



**Maryland Longitudinal Data System Governing Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**September 11, 2020**

The meeting of the Maryland Longitudinal Data System (MLDS) Governing Board was held on September 11, 2020, via conference call. Dr. 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 (John Irvine, Director of Research and Evaluation served as designee for part of the meeting)
- Ms. Tiffany Robinson, Secretary of the Department of Labor (Michael Harrison, Director, Office of Policy Development served as designee for part of the meeting)
- Dr. Nancy Shapiro, Associate Vice-Chancellor for Education & Outreach (Designee for Dr. Robert Caret, Chancellor)
- Dr. Karen Salmon, State Superintendent of Schools (Dr. Sylvia Lawson, Deputy State Superintendent for School Effectiveness served as designee for part of the meeting)
- Dr. Farzad Moazzami, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, Morgan State University (Designee for Dr. David Wilson, President)
- Dr. Brad Phillips, Director of Research, Maryland Association of Community Colleges, (Designee for Bernard Sadusky, Executive Director)
- Ms. Sara Fidler, President of the Maryland Independent Colleges and Universities Association
- Mr. Jason Dykstra, Executive Director, Instructional Data Division, Anne Arundel County Public Schools
- Dr. Susan Sterett, Director of the School of Public Policy, University of Maryland, Baltimore County
- Mr. Christopher Biggs, Information Assurance Manager, Raytheon Company

**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 Luedtke, Assistant Attorney General
- Mr. Roy Enehiroana, Data Analyst and Department of Labor Liaison
- Ms. Jamese Dixon-Bobbitt, Executive Associate, MLDS Center

**Approval of the June 11, 2020 Meeting Minutes**

Dr. Fielder asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the June 11, 2020 meeting. Mr. Biggs made a motion to approve the minutes, which was seconded by Dr. Phillips. The motion was unanimously approved.

## **Data Inventory**

Ms. Abend started by noting that there were a total of 89 new proposed data elements from six different collections for the Board to consider. The data elements will be considered by sector and agency.

### Postsecondary

The Maryland Higher Education Commission has added three new data elements to the Maryland Approved Program Completer System. The proposed elements include first and last name for identity purposes and the capstone location where the student completed his or her state required pedagogy assessment or final internship. Dr. Shapiro noted that students often get hired at the location of their capstone internship, which has important policy implications for teacher recruitment. Ms. Abend clarified that adding this capstone data element will allow the Center to be able to determine and report on whether that is a factor in teacher recruitment and placement.

Student Registration System and Course registration collect data on undergraduate students taking courses at Maryland public institutions. The data are collected by the Student Registration System (SRS) and the Course Information System (CIS). The data include course attempts and outcomes. The CIS data provide additional course details including instructor characteristics (not identity) and course modality. Generic subject information of the course is provided, but not the course name. This data has been collected by MHEC since 2014 as part of the MAC 2 collections. Currently, the Center only knows credits earned and grade point average, but does not know the specifics of the courses taken. In response to a question from Dr. Shapiro, Dr. Kellogg discussed possible research questions that could be addressed with this new data including whether certain courses improve career outcomes, regardless of degree.

**Motion** - Dr. Sterett made a motion to approve the inclusion of the postsecondary data elements in the *MLDS Data Inventory*, which was seconded by Dr. Moazzami. The motion was unanimously approved.

### Department of Labor - Adult Education

The first set of Adult Education data elements are from correctional education and include inmates who complete educational programs while incarcerated. Ms. Abend noted that while criminal history data are prohibited, these data only indicate that the individual is in the correctional system and do not disclose any specific criminal history information such as charges or sentencing. The nine proposed data elements include generic identity data and whether they received a transitional or occupational certificate or GED® and the date it was received. In response to a question from Dr. Lawson, Ms. Abend and Ms. Luedtke clarified that the data are not part of the Juvenile Services data but could be matched across sectors. Ms. Abend also clarified that data on juveniles charged as an adult will not be included in DJS data.

In response to Mr. Dykstra's concerns about the receipt and storage of Social Security Numbers (SSN), Ms. Abend stated that SSN is important for matching student records to wage data. Personally Identifiable Information, including SSN, is maintained securely and only used for matching purposes. Because the PII data are not used for any other purpose they can be maintained in a highly secure environment. In response to a question from Dr. Sterett, Ms. Abend and Ms. Luedtke explained that the Center is statutorily prohibited from reporting any individual records. All information from the system must be aggregated and de-identified. The Public Information Act does not require the Center to disclose personal information.

