're building it in support of the system.

Glenn Meyer: Ok.

Will Goldschmidt: So, data updates. This is a leftover from the last time. An update on infinite campus, which we'll discuss in other agenda items. Now we'll open for questions.

VII. DATA PARTNER PLANNING UPDATE (Information/Discussion)
Zachary Heit, Senior Economist, Office of Workforce Innovation

Linda Heiss: With no questions for Will, we'll move on to the next agenda item and ask Zach to update us on data partner planning.

Zachary Heit: We have two updates on potential data partners and including new data in the system. One is with the DMV and one is with apprenticeship data. I wanted to provide an update on both.

In regard to the DMV partnership; previously we had reported on how Minnesota had implemented and worked with their Department of Public Safety to get vehicle driver information in their system. So, they provided us some resources, including their MOU's and their justification they approached their department with in order to make that happen. We had a call

with them on Wednesday, and it was revealed that they did things a lot differently than how we are approaching the situation. Their workforce data actually already contains fields such as first name and last name in addition to social security number, so they were already able to match to their K-12 and post-secondary data records already without establishing a link with their DMV or vehicle driver information. Why they created a partnership with their DPS was to gather more demographic information including gender, zip code, and date of birth (age). They were using it for the purposes of labor market information so that they could enhance those pieces of data and do more research with them within their labor division. So, they were looking at transiency and movement between residential zip code and where they were working, so they could track commute and transiency. Gender and age were used to look at the makeup of the labor force more accurately, so they could project potential retirement and potential supply and demand issues. So, that was their purpose in getting into an agreement with their DPS. It wasn't used for matching purposes and they weren't partnering to collect information as restricted as social security number.

In addition to Minnesota, we were put into touch with Idaho who had also accessed social security numbers for the purpose of matching in their SLDS. Their approach was to link and match data, so it was more in alignment with Nevada's objective. They were able to leverage an existing relationship between their DMV and Department of Labor where they were using DMV data for unemployment insurance (UI) claims. They built out a second MOU that would allow for the information to be used to perform a match internally within their labor department. From there, we thought we might possibly want create a similar process and structure for including DMV data into the system.

Today after this committee meeting, we have a meeting with staff at the DMV to discuss a proposal that would allow NPWR to use data from the DMV for matching purposes. There was legislation passed, SB 516, that is now NRS code 233.830, that says that certain agencies will provide data to the SLDS. One of those listed is the DMV. Therefore the first proposal, and the easiest we foresee, is to approach DMV and ask if they can provide data directly to NPWR. Either directly providing a demographic log like the other agencies, or that they would perform a match internally within DMV and then give us back a matched data crosswalk, essentially giving us a key. The third proposal is similar to the Idaho approach, where DMV would supply data to DETR and then DETR would perform an internal match.

Will Goldschmidt: A couple of things can happen there. DMV would provide data to DETR, because there's already an agreement in place to provide data to DETR. Then one of two things could happen. DETR could incorporate that new data into the demographic file that we currently get from you. That would be one way to do it. It would be a redisclosure to NPWR.

Mary Harmon: Right. And we would have to get that because there is a non-redisclosure in the agreement.

Will Goldschmidt: And that's why it's not option one.

Mary Harmon: Right.

Will Goldschmidt: Or they give you new data, you don't give the data to us, and we run the match under the auspices of DETR.

Mary Harmon: You lost me.

Will Goldschmidt: Essentially, you run the match.

Glenn Meyer: You would get all the data. Not just the DMV data.

Mary Harmon: On what equipment and where?

Will Goldschmidt: Well, that would have to be worked out.

Mary Harmon: And who is paying for this?

Tuhin Verma: So, if it's in statute, then why can't they just provide the data to do the matching?

Zachary Heit: We think they will and we're asking them after this meeting. We're giving them options and the statute should make one easier than the other.

Will Goldschmidt: If there's a problem that somehow says that there isn't a way they can do that, then there are other options.

