

MARYLAND LONGITUDINAL DATA SYSTEM (MLDS)
550 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201

GOVERNING BOARD MEETING

June 12, 2015

MINUTES

The meeting of the Maryland Longitudinal Data System (MLDS) Governing Board was held on June 12, 2015, in the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) Board Room of the Nancy S. Grasmick Building. Dr. Kirwan, Chair of the Governing Board, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and noted that a quorum was present.

The following Governing Board members were in attendance:

Dr. William “Brit” Kirwan, Chancellor, University System of Maryland and Chair
Dr. Jennie Hunter-Cevera, Acting Secretary of Higher Education and Vice-Chair
Ms. Kelly Schulz, Secretary, Department of Labor Licensing and Regulation
Ms. Tina Bjarekull, President, Maryland Independent Colleges and Universities Association
Mr. Brian Roberts, Change Management Specialist, Montgomery County Government
Mr. Steven Rizzi, Vice President, PAR Government
Mr. John White, Maryland State Department of Education (Designee for State Superintendent Lowery)

The following staff members were in attendance:

Mr. Ross Goldstein, Executive Director, MLDS Center
Ms. Tejal Cherry, Director of System Management Branch, MLDS Center
Ms. Laia Tideman, Data Management Coordinator, MLDS Center
Mr. Peter Hobbs, Director of Reporting Services, MLDS Center
Dr. Laura Stapleton, Associate Director of the Research Services Branch, MLDS Center
Dr. Angela Henneberger, Research Coordinator, MLDS Center
Ms. Dawn O’Croinin, Assistant Attorney General for the Governing Board and MLDS Center
Ms. Jamese Dixon-Bobbitt, Executive Associate, MLDS Center
Mr. Chuck Shelton, Senior System Architect, MLDS Center

Dr. Kirwan began the meeting by asking the Board members and staff to introduce themselves. There were no additions to the agenda.

MLDS Center Report

Staffing

Ross Goldstein introduced Peter Hobbs, who is the new Director of Reporting Services. Mr. Hobbs is taking Jon Enriquez’s place as the shared employee with the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC). Mr. Hobbs was last working at Carroll Community College where he served as a Director of Information Services for five years in the Continuing Education and Training Division. Mr. Hobbs is a great fit for this job given his knowledge of higher education data reporting and his prior experience designing data reporting systems, dashboards, and analysis.

The Center's network administrator left for another job. The Center is actively recruiting to fill this position. The State Department of Education (MSDE) is recruiting for a similar position and already has a list of eligible candidates assembled. The Center can use the MSDE list, which will greatly reduce the timeframe for finding a replacement.

In response to a question from Dr. Kirwan regarding the Center's ability to recruit and keep qualified IT professionals, Mr. Goldstein stated that it is an ongoing challenge, but progress has slowly been made. The current staff is very qualified and the recent recruitment for the DBA (Database Administrator) and ETL Analyst (Extract, Transform, and Load) produced some very promising candidates.

Mr. Goldstein informed the Board that Jason Perkins-Cohen resigned from the Board. The Governor will be filling the vacant seat. Ms. Bjarekull asked what position Mr. Perkins-Cohen filled. Mr. Goldstein responded that Mr. Perkins-Cohen did not fill a particular position. There are four members of the public who are selected by the Governor. Mr. Perkins-Cohen was one of those members.

Data Standards

At the March 13, 2015 meeting of the Governing Board, staff presented the Data Reporting Standards for the Board's review and comment. A suggestion was made at that meeting to seek outside review and comment on the standards. Staff followed-up on that suggestion by having the research consultant to the REL-Mid Atlantic review the standards. The consultant provided some useful feedback that will help provide more clarity to the Standards. She also confirmed that Maryland is ahead of the curve in establishing this type of well documented procedure. Mr. Goldstein stated that he and Ms. Tideman will be attending a REL meeting later this month to present an overview of the standards.

