Maryland Longitudinal Data System Governing Board
10:00 am - 12:00 pm
February 2, 2011

Meeting Minutes

<u>**Board Members in Attendance:**</u> Dr. William "Brit" Kirwan, Ayana English-Brown, Dr. Nancy Grasmick, Nicole Murano, Brian Roberts, Elizabeth Sachs, Alex Sanchez, Clay Whitlow, and Dr. David Wilson

<u>**Absent:**</u> Dr. Michael Martirano, Jason Perkins-Cohen

<u>**Other Attendees:**</u> David Stevens, Jaclyn Lichter, Paulette Francois, Lynn Reed, Dr. Leslie Wilson, Dr. Danette Howard, Chandra Haislet, Elizabeth Kameen, Paige Kowalski, Judith Wood, Don Spicer, Stan Jakubik, Mark Heidrich, and Representatives from Anna Arundel County Public Schools

<u>**Welcome**</u> (**Chancellor Kirwan**)
   The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. The board approved the minutes from December 7, 2010 meeting.

<u>**Project Management**</u>
   Dr. Kirwan introduced Judith Wood the LDS Project Manager.

<u>**Memorandum of Understanding**</u> (**Elizabeth Kameen**)
   Elizabeth Kameen handed out and reviewed the Memorandum of Understanding between MSDE, USM, and the Governing Board.
   Ms. Kameen reviewed the following sections of document:
   - Role of the Governing Board: Review project proposals mean a report of projects will be approved at monthly meetings, receive reports from MSDE, and keep MSDE accountable for projects. The Board can terminate early if MLDS is fully operational and the role of the Board is fulfilled.
   - Role of MSDE: MSDE will fund all projects, review projects for proposal, distribute funds from RTTT, work collaboratively on projects, and assist USM with sign off process.
   - Role of USM: USM will propose projects through the LDS Project Manager.
   - Note: Any party can terminate from 180 days notice.
   - **DISCUSSION**
     o The Board asked for clarification on the word "projects" and on the role of the Interagency Group. Ms. Kameen and Dr. Wood responded project proposals would include design and architecture of the MLDS and/or the (re)allocation of people resources. Specific research projects would not be addressed at this time. The Interagency Workgroup is made up of individuals do applied research on data. If a project is proposed, it will be thoroughly vetted through the Interagency Workgroup. At all times, the Board can/should give guidance to the Interagency Workgroup.
     o In response to questions about expenditures Ms. Kameen commented there should be seamless processes between groups for smaller projects. The RFI process will be more challenging.

- **PROPOSED CORRECTIONS**
  - *I. Role of USM,* Part A (page 2):
    - Add in the word "work plans." Proposed language: *Propose to the Governing Board for approval and to implement after final approval from MSDE, a project or series of projects (WORK PLANS) that will lead to the development of the MLDS.*
    - Streamline the last sentence to include "people, processes, and technology"
  - *VI. Compensation and Method of Payments,* Part A (page 4):
    - Amend amount: *$4,044,560.00* to $4,944,560.00
  - Correct typos—USM spelled incorrectly and other minor errors (multiple pages)
- A motion was made to approve MOU with the proposed corrections. The motion was passed unanimously.

LDS Interagency Workgroup Update
- **Discussion of Federal Assurances (Chandra Haislet)**
  - Challenges related to assurances: need a strategy since P-20 Center will not be ready in September, need to amend MOU to meet assurances.
  - One major challenge: Creating P-20 student identifiers through linking students to social security numbers that are given/collected on a voluntary basis. MSDE will continue to collect SSNs.
    - This is a challenge because Higher Ed and workforce only use SSN, some parents prohibit children from using SSN in K-12, and some students do not have a SSN.
    - The short-term solution depends on a manual process. MSDE sends SSNs to MHEC. Only captures 75% due to voluntary release to MSDE. 75% is acceptable because there is no stated acceptance level.
    - This as a national problem. Since there are little definitions through ARRA the group will have to determine definitions for the State to move towards something that will compliment research. Discussions will become important to define what MD needs until there is a national standard.
- **Discussion of Policy Questions (Dr. Danette Howard)** see attached Policy Questions
- Dr. Howard handed out and reviewed the Policy Question document. She responded to the Board's questions about the document.
- Question 1: *Are students academically prepared to enter college and complete their programs in a timely manner?-* MHEC currently uses self-reported data from the SAT/PSAT related to which classes students take in high school. There are questions on reliability. However, MSDE is in the process of creating electronic transcripts. This system will allow for a direct upload of high school transcript data to show what students actually completed. Grades will also be included in the upload. MSDE is doing a proof of concept in 5 LEAs. No date set for when ALL schools will have electronic transcripts. The State is also setting a definition of college preparedness.
- Question 5: *How does placement in developmental coursework vary among students of different backgrounds (i.e., race, ethnicity, and preparation)?* -This assurance will