Mary Harmon: Ok. With the DMV data that DETR currently gets, there are some drawbacks. One, we get it monthly and it's with people that have active driver's licenses. So, if you get a DUI and your license gets suspended DETR doesn't get the next month.

Zachary Heit: And it's just driver's licenses? Does it include state ID cards?

Mary Harmon: I am not sure. It's been so long...this has been existing since before I got to DETR. It's a flat file that they provide to us monthly. And we don't even use it anymore for SSA verification. We use it as a secondary verification.

Will Goldschmidt: That's a good point. Obviously, we would want more of the historical data, not just a current active file set.

Mary Harmon: This is what I'm being told by people throughout the years. That this is some of the things have not rolled up my sleeves and looked at. So, they may say that we're giving you this data, but I don't think that's true.

Will Goldschmidt: Ok. We'll ask them. I think that's a good point.

Mary Harmon: And I don't think we get a lot of the demographic that you would be wanting.

Will Goldschmidt: What we desperately want is name and date of birth.

Mary Harmon: But I didn't know if you needed the other data for labor market information.

Zachary Heit: I mean we could always ask them, but I think the main purpose we're looking to do with DMV data is to connect and match the existing data sets better. The K-12 data to workforce data match. I think in the future, if we're looking to expand that information for labor market analysis, that's great. But we're focused on the fields for matching purposes first.

Mary Harmon: You might want to ask them while you're asking for this information.

Zachary Heit: Right. We can explain to them what Minnesota does and see.

Will Goldschmidt: There is benefit to their demographic data, because the only other demographic data is NDE's. So, if someone from outside of the state moved in and now we don't have their demographic data because they aren't in NDE, since they didn't go to K-12 here. So, there is value in having that other demographic data relative to our reports, because we're still going to be able to do workforce analysis. So, we'd want it, but what's critical for the matching purposes is name and date of birth.

Mary Harmon: Ok. And Zach, if we do go down option two, we're going to have to figure out how that's going to get funded.

Zachary Heit: Yes. Are there any other questions on that or else I can update on apprenticeship data?

So, currently, OWINN is the State Apprenticeship Agency. We have a person in our office that works with the federal database on registered apprenticeships called RAPIDS. So, we're exploring how to get that apprenticeship data into NPWR so that we can look at, create and develop an apprenticeship report that was approved last meeting for the research agenda. Through a published FAQ on apprenticeship data, we know of four states that currently have registered apprenticeship data in their SLDS, and that's Washington, North Carolina, Texas, and Nebraska. Texas and Nebraska are the only two states that use RAPIDS data, because Washington and North Carolina have their own apprenticeship databases. So, Nebraska and Texas both use RAPIDS data in their system. So, we're exploring how to get an extract from the RAPIDS database to put in the SLDS, so we can develop and run reports using that data. We're currently at the beginning stages of this discussion. We had a meeting with the State Apprenticeship Director in OWINN about this. There is a technical assistant or expert at USDOL that could provide answers to questions on how states can access RAPIDS data. So, if we need to, we can approach them and ask them to provide a roadmap on how to proceed.

VIII. NSHE UPDATES – FINANCIAL AID AND AP REPORTS (Information/Discussion)

Linda Heiss, Chair

Sarah Echo, Institutional Research Analyst, Nevada System of Higher Education

Linda Heiss: Item eight is my item. Financial Aid report from NSHE, which looks at financial aid received and loan by major. That report is in progress. The AP Reports are in progress. That one was combined on the initial Dual Enroll/AP report and we already had done the Dual Enroll, so now we're working on the AP. And then I think last time, I talked about the teacher education dashboard that we created. That was specific to NSHE institutions, but I've worked with the licensure person at NDE, and he and I are going to work together. So, in that dashboard that shows the supply and demand right now, we're saying NSHE meets this much of the demand. We're actually going to fill that gap and we're going to say, NSHE meets this much of the demand and Alternative Route Licensure (ARL) programs meet this much of demand. This many teachers come from out of state, so we can account from 100% of the demand with other than NSHE institutions. That dashboard was successful, so the nursing department had asked that we had develop one for nursing. So now we started a nursing education dashboard where we would do the same thing and we'll also be able to show where nurses came from besides NSHE.

