



MLDS CENTER

Maryland Longitudinal Data System

Address 550 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
Phone 410-706-2085
Email mlds.center@maryland.gov
Website www.MLDSCenter.org

Maryland Longitudinal Data System Governing Board Meeting Minutes December 13, 2019

The meeting of the Maryland Longitudinal Data System (MLDS) Governing Board was held on December 13, 2019, in the Maryland State Department of Education Board Room, at the Nancy S. Grasmick Building. Mr. James Fielder, Chairman of the Governing Board, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and noted that a quorum was present.

The following Governing Board members were in attendance:

Dr. James Fielder, Secretary of Higher Education
Mr. Sam Abed, Secretary, Department of Juvenile Services
Mr. Michael Harrison, Director of the Office of Policy Development (Designee for Ms. Tiffany Robinson, Secretary of the Department of Labor)
Dr. Nancy Shapiro, Associate Vice-Chancellor for Education & Outreach (Designee for Dr. Robert Caret, Chancellor)
Ms. Amalie Brandenburg, Deputy State Superintendent for Finance (Designee for Superintendent Karen Salmon)
Dr. Cheryl Rollins, Director of Institutional Research, Morgan State University (Designee for Dr. David Wilson, President)
Ms. Sara Fidler, President of the Maryland Independent Colleges and Universities Association
Mr. Steven Rizzi, Vice President, PAR Government
Mr. Jason Dykstra, Executive Director, Instructional Data Division, Anne Arundel County Public Schools

The following MLDS Center staff were in attendance:

Mr. Ross Goldstein, Executive Director, MLDS Center
Ms. Tejal Cherry, Director of System Management Branch, MLDS Center
Dr. Angela Henneberger, Director of Research, MLDS Center and Research Assistant Professor, University of Maryland, School of Social Work
Ms. Ann Kellogg, Director of Reporting Services, MLDS Center and MHEC Liaison
Ms. Molly Abend, Data Management Coordinator and MSDE Liaison
Ms. Dawn O'Croinin, Assistant Attorney General
Mr. Roy Enehiroana, Data Analyst and DLLR Liaison
Ms. Jamese Dixon-Bobbitt, Executive Associate, MLDS Center

Dr. Fielder welcomed the new members.

Approval of the September 13, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Dr. Fielder asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the September 13, 2019 meeting. Mr. Rizzi made a motion to approve the minutes, which was seconded by Mr. Abed. The motion was unanimously approved.

Mid-Year Output Priorities Update

Research Branch

Dr. Henneberger began the mid-year output report by reviewing the three main priorities of the Research Branch:

1. Conduct in-depth statistical analyses on topics to support policymakers;
2. Develop technical documentation to help researchers conduct analyses; and
3. Apply for external funding to help support the first two items.

Over the past six months, the Research Branch held three research series:

1. Modeling Student Mobility in MLDS Data;
2. Juvenile Arrest and Peer Relationships (Dr. Wade Jacobsen from UMCP); and
3. Poverty and Homelessness.

Also over the past six months, the work of the Research Branch produced the following Research Reports:

1. Effects of High School CTE (Published);
2. Poverty and Long-Term Outcomes; and
3. Teacher's Characteristics and Student Outcomes (funded by AERA).

Finally, the Research Branch produced the following additional research output:

1. Published 3 peer-reviewed manuscripts
2. Submitted 3 grants for additional funds
3. Prepared a research spotlight highlighting findings from the poverty study

In response to a question from Mr. Harrison, Dr. Henneberger clarified that the CTE analysis looked at the CTE program area completed, but did not look at geographic trends. Additionally, the study did not consider apprenticeship, but future analyses will since youth apprenticeship is a CTE pathway.

In response to a question from Mr. Dykstra, Dr. Henneberger clarified that a student's proportion of time eligible for FARMS was the indicator for poverty. This was possible since this was an older cohort, not impacted by community eligibility. However, going forward, other economically disadvantaged indicators will be used.

Reporting Services Branch

Ms. Kellogg, Director of Reporting Services and liaison to MHEC, began by providing an overview of work on new priorities.