Briefing for Governor's Policy Office

Several senior staff members met with Adam Dubitsky and Mark Newgent, the Governor's Policy Director and Deputy Director. The meeting was a good opportunity to brief them on the Center, including an overview of the technical and security solutions employed as well as the work and agenda of the Center. It was also a good opportunity to understand their areas of interest.

Budget

At the last meeting the Board was informed about a proposed \$300,000 targeted reduction. That reduction did occur. Nonetheless, the Center has sufficient funds to get through the end of the year due to the staffing vacancies and the additional federal funds from MSDE from the 2012 SLDS grant.

The Center is still able to undertake several procurements necessary to build out the data center, including Oracle software, VMWARE, and SSL Certifications.

Independent Audit

Mr. Goldstein noted that at the beginning of the fiscal year, he had informed the Board of his intention to seek an independent audit. An independent audit has not been done because the Center was audited by the Office of Legislative Audits (OLA), which included an IT and Security Audit. Also, an independent audit was not worthwhile until the system was fully moved from the data center at the Department of Public

Safety and Correctional Services (DPSCS) to the MSDE data center. Mr. Goldstein noted that at the beginning of the next fiscal year an independent audit will be a top priority.

Dr. Kirwan asked whether findings of the OLA audit would be discussed. Mr. Goldstein indicated that the findings and the Center's response were sent to the members. While the Legislative Auditor designates the findings as confidential, the recipient agency is not obligated to keep the document confidential. Accordingly, the Board does not have to be in closed session to discuss the issues raised. Dr. Kirwan asked staff to review the seven recommendations.

- The first recommendation is to delete all non-encrypted files received from partner agencies immediately after ETL processing. This recommendation has been implemented. Ms. Cherry explained that files sent by the agencies are encrypted when sent, but did not remain encrypted while being stored on the Master File Transfer (MFT) system server. Accordingly, deleting those files immediately after loading them into the system limits the exposure of the PII (personally identifiable information) data. Further, Ms. Cherry noted that the files on the MFT server are now encrypted at rest.
- The second recommendation is to enable database column encryption for all tables having columns containing sensitive data. Ms. Cherry noted that the Center has implemented database column encryption for all tables containing sensitive PII data in the Master Data Management (MDM) system. The MDM is the only part of the system that stores and utilizes PII data.
- The third recommendation is to ensure all servers are updated with the latest operating system software security patches and that all future updates are installed. Ms. Cherry noted that the audit was done at the data center at DPSCS. The Center had no control over the servers or ability to effect the updates. The Center has access to the servers at the MSDE data center and has ensured that updates are properly installed.
- The fourth recommendation is to ensure all servers have anti-malware software installed and that it is up-to-date. Ms. Cherry stated that the servers at DPSCS did not have anti-malware software installed and that Center staff had no access to install it. The new system at MSDE does have the latest anti-malware installed and Center staff have access to the servers to perform maintenance and security checks.
- The fifth recommendation is to ensure that servers are kept up-to-date for all critical security related updates to potentially vulnerable software. Ms. Cherry again stated that the Center has no control over this at DPSCS, but staff has installed the security patches at the MSDE data center.
- The sixth recommendation is to adjust the firewall rules to implement a "least privilege" security strategy. Ms. Cherry noted that all firewall rules with "least privilege" security are in place at MSDE. The firewall changes were not made at DPSCS since the move to MSDE was imminent.
- The seventh recommendation is for the Center to operate the MDM on a dedicated server. Ms. Cherry noted that a separate virtual machine for the MDM system has been created, but it is not physically separate. Mr. Goldstein noted that this is the only finding with which the Center disagrees. Virtualization is a standard industry practice consistent with guidance established by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).

Mr. Rizzi noted that, as it relates to virtualization, he agrees with the MLDS position. He expressed surprise that the auditors are not being more flexible in acknowledging that virtualization offers a very cost efficient data center model. Mr. Rizzi also asked for additional clarification on the firewall issue - specifically, what ports or services were not blocked. Ms. Cherry stated that the firewall rules allowed MDM and ODS (Operational Data Store) to talk back and forth. While this was only an interior firewall,

it could expose the MDM to a database administrator who otherwise should not have access. Now the MDM has all ports blocked and only allows a one way transfer of information.