We're updating the Remedial Enrollment report, which as you know is different from the Remedial Cost report that NDE does through SLDS. And then in addition to that, we have produced the Supply and Demand report for all occupations in the state and then showed how much of the demand that NSHE institutions are meeting. We met with Bob Potts, who would like us to do that same kind of report but base it on the Governor's priorities instead of NSHE programs. So, once DETR releases their final projections, which I'm waiting to hear from Bob on, we will also create a secondary supply and demand report showing the Governor's priorities.

And that's it for the NSHE update. Does anyone have any questions?

Zachary Heit: I have a question about the teacher education dashboard. Looking at the teacher licensure data, will we be able to tell how many of those licensed teachers are actually working in Nevada?

Linda Heiss: Yes. As I understand it through the licensure, they actually have worked to develop a significant database where they can actually track who is in the schools, but track which positions or openings are open. So, the DETR projections on teachers are actually, at least the last round, was pretty off. So, there's a lot more teachers needed than what DETR was projecting. So, they actually have by school, how many teachers are actually needed. So, using the licensure database, we're going to update the demand in addition to the supply.

Zachary Heit: That's awesome. Wasn't the last projection by DETR somewhere around 1200 teachers needed?

Linda Heiss: Something like that. The actual number is believed to be higher than that. So, they have it by school so, they'll still be able to break that down by region like we do currently.

Zachary Heit: I don't know if you know of their current capability or if they're planning on it, but are they also tracking other licensed personnel outside of teachers like school counselors, nurses, etc.

Linda Heiss: Ok. That's another section that we want to work on. That is kind of one of our next steps in terms of that dashboard and adding those different professions.

Zachary Heit: That's great.

Linda Heiss: So, if there are no other questions we'll move on to agenda item nine, which are the NDE updates from Glenn.

IX. NDE UPDATES – CTE DATA AND INFINITE CAMPUS (Information/Discussion)

Glenn Meyer, Director of Information Technology, Nevada Department of Education

Glenn Meyer: Ok so, Infinite Campus updates. We've been working for the last year on quite a few new data elements in Infinite Campus. One of the first ones that I'll talk about today is the new diploma types. There's some new requirements for the standard diploma. There's a new college and career ready diploma. And there's also a new alternative diploma. So, we've been working with Campus and our district partners to create new graduation plans within Campus that fallow those new requirements and to be able to issue those two new diploma types as well as incorporate the new requirements for the standard diploma. That work is nearing completion. We have to be able to issue those diplomas this year. The college and career ready diploma as well as the new standard diploma types have been completed. We're working on the alternative diploma right now. Those two completed diplomas are in test in Infinite Campus right now. As soon as they pass test, they'll be live and in production.

We've also been working on CTE data and information regarding CTE courses. We've been working with Patrick and his group at CTE. They were also involved in the new diploma type work, so some of that work kind of overlaps. Also, creating new reports inside of Campus, developing a CTE tab in Campus so that districts can more easily validate and report on their CTE data. So, those are some of the things we've been working on with CTE and that work as well as the graduation work both had a course identification requirement. So, we had the need to be able identify specific courses both for those diplomas and for CTE reporting, so we've started on a project to incorporate SCED codes in the state and develop a state course catalog based on SCED code. That way all of our local districts can map all of their local courses to SCED, then we will use the SCED codes at the state level for identification and reporting purposes of the courses and course taking. Like our math course pattern report I think will benefit from this. I know Linda went through a ton of work to try and identify what all those courses were in each individual district. Now if they're all mapping back to a common course code, that work will be much easier. That mapping will have already been done at the district level, so we'll be able to collect that information. We expect it to be much more accurate as far as those courses that comply with the curriculum requirements, because part of the mapping exercise, now we can also run reports

that say here's all the district level courses that map back from the state identifiers. Then our curriculum folks here at the state can go out and audit those courses to make sure they really are meeting the requirements that they say they are mapping them to at the state level. So, we think that will improve the quality of our data.