1. The Reporting Services team conducted preliminary pipeline analyses to explore fields critical to Maryland's workforce, including nursing, teaching and computer science. The team met with key stakeholder groups in all three areas to identify data points of interest in the pipelines, including those that support grant, regulatory and accreditation reporting requirements.
2. The team also developed reports on student outcomes using the same methodology that was used in the Career Preparation Expansion Act (CPEA). Specifically, reporting on workforce outcomes five years after graduating from high school were applied to GED/NEDP diploma earners and Associate's Degree Earners. The GED/NEDP has been posted to the website. The GED/NEDP report is in final production.

In addition to the new priorities, the team also completed all of the legislatively required reports, including:

1. Dual Enrollment Report;
2. Career Preparation Expansion Act Report;
3. Annual Report on the MLDS and Center.

Finally, the team also focused extensively on dashboard production over the last six months; focusing on college-going patterns as well as the impact of financial aid on first-year students. This focus has resulted in the expansion and updates to ten dual enrollment dashboards, updates to eight high school graduate college-going dashboards and the addition of ten new dashboards on financial aid. To support future work, the team has built a comprehensive reporting table that will support all dashboards on high school students' college-going patterns, including adopting standard definitions of college-going and college graduation that comport to national standards. This will allow for comparisons of outcomes at the federal, state, local school system, and school levels.

During the first six months of this output cycle, the Center has also received about ten public information act requests, which is consistent with the first six months of last year. An additional five requests that are being converted into Center Output. For example, the request to provide the number of students working while enrolled in college full-time was completed and developed into a web report.

Data Inventory

Ms. Abend, Data Management Coordinator and MSDE Liaison proposed a few additions and two removals to the Data Inventory. The first set of proposed additions are related to U.S. Census tract and block numbers. There is one addition to MHEC's Maryland Approved Program Completer System (MAPCS) data collection. Finally, there are also two data elements proposed for removal.

1. Census Block and Tract - House Bill 1206 was passed in the 2019 legislative session and requires county boards of education to convert student home addresses into a U.S. Census Bureau tract or block number and then provide that information to MSDE. MSDE will, in turn, provide these data to the MLDS Center. The following proposed data elements are proposed for inclusion in the data inventory:
 - a. Student Census Tract
 - b. Student Census Block
 - c. School Census Tract
 - d. School Census Block

Mr. Rizzi asked whether the census data will be collected retroactively, back to the 2007-2008 academic year. Ms. Abend responded that the decision will be made in collaboration with MSDE. Ms. O'Croinin noted that the law cannot establish retroactive requirements - but all the parties could voluntarily agree to providing the prior years of data. In response to a question from Dr. Fielder about the status of receiving data from DJS, Ms. Abend responded that the data sharing MOU has been signed and staff from both agencies are working to identify data elements for sharing. In response to a question from Mr. Dykstra regarding the frequency of this data, Ms. Abend stated that she anticipated that this data would be added to the Attendance File and be reported annually.

2. MHEC is adding a Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) Code field to the Maryland Approved Program Completer System (MAPCS) data collection. The CIP code will capture the instructional program area of the student. The CIP code is the one associated with the National Higher Education General Information Survey code in the MHEC Academic Program Inventory.

3. Removals

- a. DIS-MAPCS Match Flag - MHEC previously collected a flag that indicates whether or not Maryland Approved Program Completer System (MAPCS) data are associated with Degree Information System (DIS) data that were reported for the same student from the same institution for the aligned collection year (e.g. DIS 2018 and MAPCS 2018). This flag is no longer collected by MHEC and is proposed for removal.
- b. Postsecondary: Reverse Transfer Flag - MHEC collects a flag (reverse transfer) that indicates when a community college awards a degree to a student who previously attended a four-year institution. The Center was informed by MHEC that conflicting definitions have been operationalized for the Reverse Transfer Flag data element in the Degree Information System (DIS) data collection. The Center proposes to remove this data element from the data inventory as data from other collections can be used to identify reverse transfer students.

Dr. Shapiro made a motion to approve the additions and removals to the data inventory, which was seconded by Mr. Rizzi. The motion was unanimously approved.

