

**Maryland Longitudinal Data System Governing Board Meeting**  
**1:00 p.m.- 3:00 p.m.**  
**December 1, 2011**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Welcome and Approval of Minutes** (Chancellor Kirwan)

Chancellor Kirwan called the meeting to order at 1:12 p.m.

Dr. Ben Passmore and Dr. Don Spicer requested to amend the minutes to reflect a change in description regarding the e-transcripts. This change will be made and submitted to the Board for approval over email. The Board agreed.

**M.O.U. Status** (Elizabeth Kameen)

*Refer to the M.O.U. between the Governing Board and MSDE*

Elizabeth Kameen asked that Rob London and Dr. Don Spicer explain the attachments to the M.O.U.

Rob London explained that the main questions that the M.O.U. answers are: 1) What is being built? And 2) How do we ensure sustainability of the System?

Mr. London reviewed Attachment A. and explained how the chart outlines and categorizes the building blocks of the system. He stated how a serious assumption is made: the System will remain at DPSCS.

Mr. London explained that there will be cost savings of approximately \$700K for software and \$1 million for hardware being located at DPSCS. The savings are achieved because there is an economy of scale. Also, backup and recovery and disaster and recovery is also built into the savings.

Dr. Kirwan inquired if the hardware and backup is a free good indefinitely.

Mr. London explained that they are free goods because it is wrapped up in the economy of scale at DPSCS.

Dr. Kirwan asked if there is an operating charge.

Mr. London explained that there is no charge in the interim.

Dr. Kirwan asked what happens after 2014 when the RTTT grant sunsets.

Dr. Passmore explained the process of the MOU to provide context for the Board. He described that Rob London's team composed the detail of the MOU and wrote up what was being delivered as an LDS. USM's technical team also reviewed this. In

the general sense, the system is portable. However, the USM technical team disagrees with the projected cost savings.

Mr. London continued to explain Attachment A, Item 2. *LDS System Infrastructure Delivery* to the Board and explained the costs based on shared services (Attachment A, #3). Assumptions on costs:

- \$38K is for maintenance (#3)
- \$72K is for annual maintenance hardware (#4)
- \$18K is for physical facilities rack services; only one rack is needed.
- Remaining costs are for staff

To accommodate for unforeseen budget costs, about \$200K is needed for the system operation. USM estimated about \$300 K needed.

These are conservative estimates on costs.

Dr. Spicer clarified that there is an implication of separating technology from the Center. The Center will have staff.

Dr. Passmore noted that currently, the staff costs are “hidden” because the work is being done by consultants under RTTT funding.

John Ratliff underscored that there will be a \$1 billion deficit and that there will be intense scrutiny of the finance committee. He would like to ensure that the finance committee does its due diligence in seeking outside funding. He remarked that he was reminding the group that there will be scrutiny for all budget requests.

Dr. Kirwan made the observation that the Board members are all volunteers. He asked whose responsibility it will be to fund the LDS. He also stated that to manage data requests, there will be a fee structure in place.

Mr. Ratliff stated that the State does want the LDS and there is an expectation for the Board to think creatively on how to fund the System. He stated that the Governor took an approach not to fund orphan data centers, making a tough decision. The Board will also have to make decisions and find a way to fund the system.

Dr. Passmore stated that the Interagency Workgroup is beginning to look at a consortium-based plan and to draw on existing resources.

Mr. Ratliff stated that in future budget discussions, he would like to convey that the Board has done the due diligence.

Dr. Leslie Wilson stated that much of the return on investment with the System may not be seen until a long time. She gave the example of how e-transcripts will help to save the State and locals a million dollars and more over time.

Dr. Kirwan summarized the cost discussion:

- 1) Ongoing maintenance costs are approximately \$250K per year
- 2) The Center will have ongoing costs

Ms. Kameen reviewed the major points of the M.O.U.

MSDE will

- Administer up to \$2 million
- Make presentations to the Governing Board and Executive Committee on projects

The Governing Board will

- Review projects, discuss problems, and provide advice
- Establish a mechanism on how the MLDS and Center will operate together
- Take ownership of core warehouse and will sustain it

She highlighted D that the M.O.U. sets the termination date as June 30, 2014. Any party can terminate within 60 days of written notice to the other party.

Ms. Kameen also reviewed part F, describing how MSDE will transfer ownership of the core data warehouse, when completed, to the Governing Board.

Dr. Kirwan asked if the LDS is a state entity.

Ms. Kameen responded that LDS is a state asset and the Center is independent. To answer a question from Mr. Ratliff, Ms. Kameen stated that the Center will own the data warehouse.

Dr. Kirwan asked if Board members are protected if the system was breached.

Ms. Kameen stated that under tort law, no Board member will be held personally liable.

Mr. Ratliff asked for Ms. Kameen to explain DPSCS's role.