present a difficulty because we do not have ability to assess outcomes for students who delay enrollment to higher education. Data is kept in a co-hort for the graduating class then kept for 1-2 years after secondary graduation. Currently, the uses of the data have changed to include a need differentiate between a 28 year-old student who has delayed enrollment vs. student who just got out of high school.

- Question 8: *Are community college students able to transfer within state to 4-year institutions successfully and without loss of credit?* - Currently cannot answer question because there is no data on postsecondary data. MHEC does not have student-level transcript data. Would require linking the transcript data to postsecondary data systems.
- Question 9: *Which students are being lost in the transition between community colleges and 4-year institutions?* - There should be a better definition of which variables to focus. The issue should be revisited in order to link student level data to the National Clearinghouse data.
- Question 12: What are the differences in performance, retention and graduation, including time to degree, of students beginning in dual enrollment programs, at 2-year institutions and at 4-year institutions?
    - Dr. Howard responded the there is a need to clarify what improving access. Does that mean enrollment rates are increasing or something else?
    - Current MHEC Systematic Gaps: MHEC does not have data on students with a disability entering postsecondary education. MHEC is working with AG to determine how to capture the data.
- Question 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15- Currently, we can answer these questions.
    - Dr. Howard noted: Question 10-We have SES data, but the staffing capacity in MHEC is limited to adequately address systemwide data. Question 11-We do not capture AP students. This reporting is done be the College Board.
    - Chancellor Kirwan mentioned that there will be a Bill submitted for the State to have greater oversight over the for-profit institutions that get 25% Pell Grants, but have a 7% Graduation rate.

- **Initial Gap Analysis (Charles Benil)** see attached Gap Analysis

- There are gaps in data related to nonpublic schools, home-schooled students, juvenile services education, graduation equivalent diploma, independent in-state non-profit, independent instate for-profit, out-of-state institutions in Maryland, private career schools, out-of-state distance education, public non-credit students, independent contractors, and self employed.
    - **MICUA** provides MD resident data, but no out-of-state. Data looks at total population—collected at an aggregate level (the number of bachelors who have been awarded and total student enrollment). In a broad sense, there is regulatory authority for MHEC Secretary to collect information outlined by law.
    - **Out of State Distance Education** No way to know who is participating.
    - **Public non-credit students** there is no system to get student-level data. An entire set of policy questions will be needed on how to handle credit/non credit.
    - **Home school-data** is based on information voluntarily reported at aggregate.

- **Juvenile system** The population i3,000 population—there are privacy issues. Data is collected at an aggregate level not student level
- Correctional education/disabilities—there is a piece of data about student population; adult correctional—under DLLR. Area could be included. Always more about a legal/private sensitivity.
  - o The Board should review and also submit other questions.

- **RFI (Ben Passamore and Judi Wood)**
  - o The RFI process will identify things that we are unsure about while we are in the architecture phase of the project. Additional support will come from the Interagency Workgroup.