Career Preparation Expansion Act Report

Ms. Ann Kellogg provided an overview of the results of the Career Preparation Expansion Act Report. This was the second iteration of this annual reporting required by the *Career Preparation Expansion Act of 2018 (SB 978)*. The report is produced in conjunction with the Governor's Workforce Development Board (GWDB) and provides an analysis of the workforce outcomes of high school students five years after high school graduation including wages earned; hours worked; and sector of employment. The Center does not have data to directly report on hours worked.

Ms. Kellogg provided a comparison of outcomes for the 2012 cohort of high school graduates reported in the 2018 Report and the 2013 cohort reported in this year's report. The outcomes are very similar between the two groups. Since the outcomes are so similar, Ms. Kellogg noted that she would primarily focus on the new content added to the report at the request of stakeholders. Those new areas include:

1. An analysis of the impact of CTE completion for high school students who do not go on to college;
2. Further analysis of outcomes for "still in college" or "some college" groups; and
3. Student loans and the impact on student outcomes.

Overview: The report looked at students who, five years after graduating high school, had full quarter wages (i.e. were fully engaged in the workforce). Fully engaged in the workforce means a student is employed in the quarter five years after high school and the quarter before and after that quarter - in other words, wage data for quarters 19, 20, and 21 post-high school. Using this methodology, 47% of all high school students were fully employed and their median quarterly wage was \$6,160. To provide context, wages were compared to the MIT Living Wage indicator, which showed that 34% had a quarterly wage at or above the living wage. This rate varied from a low of 26% for those with "some college" to a high of 66% for those with a Bachelor's degree.

Impact of CTE: Of the high school graduates who did not go on to college, 45% had full-quarter wages. Graduates with a CTE or USM/CTE program completion have a slightly higher median quarterly wage than those with USM or other completion types. Graduates with these two program types are also more visible in the wage data. Only 36% of others had full-quarter wages compared to 54% and 58% of the two CTE groups.

Perhaps more importantly, overall, only 33% of high school graduates that did not continue on to college and have full-quarter employment had a quarterly wage above the living wage. However, this rate varied by program completion from a low of 29% and 30% for “other” and USM respectively, to a high of 41% & 42% for CTE and USM/CTE respectively.

Still in College/Some College - The report provides additional analysis of the population of students “*still in college*” (enrolled in college at the five-year mark) and students with “*some college*” (attempted college but disengaged without graduating), including how long each group was enrolled in college and their varying outcomes.

First, of those *still in college*, approximately 1,100 students or 10% of all *still in college* students decided to enroll in college for the very first time five years after high school. The vast majority of *still in college* students, around 9,000 students, enrolled in college for almost every term of the five year period. Some may have obtained a lower level college degree, like an Associate’s and are continuing on to a Bachelor’s, others may have finished a Bachelor’s and are continuing on to a graduate degree. In response to a question from Dr. Shapiro, Ms. Kellogg noted that the Center does not have a way to determine if students were in the military immediately after high school.

Second, the *some college* students account for about 20,000 high school graduates. Half of the 20,000 attempted college for less than two years. One-quarter of this group attempted college for almost every term of study for the 4.5 year period and then left. It is possible that some amount of this last group return in the sixth year and graduate as their frequent enrollment suggests they are chipping away at a degree.

The interesting pattern for both groups is the inverse relationship between time in college and wages. Those who attempted college for shorter periods of time had higher median quarterly wages than those who were enrolled longer. For those *still in college*, this may suggest high school graduates involved in career-track employment seeking a postsecondary education for promotion or to change careers. For the *some college* group, this may suggest that those who try college and then quickly exit may not be as far behind financially as those who never attempt college.

For those (both *some college* and *still in college*) with longer duration of enrollment and low median quarterly wages, this suggests that they are extending time to a bachelor’s degree for what amounts to an annualized amount of around \$20,000. Had they graduated with a bachelor’s degree in the 4.5 year period they may have been earning twice this, as the median quarterly wage for bachelor’s degree is \$10,000 or \$40,000 in a year.