It was determined by Rob London that DPSCS is hosting the system. However, if there are changes, there would have to be M.O.U.s written to clarify roles. Mr. London also assured the Board that the MLDS, Project 61, is in alignment with RTTT in intent and execution.

Dr. Kirwan asked what will be copywritten.

Ms. Kameen explained that the System will likely be copyrighted or will have a trademark or patent. If this is the case, the M.O.U. states that MSDE and the Governing Board get access to the System.

Dr. Spicer assured the group that the M.O.U. outlines what many states are currently doing.

Dr. Kirwan asked how royalties would be handled if a researcher writes and sells a book, using data from the system.

Ms. Kameen stated that each data request and the agreements made will be handled on a case-by-case basis.

Ayana English-Brown asked how the number of system users was derived.

Dr. Passmore stated that the first conservative estimate of how many system users would handle the data directly was 20. From that projection, the system was built to accommodate more than projected future capacity, and taking into account end-users. Therefore, the number estimated was 300.

Mr. London mentioned that there was a practical approach also by modeling after DPSCS' system. The team looked at how many users worked with the system. The number was also based on the practical operational approach.

There was a motion to approve the Governing Board M.O.U, with an amendment to change Dr. Kirwan's title from Chancellor of the University of Maryland System to Chair of the MLDS Governing Board.

The Board unanimously approved the M.O.U.

**MLDS Development** (Chandra Haislet & Rob London)

*Refer to the MLDS Development presentation for more details.*

Chandra Haislet gave the project status update:

- She announced that there will be a series of future Oracle trainings. Also, a user manual for data requests for K12 has been developed. This will help log requests so that there will be information on what portals may need to be developed and how the System should evolve.
- Ms. Haislet also announced that there a Senior Security Specialist will be hired who will be an employee at MSDE and will have oversight by USM.
- Dr. Danette Howard voiced concern about a slowed procurement process. Mr. London stated that delays were due to holiday and the MHEC move, but that this may not be an issue. He also clarified that there is a process where

MSDE is able to draw down funds to avoid the issue of a slowed pace due to Federal timelines.

Rob London reviewed the federal SLDS Grant:

- We are applying for \$3.9 million. We could be granted a portion of that amount.
- 15 projects are focused around five grant objectives:
  - 1) Expanded data collections
  - 2) Master data management and probabilistic matching subsystem
  - 3) Advanced dashboards for policy decision makers
  - 4) Delivering and validating impact of LDS training
  - 5) Research in identifying future SLDS data sets
- Mr. Ratliff asked what is the degree of confidence. Mr. London said that we met all criteria for the grant and we are ahead of states as far as our governing structure.

Though screen shots of the portal were available, the portal demonstration has been tabled due to technical difficulties. The Department of Legislative Services had a firewall that prevented access to the portals.

#### **E-Transcripts** (Dr. Donald Spicer)

Dr. Spicer gave an update on the e-transcripts. He estimated that \$1 million will be saved.

Mr. Ratliff asked if a non-public can also submit, and Dr. Spicer clarified that institutions have to agree to submit to MSDE. Dr. Howard said that they are moving in this direction for higher education. Ms. Nicole Murano stated that some institutions do not submit some unit-level record data.

#### **On-deck Policy Questions** (Dr. Ben Passmore)

Dr. Passmore stated that the 15 initial policy questions are as much as the staff can handle, given the depth of interagency collaboration that is needed to map the questions and then build out the system. However, if there are questions that are identified at the Board level and if there is something missing, the Board may submit this to the Policy Workgroup. It would also be ideal if staff were supplied to assist with answering the question that is asked. Dr. Passmore gave the example that the process to work through Policy Question 2 took 4 hours (and that was supposed to be the easiest question.)

Jason Cohen asked if any questions were missing and if there is an opportunity for Board members to help define some of the terms in the questions. He gave the

example that in order to know if students are successful in the workforce after graduation, we would have to define “success”.

Mr. London clarified that there is a process to operationalize each statement. Terms in each question are defined and mapped. Gaps are then identified by the group and handled.

The Board will be presented with each question and its definitions.

Lynn Reed stated that David Stevens, Jason Cohen, and she can look through the questions and send workforce definitions that are appropriate for the questions.

### **Funding Strategy** (Dr. Passmore)

As explained earlier in the meeting, the Interagency Workgroup will be focusing on a funding consortium for funding. Dr. Spicer will help provide expertise from his extensive work on Boards in the past. One challenge is that there are no products that the Center has produced; therefore, it is tough to determine prices.

### **Report to the General Assembly** (Dr. Passmore)

Dr. Passmore asked that the Board review the document and send changes to him. He stated that this must be done expediently since the report is due to the Governor and General Assembly by December 15.

The Board determined that approval will be made electronically.

### **Conclusion** (Dr. Kirwan)

After Mr. Ratliff thanked the Chair, Board and staff for all the hard work and progress made, Dr. Kirwan adjourned the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:53 p.m.

adjourned at 12:03 p.m.