Will Goldschmidt: When do you think the SCED codes will be integrated into Infinite Campus?

Glenn Meyer: We're hoping to have this ready to go for the 19-20 school year. We're working right now and just kicked off the project. Tuhin is going to be helping with that too. He's going to be coordinating the effort to get participation from all of our district partners. We have some pilot district already working. Clark County has been using SCED codes for the last two years and they have them all populated in Campus, so we're working with them and hoping to use them as a pilot district. Also, I know Patrick has been working a few districts on the CTE stuff and those CTE SCED codes. He's already developed the CTE course catalog with the state accepted SCED codes in there. So, we would like some of our districts to start using those codes this school year and just see if that data is flowing up through the system. We'll kind of use that as a pilot so we can go ahead and roll it out in the fall. We're hoping by January we can start piloting with some of those districts and start collecting their course data at the state level to see how that works and if things are transferring across exactly how we expected them to be.

We have been working on two data match processes with external agencies. The first is with the Department of Health and Human Services to exchange direct certification data for free and reduced lunch. We are now receiving a file from DHHS monthly that contains all of the benefit recipients for TANF, SNAP, and Medicaid. We're using that file to match against Infinite Campus and then we are informing our districts; we're sending them a file of all those matched students in their district, so they can go in and mark them as direct certified. We've also created a process for districts that want us to do it for them. Where we can just push that down through Campus. Once we make the match, we can actually flip the kids FRL direct certification flag from the state and push it down. Our smaller districts are using Campus as their nutrition program. Our districts using a third-party nutrition program, they prefer a file because they're importing that file into their third-party system. Then most of them have already written processes that take that information from their third-party system and put it into Campus. Either way it's still getting populated into Campus so we now have that information directly available to us.

We're also at the state level, with those results, creating an economic disadvantage indicator that's decoupled from free and reduced lunch. Now we can truly say who our economic disadvantaged students are based on some income verification test that's been performed by a state agency. Again, we think that will be a more accurate picture of who our economic disadvantaged kids are versus who our free and reduced lunch recipients are. We know those numbers are not the same because you can qualify for free and reduced lunch if your school's population is over 30-40% free and reduced lunch, in some cases, your whole school can qualify, which means everybody is eligible regardless of what their income level is. This will give us more accurate indicator. Right now it's just for internal use because all of the legislation in Nevada, for any kind of reporting where they're trying to make some sort of economic value decision right now is based on free and

reduced lunch because we've never had another indicator. We expect to start getting the word out about the new possible indicator and hopefully some of that legislation will start to change where we can use that indicator as opposed to free and reduced lunch.

Will Goldschmidt: Have you talked to Health and Human Services about joining NPWR?

Glenn Meyer: Yes, we did. Two year ago. We actually had quite a few conversations and at that time they were very interested. They had a program they wanted NPWR data for as well. So, it was kind of a mutual thing. They didn't have the money for it at the time.

Tuhin Verma: So their problem was that they multiple data sets and they wanted to first fix that and have one source of data that they could contribute to us. They were asking for money the last session for IBM Oracle to come in and do that work. But I don't know what happened with regard to that.

Glenn Meyer: They're getting really close. I just had a phone call with their Chief IT and we were talking and he was asking me questions about NPWR and what data is available, and he was telling me they were getting really close to this golden dataset. He was interested in how we're matching and having that conversation. I told him that we were having this meeting this week. I told him that I know this is a topic on our agenda and that I would get back to him after we had this discussion, hopefully with some more information. I do think they're still interested in joining. I think they have a lot of good data that we could all benefit from. I just think the reason it didn't happen before is that project they were really depending on, went ahead without it. It kind of fell off of their radar I think. But now that they've got that golden set, or they're close to it, I think it's been resurrected over there. Now there's some education data they want.