Finally, Ms. Schulz noted that the findings appear to be consistent with the findings at other agencies around the state. Ms. Schulz recommended that staff consult with DoIT to ensure the agency is implementing standard data center security procedures already in place or soon to be released.

Assistant Attorney General

Dawn O’Croinin explained that the Center is seeking to obtain driver’s license data from the Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA) to use for the limited purpose of verifying and improving the identity match rate. Currently the lack of Social Security Numbers (SSN) in K-12 data greatly reduces the Center’s ability to match those records directly to workforce records, which only have SSN for matching purposes. Ms. O’Croinin has consulted with counsel to the MVA. There is a provision in the State Public Information Act that specifically allows sharing data for verification purposes. However, there is a provision in State regulations (COMAR) which limits disclosure for the purpose of allowing MVA to verify its data against federal data systems. The regulation appears to be in conflict with the statute. In response to a question, Ms. O’Croinin responded that the regulation can be changed or clarified by the agency and would not require a legislative change. The Center’s authorizing statute permits us to have this data for purposes of data matching.

System Update

Ms. Cherry provided an overview of the timeline highlighting the MLDS Center Data System Milestones.

1. Security and User Access
 - a. Staff is creating LDAP (lightweight directory active protocol) using an Oracle Tool to create user groups and link them to MicroSoft Active Directory. This will assign assign users correct access to the system based on their roles and responsibilities.
 - b. Background checks and ongoing security training for all current staff is complete.
 - c. Staff plans to schedule a vulnerability test for July or August to test the security of the system.
2. Development Environment
 - a. Staff has installed all of the Oracle products at the MSDE data center, which completes the move to MSDE from DPSCS.
 - b. Charter Data Snapshots were completed and posted to the website and staff expects to develop new dashboards in the coming months.
 - c. Staff plans to install a database management software tool.
 - d. Staff continues to work on match rate and overall data quality.
3. Test and Production Environment
 - a. Staff has completed installation of all servers, VLAN, firewall rules, and VMWARE for the Center.
 - b. Next staff is working on installing SAS software for researchers. The plan is to have a virtual machine for each researcher with needed software. In response to a question, Ms. Cherry confirmed that all work by researchers will be done locally on the server.
 - c. Staff will be evaluating offsite backup solutions. Originally, staff thought that the Center could be part of the MSDE backup solution, but MSDE has not implemented one. Staff will evaluate different options, with an emphasis on data security. In response to a question, Ms. Cherry confirmed if the Center procures a cloud service, the backup can occur almost instantaneously. Mr. Goldstein noted that State law requires the Board to ensure that any contracts that govern databases that are outsourced to private vendors

include express provisions that safeguard privacy and security and include penalties for noncompliance. Accordingly, if the staff recommendation is for a cloud backup, the Board will be notified and fully briefed prior to implementing that solution. The last item for the test and production environment concerns steps to improve encryption for the transfer of data from the agencies. In response to the Legislative Audit, staff has encrypted the data at rest on the MFT server. However, that is a temporary solution. Staff will evaluate and implement another product that provides a more integrated solution and stronger encryption protocols.

4. Data Load

- a. Ms. Cherry noted that now that the ETL Analyst is on board full time, the Center is making significant progress loading data, including:
 - i. 2008-2013 UI wage, GED, and NEDP data from DLLR
 - ii. 2014 attendance data from MSDE
 - iii. 2008-2013 SAT, PSAT ACT, AP and IB data from MSDE
 - iv. 2008-2013 National Student Clearinghouse data from MSDE
- b. Next staff will load MHEC data from the enrollment and degree information systems.
- c. Center staff will work with the partner agencies to schedule recurring data loads.
- d. Center staff will work to build and test automated ETL processes to load data from the MDM to the ODS database.

5. Standard Operating Procedures

- a. Staff is developing an implementation manual for the Data Security and Safeguarding Plan. Currently the manual is 30 percent complete.
- b. Staff completed the response to the Legislative Audit and action items to correct findings.
- c. Staff is working on implementing log aggregation and audit reporting and testing.