Student Loans - Finally, this year the report analyzes the impact of student loans for those who attempt college (due to cohort size and space limitations, the presentation only includes students with a Bachelor’s degree and students with some college). Since the focus of this report is on employment, the report only explores loans for those with full-quarter employment to understand if wages are sufficient to cover living expenses and student loan payments.

Even if fully engaged in the workforce, students who attempt college, do not finish, and have loans have a significant gap between their actual wages and the wages needed to cover living expenses and student loan payments. This deficit can be as much as \$3,000 or more for the approximately 3,300 “some college” with full-quarter employment. In comparison, when fully employed, those who attempt college and earn a bachelor’s degree have sufficient funds to cover their living expenses and student loan payments, even at higher loan levels. The surplus funds are approximately \$1,000 for the approximately 1,400 Bachelor’s degree earners.

In response to the question, Ms. Kellogg responded that there are some sources that allow us to compare Maryland to other states. Specifically, IPEDS allows for a comparison of the percentage of students receiving loans nationally with the percentage in Maryland and finds that Maryland student loan rates are four percentage points lower than the national average. In response to a question from Dr. Fielder, Ms. Kellogg responded that she could provide average loan amounts for each educational attainment group.

Mr. Rizzi noted that half of the population are not fully engaged in the workforce and asked how they are accounted for and addressed in the report. Ms. Kellogg responded that the wage visibility section provides information on these students including the number with no visibility differing degrees of some visibility in Maryland wage data. Mr. Rizzi stated that the report findings are interesting, but is concerned that the wage analysis is only on 50% of the population.

Mr. Abed noted his concern that if a student attempts college and doesn’t complete, the student is putting himself or herself at extreme risk. Dr. Fielder agreed that this is a major concern and noted several policy initiatives that the State has taken to address the issue - such as making scholarships available. Further, institutions have undertaken initiative, such as intrusive advising to ensure that students are staying on track. Dr. Shapiro also noted work being done to accelerate students through developmental courses and ensure that loan money is not spent for non-credit classes.

Ms. Fidler noted that it would be helpful, for context, to include the wages of the no college group even though they do not have loans. Further, given the short time period, the ability to fully understand the impact of some college attendance can’t be fully understood. For example, the near completer program could improve outcomes for the *some college* group after the five year period. Ms. Kellogg agreed and noted that the first cohort will soon have ten years of post-high school data and the Center plans to re-run the analysis at the ten-year point. In addition, the plan is to continue to revise the report and focus on different topics of interest, such as differences by race, ethnicity, gender, and geography.

Annual Report

Mr. Goldstein noted that state law requires the report to include the following five sections.

1. Update on the implementation of the system and activities of the Center as follows:
 - a. System Implementation and Management
 - i. Records Count
 - ii. Match Rate
 - iii. Security Audits - Federal Homeland Security - and Legislative Audit

- iv. System Architecture Review - Consultant Report - high-level description
- b. Activities of the Center
 - i. Stakeholder Engagement - focuses on work done for MHEC, MSDE, DoL, DLS, Baltimore City (Promise Heights)
 - ii. Lists Data Requests - 30
 - iii. External Research and Grant Funded Projects - supported
 - iv. Research Series
 - v. Presentations
 - vi. Research Conferences
 - vii. Publications - noting that this was the first year with publications in nationally recognized journals and marks an important milestone
 - viii. Synthetic Data Project
- 2. List of all studies performed
 - a. Research Reports
 - b. Dashboards
 - c. Dual Enrollment Report
 - d. Public School Student Pathways
 - e. Career Preparation Expansion Act Report
 - f. GED and NEDP Outcomes Report
 - g. Wage Visibility for Full-Time Undergraduate Students
 - h. Planned Research and Reporting - overview of output plan
- 3. Data Determined to be Unnecessary - two items - presented today
- 4. Proposed or Planned Expansion of Data
 - a. Overview of data inventory
 - b. Lists all data elements approved this year - noting that there are 167 new data elements
- 5. The final section is "Recommendations made by the Governing Board."