Mr. Harrison noted that the Department of Labor (DoL) had concerns about transferring these data elements, including some of the privacy concerns already discussed. Mr. Harrison also noted that DoL is

concerned about losing the proprietary rights to the data once it is turned over and would like to limit access and use of the data by researchers until the DoL questions are addressed. Mr. Goldstein responded that there are a lot of processes surrounding the research of MLDS data. The process is collaborative and offers numerous opportunities for stakeholders to comment and weigh in on the research question and design. The Center cannot commit to limit all research but noted that DoL would have opportunities to comment and help shape the research. Dr. Henneberger offered to follow-up and meet with stakeholders at DoL to better understand the research questions and the Center and Research Branch can work to prioritize those topics. Mr. Harrison noted that there was a lot of interest in the Correctional Education Division to understand what happens to the recipients of the various certificates.

**Motion** - Mr. Abed made a motion to approve the inclusion of the Correctional Education data elements in the *MLDS Data Inventory*, which was seconded by Mr. Biggs. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### Department of Labor - Apprenticeship

Three new apprenticeship data elements are being proposed for inclusion in the Data Inventory. The data elements are Sponsor Name, Type of Sponsor, and Employer ID. These new data elements are in addition to the more than 40 data elements approved at the June meeting. The Center was informed of these elements by DoL and they will make the data significantly more comprehensive.

**Motion** - Dr. Phillips made a motion to approve the inclusion of the Apprenticeship data elements in the *MLDS Data Inventory*, which was seconded by Mr. Dykstra. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### Department of Juvenile Justice

Ms. Abend started by reminding the Board that at the last meeting, the Board approved 10 identity elements from the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS). The Center received a sample file from DJS and the staff are confident in their ability to match the DJS records to MLDS records. The 38 new data elements fall into four main categories:

1. Delinquency History
2. Court Action History
3. Supervision History
4. Placement History

Next, Ms. Abend explained that there are four types of data, including location, dates, individuals and organizations, and alleged and adjudicated offenses. Ms. Abend noted that DJS collects non-Maryland juvenile records. The Center will work to develop a policy on how to deal with those data. Second, placement data lists individual names of group home providers (foster parent). DJS has agreed to remove that information. The Center will still know the type of provider, but not the specific name of the individual provider. Ms. Luedtke asked whether the data will still indicate where the group home is located. Ms. Abend and Mr. Abed were not sure and will need to seek clarification. The data also include a Child in Need of Assistance (CINA) indicator. While the Center is prohibited from receiving CINA data, the information being provided is merely an indicator and does not disclose any specific facts about the CINA determination. Finally, Ms. Abend pointed out that the offense codes provide very specific information about the offense committed.

Mr. Abed spoke about why DJS is interested in including so many data elements. DJS wants to be able to understand juvenile outcomes and how certain determinations (charges, sentences, etc.) impact those outcomes. That requires an understanding of the finer gradations of those data elements. Dr. Lawson stated that MSDE has a concern about the offense code data points. She reminded the Board that even

though the juveniles are in DJS facilities they are educated by MSDE. Dr. Lawson also noted that 37% of the students are special education students and 62% are African American. MSDE thinks the information is overly specific and that the same data points could be received in much broader terms. Dr. Lawson also raised concerns that public information requests can be made to receive the data. The priority is to protect students and student information.

Dr. Shapiro asked for examples of the cross-sector questions that would be answered by these types of details. Mr. Abed reiterated DJS' interest in matching juveniles with eventual outcomes, beyond recidivism, which is the only available outcome measure currently. For example, what happens ten years after a juvenile is charged with a very serious offense: is the juvenile a functioning member of society? Mr. Abed noted the sensitivity of the data and the collateral consequences to youth in the juvenile justice system. He also noted that the MLDS has a lot of protections around the database. Mr. Abed concluded by noting that the Juvenile Justice Reform Council, of which he is a member, is very concerned about missing data elements because it leads to speculation, which is far worse and results in bad policy decisions. Dr. Henneberger, also in response to Dr. Shapiro, noted that in most instances, general offense categories would be sufficient. However, specific data would provide better information for determining whether a school-based prevention and intervention program that targets a specific behavior was successful. For example, when analyzing the effectiveness of a substance abuse prevention program knowing the offense codes would give more insight into the success of the program.

Mr. Goldstein acknowledged that this topic had been a big source of debate internally and at the most recent Research and Policy Advisory Board meeting. While noting the sensitivity of the information, Mr. Goldstein stated that there are ways to minimize concerns. For example, for Center dashboards and reports, an internal policy to use only the offense category or type could be established. For research, both internal and external, discussion and consultation with agencies always takes place. This would ensure thoughtful and cautious use of the specific offense code information. Finally, Mr. Goldstein acknowledged that PIA requests are an unknown. However, there is nothing to prevent the Center from establishing a more rigorous suppression standard for that information given its sensitivity.