Mr. Rizzi asked about the type of audit that was conducted by the Legislative Auditor. Ms. Cherry responded that it was a hands-on audit. The auditors went to the data center sites and reviewed systems and inspected firewall settings. They did not look at past security logs. Mr. Rizzi recommended that staff develop a “test and approval to operate” procedure to use when the system is complete and whenever configuration changes are made.

Research Update

Dr. Laura Stapleton, Associate Director of the Research Branch, provided the update for Dr. Woolley. First, Dr. Stapleton informed the Board that the online education report was completed and provided in the meeting packet. Other reports are in progress, but waiting for completed data loads and restored access to the data center. (The researchers had access to the old data center, but have yet to receive access to the new data center). The researchers and the system development team have been meeting every two weeks. It is a good opportunity to define priorities, understand the structure of the database, and establish rules for working with the data.

Dr. Stapleton stated that the research team submitted a project proposal to be included in MSDE’s application for the 2015 State Longitudinal Data System grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences (IES). The grant proposes to create synthetic data. Having synthetic data will increase the usefulness of the data by providing greater access to researchers and policy analysts. If successful, the project will serve as a model for other longitudinal data systems.

Dr. Stapleton provided an overview of what synthetic data is and how it is created. She began by noting that missing data can be imputed with high confidence based on the correlation with other known data. If missing values can be imputed, then it is also possible to impute all the values to create a new synthetic data set, using what we know about the the source data set. This method is already being used by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Next, Dr. Stapleton provided an overview of the projects that make up the proposal:

- Create a data warehouse that contains needed data identified by potential end users of the synthetic datasets.
- Create and test a data warehouse with synthetic copies of the datasets supporting population average analyses.
- Disseminate information about the synthetic datasets by hosting an educational researcher summit and an early career educational scientist conference.
- Study the feasibility of creating synthetic datasets that would allow for robust analyses of cluster-specific research questions or random effects estimates.

Noting that during the establishment of the MLDS, restraints on the use of and access to data were created in order to ensure that it would only be used for public policy purposes, Ms. Bjarekull wanted to know whether this proposal would allow the data to be opened up to any member of the public for any use. Dr. Stapleton responded that it would make the data more easily accessible in a secure manner, but it would still be up to the Board to determine who uses it and for what purpose.

Dr. Kirwan asked about the reliability of using synthetic data in lieu of the actual data. Dr. Stapleton noted that this is part of the testing that will have to be done. She also noted that the U.S. Census Bureau, which successfully created and uses synthetic data, has researchers use the synthetic data to conduct their analysis and develop their code, but permits the final code to be run against the actual data set to confirm the results.

Mr. Rizzi and Ms. Bjarekull reiterated the concern about making the synthetic data available to any person for any purpose, noting that this could include a commercial purpose. Mr. Goldstein responded that the Board would not lose control of the synthetic data. The synthetic data set is based on Center data and therefore the Board can put parameters around its use. Currently the Center is very limited in what it can provide in response to a data request - specifically only aggregate data sets. The synthetic data would allow the Center to provide more data in response to a data request - but in a highly secure manner. In response to a question, Mr. Goldstein confirmed that the synthetic data would not simply be available to any member of the public for any purpose. Ms. Schulz asked who will determine the value of the request. Mr. Goldstein responded that this is a topic we are facing and why the Longitudinal Data Request procedure was provided to the Board. The procedure articulates how the Center will respond to data requests. Ms. Schulz stressed that this is highly sensitive topic. When the General Assembly approved the legislation creating the MLDS the intent was to provide the data among State agencies to allow them to analyze educational outcomes. Therefore it is important to carefully consider the value of allowing other outside entities to utilize the system. Mr. Goldstein agreed that there was an intention to limit the access to the data, but also noted that more access will lead to more research and analysis and ultimately allow the State to realize a greater benefit from the system. For example, Mr. Goldstein noted that right now, if one of the partner agencies wanted data to run an analysis, the Center could only provide aggregate data sets - which might be less effective. Ms. Schulz agreed, but also noted that there is a big

difference between a State agency requesting access versus an outside entity requesting access for a purpose with which the Governing Board may or may not agree.