In response to a question by Mr. Rizzi, Ms. Kellogg noted that the Center began with one mandatory annual report, Dual Enrollment, and now has a second mandatory annual report, Career Preparation Expansion Act. Mr. Goldstein noted that the mandated reports are good because it demonstrates interest in the Center and data use. However, the Center is responsive to legislative requests and statutory mandates are not required. The annual reports have to be continually submitted even if interest in the topic wanes.

Mr. Goldstein proposed a review of the next two topics prior to discussing proposed recommendations as the topics may have some bearing on possible recommendations.

Mid-Year Budget Review

Mr. Goldstein reported that the Center is on target for its FY 2019 budget, which was reviewed and approved by the Governing Board at the June meeting. Mr. Goldstein noted that there is \$20,000 of unspent funds from last year's research branch MOU. The funds were encumbered, so they can be applied to this year's research branch budget. This frees up \$20,000 that can be applied elsewhere, such as:

1. Add to research branch budget as needed (noting that the research budget had to be reduced last year);
2. Security Audit; and
3. Advanced IT security training for IT staff.

As mentioned, this year, the Center had to reduce the Research Branch Budget by over \$40,000. The Governing Board directed the Executive Director to seek an increase in funding to ensure there are sufficient funds for the Research Branch budget and to support other critical operations. Regarding the efforts taken, the Center did not seek an over-the-target request (MSDE advised that it would not be effective). However, the Center has submitted a request to the DBM budget analyst.

Dr. Shapiro recommended that any budget conversations and funding requests should make reference to the Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education (Kirwan Commission). The Center has provided research and analysis to the Commission and future funding for the implementation of the Commission's recommendations, including analyses of program outcomes, should include the Center.

In response to a question, Mr. Goldstein stated that since there were no definitive spending plan, Board approval was not being requested to spend the \$20,000. Board approval will be sought if specific spending needs arise and are over the \$10,000, established in the bylaws.

2020 Legislative Session

Mr. Goldstein began by explaining that the *Career Preparation Expansion Act of 2018* requires MHEC to collect professional and occupational licenses from the Department of Health and the Department of Labor. The legislation also required the collection of vocational certificates and other industry certifications. To implement this law, the Center and MHEC agreed that it made more sense for MLDS to directly collect the data on MHEC's behalf as it would be more straightforward and present less risk since sensitive data would not be required to change hands as many times. However, MDH had several concerns about this arrangement and the law. Specifically, their concerns were:

1. No direct requirement to provide PII;
2. No representation on the Board;
3. The law requires MHEC to collect not MLDS; and
4. The Secretary of the Department of Health was required to take certain actions that were beyond the scope of his authority as they relate to the data maintained by the independent health occupation boards.

To address these concerns all parties met and agreed that the best approach would be to amend the law. Proposed legislation has been drafted to address the issues by moving the requirement to MLDS section of the law, clarifying that personally identifiable data must be provided to the MLDS, adding representation for the health occupations boards (the Governor to appoint a representative of the executive directors of the health occupation boards) to the MLDS Governing Board. Finally, the statute defines these data as education data. The MLDS statutory structure defines all data as either workforce data or education data. It is not workforce data since it does not mean the person has a job. Instead, it is more like an education credential.

Mr. Goldstein also informed the Board that the Governor's Legislative office was informed. They had no issues with the legislation and the authorized the Center to find a private sponsor. Mr. Goldstein noted that he spoke to Delegates Kaiser and Luedtke, who were also supportive of the proposal and referred the bill to Delegate Stephanie Smith from Baltimore City (District 45) to be its sponsor. The bill has been filed. Ms. Fidler recommended seeking a sponsor to cross-file the bill in the Senate.

Annual Report - cont.

Mr. Goldstein first asked whether the Board wanted to add any recommendations to the report and then ultimately asked for the Board's approval to finalize and submit the report on its behalf.

Mr. Abed recommended approving the report without any recommendations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harrison. Dr. Shapiro asked to consider a recommendation that the MLDS support the recommendations of the Kirwan Commission, stating that this would help establish a link between the Commission's work and the Center. Dr. Fielder noted that the recommendation was overly broad in that it commits the MLDS to support any recommendation of the Commission.