- **Data Quality Campaign (Paige Kowalski)**
  - o It is about people, processes, and technology.
  - o DQC has ten actions correspond with 12 America elements.
    - MD has 6/10 (4 we need to work on)
    - Average State has 8/10
    - MD's gap: MD should provide access to the MLDS process. The goal is to give people access to policy questions—parents, school boards, businesses need to answer policy questions at their level. The more access the State gives, the better the locals can answer their questions.
  - o Ms. Kowalski offered suggestions about public relations strategies and how to label "policy questions" to public.
  - o National Student Clearinghouse—take leadership to work with neighboring state (project—ID, OR, HI partnering on students moving across). MD should think of partnering with the Mid-Atlantic States to create links in their LDS.
  - o DQC wants to use MD as an example for the collaboration between higher education and K-12.
  - o She highlighted that every state does something great. The hope is to borrow/adapt from all states going through the process. There are training modules, portals, policy questions to borrow. Idea is to adapt.

Meetings: The schedule for the 3-4 meetings will be determined in advanced. Next Meeting will focus on RFI.

Conclusion (Adjourned 12:07pm)

Policy Question	Can the question be answered with the LDS as it is currently configured		Comments
	Yes	**No**	
1) Are students academically prepared to enter college and complete their programs in a timely manner?	X		The question can be answered if an academically prepared student is defined as one who meets the University System of Maryland's admissions standards, and if high school-level transcript data are available in the LDS.
2) What percentage of Maryland high school graduates go on to enroll at a Maryland college or university?	X		This question can be answered for high school graduates in a given year, or within a specific period of time.
3) How does the above percentage differ by race, ethnicity, and preparation?	X		
4) What percentage of Maryland high school graduates entering college are required to take developmental courses and in what content areas?	X		
5) How does placement in developmental coursework vary among students of different backgrounds (i.e., race, ethnicity, and preparation)?		X	No. MHEC collects information on developmental course-taking patterns for recent high school graduates only.
6) How likely are students placed in developmental courses to persist in college and transfer and/or graduate		X	No. This information is only available for recent high school graduates.
7) How does performance in developmental course work (i.e., persistence and transfer/graduation) vary among students of different backgrounds?		X	No. This information is only available for recent high school graduates.
8) Are community college students able to transfer within state to 4-year institutions successfully and without loss of credit?		X	MHEC does not collect transcript-level data which would be needed to provide information on the number of credits students transferred with and the number of accepted by the 4-year institution.
9) Which students are being lost in the transition between community colleges and 4-year institutions?	?	?	The term "lost in transition" needs to be clearly defined.

Question			Comments
10) What are the differences in performance, retention and graduation, including time to degree, of students who initially matriculate at a Maryland community college and transfer to a Maryland 4-year institution versus those who initially matriculate at a Maryland 4-year?	X		
11) What are the differences in performance, retention and graduation, including time to degree, of students beginning in dual enrollment programs, at 2-year institutions and at 4-year institutions?	X		This question should be expanded to include all students who enter college with advanced standing, such as AP students. This expansion would require the collection of additional data.
12) Which financial aid programs are most effective in improving access and success (i.e., retention and graduation) for Maryland students?	?	?	Further clarification is needed. How is "improving access" defined?
13) Which 2-year institutions are allowing students to persist most effectively and either graduate or transfer?	X		
14) Which 4-year institutions are graduating students most effectively and in the timeliest fashion?	X		
15) To what extent do those who do not complete high school but who earn a GED go on to obtain a post-secondary credential?	X		
16) What are the educational and labor market outcomes for unemployed workers who use federal and state resources to obtain training at community colleges?		X	
17) What economic value do noncredit community college credentials have in the workplace?		X	
18) Are graduates of Maryland colleges successful in the workforce?	?	?	Further clarification is needed including defining the term "workforce success".

<u>Additional Policy Questions – Proposed:</u>

- What are the relationships between concurrent employment and educational outcomes for high school, community college and 4-year college / university students?

- What high school performance indicators are the best predictors of students' success in higher education or the workforce?

- Do high school students' course patterns affect the workforce outcomes for students who directly enter the workforce?