Will Goldschmidt: That's why I bring it up. We're doing that for Virginia right now. Not to talk about another state but Virginia's social services is on their P-20W system. We're building two reports right now for the Department of Social Services that bring together that intersection of the education assessments and we're mapping that back and creating that intersection to SNAP recipients, TANF recipients, and we're showing the counts of the people inside the social services are that are also hitting those assessments. Then the scores of those people receiving those services and what their mean scores are compared to people that qualify but don't receive services and their mean scores to create some comparative analysis. If HHS were in, usually those types of numbers are very valuable to the program managers by being able to see the impact that services have on educational outcomes. That's why linking you're doing now on eligibility is important. Virginia has been doing that for years. So social services sends over to K-12 a list of people that are eligible for free and reduced lunch, K-12 flags it, DHHS flags it, there's some other flags in there on additional items. In October, we're going to release the first report that's going to show education attainment on the events and the SNAP, TANF, social breakouts and its going to go all the way out to post-secondary. We're going to track it all the way out through college. If people are interested in that type of work, the system is primed and ready, we just need to bring the DHHS data in. We've already done the leg work to understand how to create these calculations

and the business rules. We can show you what those business rules are. If you like them, it's an easy lift to create that report for Nevada.

Glenn Meyer: The next one, we're working with DCFS, Division of Child and Family Services, to do a foster care match. Again, right now it's monthly, so every month we're getting a file from DCFS and we're matching those kids statewide against Infinite Campus. Then we're providing that information back to our districts or we're flipping that flag for them, whichever they want us to do. We're also doing some work at the district level on foster kids by building out the foster tab in Infinite Campus. Campus has a core foster student tab where you can record foster information, but we're customizing that tab a little bit more for Nevada and the way we use it. We're changing the values in the drop-down boxes to match our terminology and those kinds of things. We're working closely with Carson City School District. They're kind of leading that project. They've been working with other districts to design what that page is going to look like and how it's going to function. They're testing some of the changes and updates that they've made to it right now, so we're hoping to have that ready by the end of the calendar year as well. Those are some exciting things. Again, improving the match by getting a file direct from the agency and bouncing it against statewide Infinite Campus has been huge for our districts because the way it worked before was DCFS would provide a file to the district of the kids who only resided within their zip code. And would only provide that file to public schools. Charter schools never got a file and they have kids that live in the district or county that their charter school is in or in another district and they never see those kids on the list. Those kids are on either Washoe County's list or Clark County's list. By being able to match it statewide, we're able to match all kids across charters, Achievement School District, all of our normal school districts. Now we're matching kids for foster that were never matched before and were falling through the cracks at our charter schools and correctional schools and those places. That again has improved our quality of data and our ability to get services to those kids. That's been a big improvement.

Will Goldschmidt: And have you been using the Data Ladder tool to perform the matching?

Glenn Meyer: Yes. It's working great. We bought a couple more licenses to be able to do the matching. We've been using the product. It works great. The feds have been out several times, because the FRL match we're doing, we're receiving money from the Department of Agriculture to do part of that work. So, they've been coming out to make sure that their money is being well spent and we've shown them the matching process and they're impressed with it as well.

Will Goldschmidt: Speaking of money for reimbursement type stuff. We are starting a project in Virginia to start identifying the WIOA workers who are receiving either SNAP or TANF benefits. Because all that training money spent by the state is reimbursable through a federal program. I can get you the details. We're working on putting the contract in place in Virginia. Essentially, we're trying to identify WIOA participants who are receiving one social service program and there's total reimbursement from the feds for this if you show them the list of recipients by name. Virginia thinks there's millions of dollars on the line through this reimbursement program. We would be able to do something like this if we could get health and human services data. Or do you know if you're already doing something like that?

