

Maryland Longitudinal Data System Governing Board Meeting
10:00 a.m.- 12:00 p.m.
September 8, 2011

Meeting Minutes

Welcome (Chancellor Kirwan)

Chancellor Kirwan called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. The Board approved the minutes from the meeting on May 26, 2011.

MLDS Center (Dr. Ben Passmore)

Dr. Ben Passmore presented the Budget and Capabilities document (“straw man” proposal). The document has been set up to address 3 phases of development of the MLDS Center: First- reporting and compliance; Second-grounding in statute, more operative; Third-Making MLDS much more widely acceptable.

Dr. Passmore described how the Center is grounded in Chapter 190 of the Acts of the General Assembly. He described how most of the “must do” was not in the areas of research. They were focused on compliance, privacy, and setting up governance and management of data. The Center shows where management of data resides and there are appropriate controls of privacy.

Distinguishing features of development:

- Phase 1: Shows how this could be accomplished and meet the law at lowest cost and simplest form. Phase 1 details what happens if there is little to no money. It is a reporting and compliance clearinghouse. Research is done by program experts borrowed from agencies. The work draws on agency staff. Example: if DLS wanted specific requests, the request would be farmed out. This is not a flexible or ideal model. Cost is hidden within agencies.
- Phase 2: Shows a mix of researchers and analysts. There is a light IT footprint (same as first model)
- Phase 3: Is a full research center. This phase shows a bigger IT footprint. There is an ability to move deeper in data and this model allows analysts to access some data (carefully and FERPA compliant). The Governing Board agreed that if money was not an object, Phase 3 would be optimal.

Budget Scenarios:

- Of the presented budget, when asked what was priority, Dr. Passmore explained how the Executive Director is the key person to bring on. There are complicated management tasks that an Executive Director would manage.

- Other positions include a Compliance Officer, Personnel-Research/IT.
- The budget assumes that you could buy slices of time to as effectively address this on an as-needed basis
- About 50% savings may be achieved.
- Associated programs include Data Fellows program and a Faculty Associates program.
- Note: overhead for DPSCS (a few 100K-estimated order of magnitude)

The Governing Board discussed how cost-savings would be achieved through a co-services model. It was made clear that overhead costs do not change in any model.

Dr. Martirano asked about the market comparison for salaries. Dr. Passmore remarked that the salary also includes 30% of benefits. Dr. Passmore's method of calculation was to survey technical staff. He remarked how he felt it was better to estimate a little high because these are challenging positions. There may be a few thousand in savings.

Dr. Howard commented how Level 3 would give full impact; level 2 will allow to respond to P-20; level 1 would not be that great.

When asked about timeline, Dr. Passmore explained that the expectation is that by the end of 2014 and into early 2015, there will roll out of the Center. By 2014, our MLDS MUST be rolling out to be compliant with law.

It was recommended that by FY 2014, an Executive Director should be hired.

Dr. Sadusky explained that the system would operate with substantial in-kind. Likely, an organization could provide fiscal space. It was projected by the group that initial phases would be fairly modest. Savings of 50% minimum could be achieved.

When asked where the funds for the Center would come from, Dr. Passmore responded that there is a various survey. Areas are covered by extramural/state funds. In general, public data requests, people pay for. Agency and other data requests will have invariable direct fees or have an ongoing charge. An example is JFI where research is supported by extramural funding. It would be tough to sort how much of the funding of the Center would depend on extramural funding.

Chancellor Kirwan asked the Board which phase the group was leaning toward. The Board agreed to move toward the development of phase 3. The Board committed to finding a phased-in budget for 2 million (with in-kind contribution). The Board endorsed the document as an approach. Starting with Phase 2 with the caveat that expectations would be managed with MLDS.

Dr. Howard expressed concern that we manage expectations. Ms. Lagdameo expressed the need to ensure that the approach be aligned with the work of the funding subcommittee.

MOU Status (Liz Kameen)

- MSDE/MHEC MOU
 - The MSDE/MHEC MOU was signed on August 1 and there is now movement forward to build the MHEC system. MSDE will transfer 2 million to MHEC to build data warehousing capability.
- MSDE/Governing Board MOU is in development

MLDS Development (Rob London/Chandra Haislet)

Please refer to the “Policy based Decision Support System: MLDS Development Briefing Book” This document aligns the scope of the MLDS with the 15 policy questions developed by the IWG. MSDE developed a system to fulfill requirements.

- The project is divided into 14 subprojects:
 1. Creation of Higher Education DWH DB kernel
 2. Creation of multi-agency student crosswalk ID table
 3. Creation of ETLs to load data into higher education DWH
 4. Perform data and gap analysis for 15 policy questions
 5. Design data modeling and physical database
 6. Provide a test and production hardware environment
 7. Provide an Oracle 11g portal, system and security software
 8. Provide software installation and technical operations
 9. Provide OBIEE dashboard design and development
 10. Identify, procure and install multi-agency LDS dictionary
 11. Provide security software and technical security policies
 12. Provide Oracle 11g external and internal portal pages
 13. Upgrade MHEC data system and collections
 14. LEA support for e-transcripts
- Major accomplishments:
 - Crosswalk table-The ITWG decided on a universe, identified elements in crosswalk table to link data and did a consolidation of K-12, MHEC, DLLR data—secure table. Only select individuals have access.
 - There is a timeline and team charter to help guide numbers. There are weekly webinar and meetings every other week.
 - We are moving forward on data structures. There is a data and gap analysis.
 - We have a data warehouse.
 - There are production/hardware environments—DPSCS-application software LDS system next week. Components: portal associated with that.
 - Security software; test environments are being installed.
 - Oracle Security project in motion
 - There is a dashboard pending. First there must be key metrics.

Transcripts (Dr. Donald Spicer)

- USM and MSDE are jointly offering webinars to LEAs to engage them in moving to the standards based ET process used in Maryland higher education
- ET is critical to conveying SASID from one education segment to another
 - Moving toward 90% match. There is a combination of strategies that other states are using. We do not have a good linkage.
 - Difficult challenge for K-12 workforce linkage—reason for crosswalk table.
 - Different solutions because different states have different mandates (Example—Maine, Colorado—generic number for each citizen); Most states are using data like first, last, gender, race data
- **Questions**
 - What is available that RTTT will help provide to help facilitate the best USM rollout?
 - This is CRITICAL. Expected in legislation.
 - Realistically, when will we have E-transcripts in EVERY LEA?
 - Guesstimate: a year and a half

Portal Update (Chandra Haislet)

- The portal system-operational; broken in 2 parts.
 - External and internal development pages (internal is in operation)
 - The external content is ready for review for the next IWG meeting
- See proposed flow chart to approve content. Note that there is an anticipated 60 day review cycle.
- Chancellor Kirwan remarked that if the Board needs to expedite the process, there could be a special meeting.

Conclusion (Chancellor Kirwan)

The Chancellor thanked everyone for coming out to the meeting despite the rainy weather. The meeting adjourned at 12:03 p.m.