



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

MEMORANDUM

TO: MLDS Governing Board
FROM: Ross Goldstein, Executive Director
DATE: September 2, 2022
SUBJECT: Managing for Results (MFR)

Purpose

The purpose of this agenda item is to review the MLDS Center’s *Managing For Results* (MFR) submission to the Maryland Department of Budget and Management. The MFR provides a meaningful indication of the agency’s performance over the past year.

Background

Managing for Results is a strategic planning, performance measurement, and budgeting process utilized by the Department of Budget and Management. It is used to ensure that state resources achieve measurable results, accountability, efficiency and continuous improvement. Data is collected by fiscal year and the data collection is due annually in the beginning of September.

Summary

The MLDS Center’s MFR contains two primary goals:

1. Maintaining a public facing website that provides timely and relevant information for stakeholders; and
2. Providing research and analyses, as well as other research projects that are used by the MLDS Governing Board, policy makers and the public to make data driven decisions and respond to concerns of constituents.

The performance measures for those goals and the outcomes for the prior and current fiscal years are as follows:

Measure	FY 21 Outcome	FY 22 Outcome
Number of independent security audits conducted annually	1	1
Percentage of corrective actions taken to address vulnerabilities identified by DoIT’s automated vulnerability scanning tool	N/A	98.3%
Number of new dashboards and other data analyses and summaries added to the website.	61	79
Number of page views on the MLDS Center website	27,561	31,651
Number of seminars conducted on the use and analysis of longitudinal data	20	35
Number of data requests from various stakeholders	24	33

Measure (cont.)	FY 21 Outcome	FY 22 Outcome
Percent of data requests fulfilled within 30 days of the date of the request	92%	91%
Number of new reports generated annually	14	8
Number of times MLDS data are cited	2	6
Number of written responses to formal requests for information from State policy makers	22	37
Number of reports that are published in scholarly journals annually	1	5
Number of external funding opportunities applied for or supported each year	10	7
Dollar value of external funding applied for or supported each year	\$12.4 million	\$4.4 million
Number of grants awarded each year for projects applied for or supported by the Center	4	0
Dollar value of grants awarded each year for projects applied for or supported by the Center	\$2.6 million	0
Number of external researchers provided secure staff access to conduct research at no cost to the Center	16	15

Discussion

The MFR includes a new measure of the percentage of corrective actions taken to address vulnerabilities identified by DoIT's automated vulnerability scanning tool. This new measure was added to replace a prior measure on, "the Percentage of audit criteria requiring corrective action." The change was made because the security audits that the Center completed have not been structured in a way that allows us to calculate a percentage. Accordingly, in consultation with the Department of Budget and Management, we adopted this, similar but more consistent measurement of the percentage of corrective actions taken to address vulnerabilities identified by DoIT's automated vulnerability scanning tool (Tenable). That tool provides a monthly vulnerability report to both the Center IT staff and DoIT. Each month the Center staff review the vulnerabilities and take corrective actions to address them. The denominator for this measure is the total number of vulnerabilities detected by the tool and the numerator is the number of vulnerabilities addressed. The one challenge is that some of these corrective actions require DoIT's assistance and some are simply not able to be addressed (so we do not think we will achieve 100% corrections). Nonetheless, we think it is still a good measure of our efforts to address vulnerabilities. For example, in November of 2021 there were 65 vulnerabilities identified by DoIT and the MLDS staff corrected 64 of those vulnerabilities. Overall, the Center corrected 98% of all vulnerabilities.

The Center had improvements in several important performance measures. First, the number of new dashboards and other data analyses and summaries added to the website increased by 18, for a total of 79. The Center has focused on dashboards and similar content that can be quickly and easily digested by policymakers. This focus on dashboards and similar content also explains why the number of reports has decreased (from 14 in 2021 to 8 in 2022). Detailed and comprehensive reports require a significant amount of time to produce. While

they serve an important purpose, often a streamlined dashboard or summary can fulfill the same purpose and is more likely to be consumed. The increase in the number of dashboards and similar content also explains the increase in the number of page views on the MLDS Center website. This year, the number of page views (31,651) is close to our 2019 high of 33,479 and continues the positive growth trend that began in 2021. Second, the number of requests from stakeholders increased from 24 to 37. Third, the Center also increased the percentage of data requests fulfilled within 30 days of the date of the request. Fourth The number of seminars conducted increased to 35 (from 20 in 2021). The Center initiated a series of five seminars for the General Assembly this year, which contributed to that increase. Fifth, the number of times MLDS data are cited increased to six; three times what it had been in the prior year. Finally, the number of times the MLDS Research Branch reports have been accepted for publication in scholarly journals increased from one to five. This demonstrates the high quality of the work being produced by the Research Branch using the MLDS.

There were also declines in several performance measures. The number of research grants applied for or supported declined from 10 to 7, and the number of awards fell from four to zero. Many of the grant applications submitted and supported this year were first time submissions. It is often the case that funding is not received after the first submission and requires a second submission to address the issues raised during the review process. As a result, this measure is likely to be cyclical in nature. This is only our third year with this measurement, so more time and analysis is needed to establish realistic expectations.

Action

Informational.