Mary Harmon: I don't know. But how would we do that if you have to identify them at the individual level?

Will Goldschmidt: We have a method for doing that.

Mary Harmon: Because that's contrary to everything that this is set up to be deidentified.

Will Goldschmidt: Right. It is deidentified, but if you wanted to reconstitute that identification you could. It's deidentified because we identify it and then we destroy all the underlying personal identifiable information that's linked into the UIDs and then we end up with that crosswalk table. But within that crosswalk table, I can tell you the two UIDs from each agency and give you back that information and have you guys identify these people. Or, because for the purposes of the match, at that point in time we have all that data, we could give you the PII back at that point in time, and then flush the PII. There are literally millions available. So, I think they said there were \$300 million issued from the Department of Labor in reimbursement on this program. Virginia got something like half of a million and felt like they were missing something. That program is probably available to Nevada if you aren't already doing it.

Mary Harmon: It's WIOA and what agency?

Will Goldschmidt: It's WIOA and I think it's SNAP, it could be TANF.

Glenn Meyer: It's probably SNAP because TANF is temporary cash.

Will Goldschmidt: Right. I do think it's SNAP not TANF. I'll get you the details and I can even connect back to the guy in Virginia who's initiated all of this.

Glenn Meyer: That's all I have.

Zachary Heit: I would like to continue the CTE data discussion. We had a meeting with Patrick (Bell) about CTE data being used to develop a CTE report and use it within NPWR. We think based off of our discussion with Patrick, we have a couple of options to insert CTE data, at least from 2015 and later, into the system.

Patrick Bell: Right. Correct me if I'm wrong, but you guys have these unique student IDs that is the same UID that the state system uses. I know we're building these systems in Infinite Campus, but I already have for my purposes, the data built. I know exactly how many students are participators, concentrators, completers, how many earn certificates in specific programs. I can identify a student by UID to a very specific CTE program, which these guys would like to be able to use to the post-secondary enrollment reports. It would serve some of our purposes too, such as reporting for the New Skills for Youth (NSFY) grant, to understand the connections between a CTE program, college enrollment, high-demand/high-skill career pathways, all these things that are part of the strategic plan that we've been tasked with tracking and getting data elements on.

Glenn Meyer: I think that's fine for historical data, and then we have to decide at what point do we switch from that source to Infinite Campus. It won't be until it's all there and available in Campus and tested.

Patrick Bell: Right. And that's what the data tab is there for. It tracks by program, it should track if they've completed the workplace readiness, the performance assessment for that program, whether they receive the endorsement, and basically all of the stuff we track and bring together into our office to do our reporting, eventually will be a functionality in Infinite Campus. But I have historical data for at least three years from when I started to build the data in the way that I saw it. That data could be provided to NPWR to start building the baseline and at least serve our purpose for reporting.

Glenn Meyer: I don't see any issue with that because that is the source data we've been reporting from anyway.

Patrick Bell: Since we have historical data, instead of waiting a year for Infinite Campus, we can use the last three years for a historical baseline.

Will Goldschmidt: We'll be able to take that table and add it to the staging data, and we'll be able to link all of that together and update all of the reports to include CTE.

Linda Heiss: Is there any other comment under item nine?

- X. 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.)

The second 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.

Zachary Heit: I have an update to provide in public comment. We were informed by the SLDS State Support Team that both budget bills being considered in the house do include money for a new round of SLDS grants. They're hopeful the Washington DC will be able to pass a budget that includes new grant funds. I wanted to put that on everyone's radar for future funding as we look to enhance the system and propose new projects with the SLDS.

Linda Heiss: If there is no other public comment, we will adjourn the meeting.

XII. ADJOURNMENT (Information/Discussion)

Chair

Meeting adjourned at 11:14am.

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, Tuesday, September 11, 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/.