Dr. Henneberger suggested a modification to Dr. Shapiro's motion focusing on the Center evaluating the outcomes of policies implemented by the Kirwan Commission recommendations. Ms. O'Coinin added that the motion could focus on the Center's collaboration with other state agency stakeholders in the implementation of the legislation. Dr. Shapiro noted her concern that she doesn't want more work without additional funding - collaboration is good, but the intent isn't to obligate staff time without proper remuneration. Mr. Harrison noted his hesitation to support policy evaluation by the MLDS Center. In his view, the Governor's P20 Council is supposed to be the policy arm of the MLDS. Ms. O'Coinin clarified that the Center is specifically empowered by state law to conduct evaluations to inform policy. In other words, the MLDS Center evaluates and informs - but does not make policy recommendations.

Mr. Rizzi asked whether Mr. Goldstein thought that the Board's support for additional funding would be beneficial, to which Mr. Goldstein answered in the affirmative. Accordingly, Mr. Rizzi said that the recommendation should ensure that the MLDS Center has sufficient funds to allow the Center to conduct research that supports policymakers.

Mr. Rizzi made a motion that the following recommendation be included in the Annual Report: *The MLDS Governing Board recommends that the MLDS Center pursue an increased budget allocation to allow for continued and projected research and collaboration with State policymakers and to meet the ongoing operations and maintenance needs of the data system and the Center.*

Dr. Shapiro seconded the motion. Ms. Brandenburg stated that while she understood the intent of the motion, the budget matters have executive privilege and therefore requesting additional funds prior to the budget being released was not proper. Dr. Fielder agreed and said that all of the state departments were in the same position.

The vote on Mr. Rizzi's motion was approved with five members voting in favor of the motion (Rizzi, Shapiro, Dykstra, Rollins, and Fidler), no members voting in opposition, and four members abstaining from the vote (Fielder, Brandenburg, Abed, and Harrison).

Next, Mr. Abed made a motion to approve the full report, which was seconded by Mr. Rizzi. The motion was unanimously approved.

External Research and Grant Funded Projects

Dr. Henneberger began her presentation of a new grant-funded project by first noting her appreciation for the Board's prior support for External Research and Grant Funded Projects, which help alleviate budget deficits and support additional work.

The project being presented today will study *Long-Term Effects of PBISplus - A Randomized Controlled Trial in Maryland Public Elementary Schools*. Dr. Henneberger noted that the RFP has not been issued by the Institute of Education Sciences. The RFP generally comes out in January and is due in early March. Since the timeline for submission begins and ends between Board meetings, the presentation is being made at this time. This is a low cost, short duration evaluation program grant with a focus on the use of state longitudinal data systems to do program evaluation. The award amount is typically between \$250,000 and \$500,000 for a two-year study.

Background - Dr. Henneberger explained that PBIS, Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports, is a three-tiered prevention framework.

- Tier 1 is a universal program that provides supports to all students in a school;
- Tier 2 provides secondary supports for student groups with at-risk behavior; and
- Tier 3 provides specialized individual supports for students with high-risk behavior.

The focus of the study is the tier 1 and 2 programs. PBIS uses sociocultural and behavioral supports to improve social, emotional, behavioral, and academic outcomes through supports to student and staff behavior. A key component is the use of data to support decisions.

PBIS in Maryland - Over 1,000 schools across all 24 local school systems in Maryland have been trained in school-wide PBIS. The program has shown positive effects on behavior, student attendance, academic performance, and school climate. The tier 2 targeted intervention is costly to implement, but it may also have high pay-off for long-term outcomes.

A PBIS Random Control Trial began in 2007-2008, which conveniently corresponds to the start of the MLDS K-12 student data. The study included 20 elementary schools that were randomized to PBISplus. There were 22 elementary schools using school-wide PBIS that were randomized to serve as a comparison. The study looked at the value add of the program and found that it showed improvements in need for student special education services; student academic performance; and teacher's self-efficacy. The original study also measured the cost of implementation, the fidelity of implementation and dosage in student, staff, and school characteristics.