GAP ANALYSIS
Prepared by agency representatives on the MLDS Interagency Workgroup   1/25/11

Segment: P-12 Education

Population	Comments
Nonpublic schools	• Nonpublic schools are required to meet educational standards under COMAR 13A.09.09. However, Education Article, §2-206, of the Annotated Code of Maryland exempts church-operated schools from meeting education standards. • Maryland Nonpublic Schools voluntarily provide aggregate enrollment counts each year to the Accountability, Assessment and Data Systems Division at MSDE. • In the 2009-2010 school year, 74% of all private schools (P-12) provided counts for a total of 135,722 students. • The following are the types of private schools and the self- reported enrollment counts in 2009-2010: <table><tr><td>Maryland Private Schools</td><td>Total</td><td>135,722</td></tr><tr><td>Nursery School</td><td>Pre-K</td><td>16,983</td></tr><tr><td>Private School</td><td>K-12</td><td>59,516</td></tr><tr><td>Church Exempt</td><td>P-12</td><td>54,180</td></tr><tr><td>Publicly Funded</td><td>P-12</td><td>5,043</td></tr></table>
Home-schooled students	• Maryland recognizes home instruction as an alternative to public school. Local school systems verify compliance and instructional supervision. A notification form to be given to the local school system is required prior to homeschooling. • In 2007 24,277 students were reported as home schooled by Student Services and Alternate Programs Division at MSDE. • Regulated through COMAR 13A.10.01.
Juvenile Services Education	• Education article § 22-303 requires MSDE to develop and implement education services at all residential facilities by July 1, 2012, deadline extended to July 1, 2014. • The juvenile services education program (JSEP) provides education programs to approximately 3,000 youths per year at 5 locations and is monitored by the Career and College Readiness Division at MSDE.
Graduate Equivalent Diploma (DLLR)	• No data is currently collected by MSDE on students completing a (GED). • DLLR maintains some student systems containing adult education students. Their applicability to being used in the LDS has not been investigated

Segment: Higher Education

Population	Comments
Independent in-state non-profit	• MHEC currently receives annual student-level data from most non-profit institutions under a 2003 Agreement with the Maryland Independent Colleges and University Association (MICUA). This agreement covers only those students who are Maryland residents and also has an exemption provision for very small institutions. • In fall 2010, there are 54,915 students in this population of which 56% are estimated to be Maryland residents. • Regulated under COMAR 13B.02.02.
Independent in-state for-profit	• Data is collected annually for students in these institutions, but only at an aggregate level as there is no student-level data requirement. • 4,781 students statewide (2010) • Regulated under COMAR 13B.2.02. *
Out-of-state Institutions in Maryland	• There is no student-level data collection for this group of institutions. Very basic aggregate data is collected as part of the institution approval and renewal process, but data is not collected as part of the annual process. • It is estimated that there are 15,520 students enrolled each year. • Regulated under COMAR 13B.02.01. *
Private Career Schools (PCS)	• MHEC collects student-level data to monitor student participation and success. This data is collected on forms but may be applicable to support longitudinal tracking. • There were 29,125 students enrolled in 2009 year. • Regulated under COMAR 13B.01.01. *
Out-of-state Distance Education	• Institutions from throughout the country offer on-line distance education. MHEC does not have any regulatory authority over these institutions. • In addition, there is no process by which this data is captured.
Public Non-credit Students	• There is no collection of student-level data from this population of students, mainly from community colleges. • To collect this data would require an extensive study to review the distinction of credit versus non-credit and develop concepts of programs and completions.

* An assistant attorney general assigned to MHEC is researching the issue of whether MHEC presently has the authority to require non-public institutions, whether in-state or out-of-state, to provide data to MHEC on all of their students, especially in light of § 24-707 of the Education Article pertaining to the LDS .

Segment: Workforce

Population	Comments
Independent Contractors	- The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) estimates that nationally 7.4 percent of those defined as *employed* are independent contractors; and that 88 percent of these independent contractors are self-employed. So, there is substantial, but incomplete, overlap between independent contractors and self-employed individuals. - Independent contractors and the self-employed are defined as 'workforce' data gaps because, with very few exceptions, they are not included in a state's unemployment insurance wage record (UI WR) database. - The BLS estimates that 7.4 percent of employed individuals are independent contractors should not be used to gauge the use-specific *importance* of this data gap.
Self-employed	Self-employed make up 88% of independent contractors and do not have UI data. See above discussion.