In response to a question about what data requests have been received, Ms. O’Croinin noted that there have been no formal requests or denials. According to Mr. Goldstein, there have been two inquiries received: one from a post-doc at Virginia Tech. and the other from Baltimore’s Promise, which is a newly launched collaborative dedicated to improving outcomes for the City’s youth.

Mr. Rizzi asked whether the Center would continue to hold the copyright on data shared with a researcher and whether any data sharing agreement could establish conditions limiting its use and specify that it cannot be re-shared. Ms. O’Croinin responded that the Longitudinal Data Request Form to be discussed later in the meeting addresses those issues.

System Security Update

Mr. Goldstein presented the Data Security and Safeguarding Plan (DSSP) Implementation Manual. The DSSP was developed prior the formation of the Center by a security consultant. Staff is working through the DSSP by providing a description (in red) of how the Center is addressing the requirements. Ms. Cherry provided the following highlights from the implementation manual:

1. The system design limits PII data to the MDM system, which both encrypts and masks columns that contain sensitive data.
2. All Center employees sign the security access forms, background checks and complete ongoing security training.
3. Data Quality and Integrity is accomplished by working with the agencies to conduct data quality review, analysis and clean-up. Also the Center has established a formalized data schedule and approved data inventory.
4. System account management is accomplished by defining different account types and assigning access based on roles and responsibilities. No group accounts are permitted - only single user ID and password. Rules have been established for modifying, disabling or removing a user. If a user is reinstated, all validations with new user access forms and requirements are confirmed.
5. Staff reviews the accounts quarterly. Inactive accounts are disabled after 90 days.
6. Audit logs are generated through the log files monthly and will show account creation, modification, user access and usage, and disabling and termination actions.
7. The Center uses LDAP (Lightweight Directory Access Protocol), which is an Oracle application that manages user access to all MLDS Center systems, applications, files, and databases.
8. The Center assigns a user ID and password to partner agencies to access the secure file transfer protocol (MFT site) to provide the secure data files. MFT provides the encryption needed in flight for the data files.
9. The Center authorizes remote access prior to connection through the MSDE VPN request form which must be signed by each user’s supervisor and by the MLDS User Access Request Form.
10. The Center monitors unauthorized remote connections through the VPN log.
11. The Center has established a data transfer process, using the secure file transfer protocol, which does not require the agencies to access the MLDS Center internal systems.

Ms. Bjarekull asked for an electronic copy and Dr. Kirwan stated that he would ask appropriate staff in his office to review the document and provide input.

Research Agenda Discussion

Agenda

Dr. Henneberger stated that the goal of the discussion is to engage in a conversation to gain insights and input on the Research Agenda from the Governing Board. This will be a yearly conversation that will form the priorities for the next year for dashboards and research projects. The current research agenda has 20 questions:

- 14 questions from the P20 Council (including one question on subgroup differences that is now a sub-question of all other questions);
- Three questions added from the 2012 SLDS grant; and
- Three questions proposed by the MLDS Center and incorporated by the Board.

The agenda is broken out developmentally, as follows:

- Postsecondary Readiness and Access, which has five questions;
- Postsecondary Completion, which has six questions; and
- Workforce Outcomes, which has nine questions.

Dr. Henneberger presented the discussion questions:

1. How do you anticipate these questions being interpreted, operationalized, and investigated?
2. Are there specific aspects of the broader questions we need to focus on?
3. What are the relevant policy and programming implications we should consider in our work?
4. Are there educational or workforce factors or patterns you feel are missing from the Research Agenda?