Economic analyses are increasingly being used to inform policy related to prevention programming and long term outcomes. However, desired effects may take years to materialize and often occur across public sectors - for example across workforce and juvenile justice. Therefore this really requires linked longitudinal data to understand these types of effects.

Current study - The proposed study will research two questions. First, what are the effects of PBISplus on long term outcomes, including high school, college, career, and justice system involvement? Second, for whom and under what circumstances does PBISplus have the strongest effects? The answer to these two questions will help determine the cost-benefit of implementing PBISplus and the potential for scaling PBISplus.

MLDS External Research/Grant Funded Projects Requirements - Dr. Henneberger stated that the research is cross-sector and addresses the research agenda. Specifically, it addresses the following two questions:

- Are Maryland students academically prepared to enter postsecondary institutions and complete their programs in a timely manner? (RAQ # 2)
- What are the workforce outcomes for Maryland students who earn a high school diploma (via high school graduation or GED®) but do not transition to postsecondary education or training? (RAQ # 19)

Research Methods - For the first research question, the study will identify students in schools assigned to PBISplus or comparison schools in 2007-2008 and follow the students over time to examine long-term outcomes. For the second research question, the study will link data on fidelity and dosage (from JHU) with MLDS data.

Research Team - Dr. Henneberger will be the principal investigator on the project. Dr. Bess Rose (UMB and MLDS Statistician), Dr. Catherine Bradshaw (University of Virginia), and Dr. Elise Pas, (Johns Hopkins University) will serve as co-principal investigators. The project will also include a consulting panel to provide input on the project.

Procedure and Timeline - Dr. Henneberger reported that she presented the proposed grant project to the Research and Policy Advisory Board (RPB) at their December meeting. The feedback was positive and Dr. Henneberger included RPBs feedback and suggestions into her proposal. Dr. Henneberger also noted that if funded, all data elements from Johns Hopkins University would be brought to the Board for their approval to include the data in the *MLDS Data Inventory*. Finally, if awarded, funding would start in Summer 2020 and last for two years (through Summer 2022).

In response to a question from Mr. Rizzi, Dr. Henneberger responded that she did not anticipate that Dr. Bradshaw, UVA, would need access to the MLDS. However, Dr. Bradshaw's postdoc would need access, which is permissible under the *Policies and Procedures for External Researcher and Grant Funded Projects*. Specifically procedures allow an out-of-state researcher access to the system as long as they are affiliated with a Maryland research institution (in this case UMB through Dr. Henneberger).

In response to a question from Mr. Dykstra, Dr. Henneberger noted that not all of the PBIS implementation occurred at the same time. The researchers will need to understand when it was first implemented, as this is an issue of fidelity of operation - it can and will be accounted for in the research.

Dr. Shapiro made a motion to approve Dr. Henneberger's application for an *External Researcher and Grant Funded Project*, which was seconded by Mr. Rizzi. The motion was unanimously approved.

Closed Session

Prior to initiating the closed session, Dr. Fielder reminded everyone that the next meeting is scheduled for March 13, 2020. Dr. Fielder also noted that at the beginning of the decade that is now ending, there was no MLDS. He went on to congratulate the members of the Governing Board and the staff on developing the system and Center, which has risen to national prominence.

Ms. O'Croinin stated that pursuant to General Provision Article § 3-305(b) the body will move into a closed session to discuss software security and procurement issues pertaining to the system.

Mr. Abed made a motion to move into closed session, which was seconded by Ms. Brandenburg. The motion was unanimously approved. The closed session commenced at 11:00 a.m.

Summary

The following individuals were in attendance: members of the Governing Board (see the list on page 1), Ross Goldstein, Tejal Cherry, and Dawn O'Croinin. Ms. Cherry provided an overview of the procurement issue, the cause of and possible remedies for the issue, and its potential impact on the Center's operations and security. No Board actions or votes were taken.

Mr. Abed made a motion to end the closed meeting, which was seconded by Mr. Rizzi. The motion was unanimously approved.

Closing

The open meeting reconvened at 11:26 a.m. Mr. Abed made a motion to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Mr. Dykstra. The motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,
Ross Goldstein
Executive Director

Approved: [pending]