Mr. Rizzi began by observing that when he was appointed to the Board he reviewed the statute and came to the conclusion that the MLDS would be used to evaluate specific policies. The data system provides a unique mechanism to understand which programs and policies work and which do not. The system should also allow the State to be more competitive in the market place. Mr. Rizzi's concern is that there is insufficient input from the policy makers. There is input from researchers and agency heads, but not directly from legislators or directly from Governor's policy advisors. The Research Agenda feels academic and not necessarily addressing pressing policy issues.

Mr. Rizzi also stated that the biggest shortcoming is not leveraging the longitudinal nature of the data. The Research Agenda focuses on transition points, which means that the Center is not focusing on things that are not transition points, and therefore, a lot of important policy topics will be missed. Dr. Henneberger agreed with the assessment but noted that the MLDS Center specifically agreed not to do research on topics that could otherwise be researched by the partner agency (unless asked).

Ms. Bjarekull noted that the P20 Leadership Council, which developed the original set of questions, includes legislators and the Governor's policy advisors. Those questions are broadly written to include narrower questions that will focus on specific policies or programs. Dr. Kirwan added that the P20 Leadership Council questions were created before the Board came into existence. The Board has the authority to change the questions. Finally, Dr. Kirwan noted that Secretary Schulz, Acting Secretary Hunter-Cevera, and State Superintendent Lowery are on the Governor's Cabinet as well as members of the Governing Board and can serve as a mechanism to adapt and adjust the Research Agenda to meet the Governor's policy needs.

Dr. Hunter-Cevera stated that she has had discussions with MSDE and Mr. Goldstein about using the Center to help the State be more proactive and address questions about policies we know will make a difference - or, what is an effective approach to achieving desired outcomes. This will help State

policymakers understand where the State needs to invest or intervene in programs and whether the State has adequate resources to spur successful programs.

In response to Mr. Rizzi's reiteration of the need for direct input from a senior policy advisor to the Governor, Ms. Schulz stated that Mr. Goldstein worked directly with the Governor's policy office and briefed them on the MLDS and what it is doing. One of the Governor's two policy advisors would have been at this meeting but for a schedule conflict. The Governor is aware of what the Center is doing. Ms. Schulz went on to note that the P20 Council hasn't met in a long time. The Governor is working towards reconvening the Council. Many members of the P20 Council have changed and so will the questions. Mr. Goldstein responded that the purpose of discussing the Research Agenda was to reassess and make sure the correct questions are being addressed. Mr. Goldstein went on to note that the Research Agenda provides a structure and framework for the development and work of the Center. If a question comes in from the Governor's office or the General Assembly that isn't on the Research Agenda the Center will respond if it has the data to do so. The Center will not be around long if it is not responsive to key stakeholder needs. Dr. Kirwan suggested that once the P20 Council reconvenes, the Center should send the fifteen original questions back to them for their review and any suggested changes.

Mr. Rizzi noted that there were some non-obvious uses of the data that could allow policymakers to better understand policy outcomes, for example, what happens in our inner cities. This led to a discussion regarding the inclusion of data on students in the Juvenile Justice System. It was noted that State law prohibits the Center from collecting juvenile delinquency records, criminal records, or discipline records. The information is captured by the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) and they are interested in working with the Center to better understand outcomes of students who pass through those programs. However, unless there is a change in State law, the Center cannot collect that data for those analyses. Dr. Kirwan concluded the discussion by suggesting that a representative from DJS be invited to a future meeting to talk about these issues.

Longitudinal Data Requests

Mr. Goldstein began by noting that the procedures laid out in the Longitudinal Data Request document were presented to Research and Policy Advisory Board. There are four options for responding to requests for data or information. The first option would be for the Center to establish aggregate de-identified data sets that can be made available to any member of the public who is working on a defined research project. The request would be subject to a *Longitudinal Data Request Form* which includes an affidavit that specifies that the use of the data may not be for commercial solicitation, marketing, or any form of financial gain.

The second option for responding to a request would be to develop a customized aggregate deidentified data set. This would also be subject to the same form and requirements as above.

The third way to respond to a request is to provide information or analysis (instead of data for the requester to analyze). This type of response would be made available to a Maryland education or workforce stakeholder who has a focused research question regarding Maryland education or workforce policy. Dr. Kirwan noted that this could be very broadly interpreted to mean any member of the public, which raises issues of resources and how decision will be made about which questions get answered. Mr. Goldstein noted that the original approach was to limit this type of response to a more narrowly defined set of stakeholders to include the Governor, General Assembly, partner agency or key Maryland P20 stakeholder. Mr. Goldstein also noted that there is a list of *General Considerations* that may provide some assistance in prioritizing requests. Those considerations include:

- Does the request meet the FERPA audit and evaluation exception;
- Is the request a topic that falls under the MLDS Research Agenda;
- Does the request fulfill an important public policy purpose;
- Is the the request related to work already done by the Center, and
- What is the level of effort to respond to the request?

Dr. Kirwan expressed his support for the more limited approach. Mr. Rizzi suggested requiring requests to be sponsored by a member of the Board.

In response to a question, Mr. Goldstein noted that these procedures are not establishing new policies. The Board has already adopted regulations that address fulfilling longitudinal data requests. Similarly, the Board has established regulations authorizing the Executive Director of the Center to appoint staff to the Center. These procedures, therefore, are provided to inform the Board of how those policies will be implemented and make sure that the Board agrees with the implementation decisions.

Ms. Bjarekull stated that since the Center is still operationalizing the system, perhaps it would be wise to pull back from data requests and instead focus on the purpose of the Center - the policy questions. She doesn't want to see time spent responding to outside requests to detract from the work that needs to be done on the Research Agenda.

Ms. O'Croinin responded that these procedures flesh out how the Center will meet these other obligations that are established by State law. This is similar to what other agencies would have to work through when determining how to respond to Public Information Act requests.

Ms. Bjarekull went on to discuss the restriction against the use of MLDS data for commercial interests and asked what recourse the Center has if the data is misused for a commercial interest. Ms. O'Croinin responded that there are no clearly defined consequences either in State law or FERPA (in this case where it is not personally identifiable information).

Dr. Kirwan noted that it would be good for the procedures to address the priorities for the work. This would provide the Board with more context and assurances that responding to outside requests does not overwhelm the work of the Center. Mr. Goldstein responded that fulfilling a pre-established longitudinal data request (option 1) would take no staff time. Creating customized aggregate data sets would take time, but would not require the input of the Researchers Branch (it could be done by the Center's IT staff). Providing analysis is more challenging and would require the limited time and resources of the Research Branch. Therefore, the instinct to go back to the more narrowly focused approach will help ensure that the Center does not get overwhelmed providing analysis and information in response to requests.

Mr. Goldstein noted that there is also a fourth option for responding to data requests which would provide a limited number of staff appointments (two) to researchers who are working on projects that seek to use Center data to analyze and improve Maryland education and workforce outcomes by auditing and evaluating State and federal education programs. With the staff appointment, the researcher would not have access to the entire system, but would have access to unit record data necessary for their research. The researcher would have to come to the University of Maryland, Baltimore to do the work and would be subject to all security requirements currently applied to Center staff. It has also been proposed to have the research vetted by Research and Policy Advisory Board to make a recommendation to the Executive Director on whether the research is of a nature and quality that should be given this limited appointment. Mr. Goldstein noted that Baltimore's Promise serves as a good example. It is a data

driven project that is focused on educational outcomes. Ms. Bjarekull suggested reporting to the Governing Board whenever a staff appointment is issued.

Mr. Rizzi suggested adding a license agreement to the Longitudinal Data Request Form. The license agreement would control the use, ownership, and reproduction of the data being provided. Mr. Goldstein agreed to work on that suggestion.

Finally, Dr. Kirwan asked staff to work to address the comments made by the Board members in a revised draft of the procedures. The revisions could be reviewed at the next meeting or by conference call - depending on how time sensitive they are.

Old Business Item

There was no old business.

New Business

There was no new business.

Adjournment

Dr. Kirwan adjourned the meeting 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Ross Goldstein
Executive Director

Approved: 7/7/2015