Dr. Salmon joined the meeting and expressed her concern about the specificity of the offense codes. Once they are in the MLDS it is hard to not use them. Instead, Dr. Salmon proposed putting the offense codes into broader categories, i.e. violent felony instead of the specific felony. Mr. Goldstein referred to the presentation materials which provide an example of offense type, which organizes the offense codes into broader categories of offenses (but has more detail than the broad offense categories). Mr. Goldstein went on to note that it is up to the Board to determine if DJS has put forth a strong enough use case for the inclusion of offense codes. Finally, Mr. Goldstein noted that the MLDS contains a lot of sensitive data and the Center has demonstrated its ability to protect and manage that data. Dr. Kellogg noted that the offense type is not a proposed data element at this time. Offense category and offense codes are the two proposed data elements.

Mr. Abed noted that the broad categories are problematic because as the definition of a crime changes (which frequently occurs) it will be difficult to make comparisons between the offense types or categories.

Dr. Sterett noted that all parties want to avoid collateral damage to young people and that the Center has reassured the Board that they can protect privacy by ensuring that data will be reported in the aggregate and by considering more stringent suppression requirements. Accordingly, if the concern with collateral

damage is eliminated and given that there are research possibilities that could benefit juveniles, the inclusion of the data should be considered.

In response to a question from Dr. Fielder, Ms. Abend stated that the availability of Social Security Numbers from DJS is about 20% and there is no other unique identifier available for matching to the other sectors. Nonetheless, with the name, date of birth, and other personally identifiable data the Center has demonstrated its ability to match the DJS data and is confident it can do so with a high level of accuracy.

In response to a question from Mr. Dykstra, Ms. Abend clarified that there are three levels of offense data:

1. Offense Codes - which are the most specific
2. Offense Type - which is a rolled-up version of the offense codes into more specific groupings
3. Offense Category - which is the broadest roll-up of the offense codes

Offense codes and offense categories are proposed data elements. Offense types are not a proposed data element. Mr. Abend stated that the offense codes are based on the statutory definitions (developed by the Sentencing Commission). The offense types are not an available data element.

**Motion** - Mr. Dykstra made a motion to approve the proposed DJS data elements with the exception of the offense codes. The motion was seconded by Dr. Salmon.

**Discussion** - Mr. Goldstein asked whether DJS wanted to consider replacing offense code with offense type, which would provide a little more granularity. Mr. Abend indicated that this was not a data element. Mr. Abend went on to state that removing offense codes provides no additional protection for kids and it will result in limiting the ability to do meaningful research. Further, since criminal charges are altered and amended over time, long term comparisons are less reliable when using categories or types instead of the specific code. DJS fought for inclusion to do this exact research - this is not just a preference - it is fundamental for the policy analyses they want to do. Mr. Irvine joined the meeting and confirmed that while a certain level of research can be done without the offense codes, not having them cuts off the ability to conduct certain research - for example, research on disproportionate sentencing requires the specific offense codes.

**Roll Call Vote** - Mr. Dykstra, Dr. Salmon, Dr. Fielder, Ms. Fiddler, Dr. Sterett, Dr. Shapiro, Dr. Moazzami approved the motion, Mr. Abend opposed the motion, and Mr. Biggs, Dr. Phillips, and Mr. Harrison abstained. The motion was approved by a majority of the Board.

### **Center Output**

Dr. Kellogg began the Center Output presentation by discussing progress on the Center's priorities for the Reporting Services Branch. The Center is very close to finishing the full lifecycle dashboards for high school to college and workforce (at age 25). The dashboards will allow the user to filter by local school system and school. Adding the wage data is the last part, which should be done in time to present at the December Board meeting.

Dr. Kellogg noted that the Center also produced a report on the workforce outcomes of Associate Degree Earners five years after earning the degree. Dr. Kellogg conducted a webinar presentation on the report and is now working with the Maryland Association of Community Colleges to use the report format to provide specific results and information for each community college. This reporting will support their reporting requirements and highlight the great outcomes for Associate Degree earners.

Dr. Kellogg is also working on developing a robust teacher dashboard and providing information to support the teaching colleges in completing MSDE required reporting on teacher preparation programs. The report shows the production of teachers by each college and whether they are teaching in Maryland and whether they are working in a low performing or Title 1 school.

Finally, Dr. Kellogg noted that work is ongoing on the Career Preparation Act Report and she will have results to show the Board in December. In response to a question from Ms. Fiddler, Dr. Kellogg responded that she has been asked to disaggregate Associate's Degree data by transfer or career degree type. The report will show the workforce outcomes for each degree type, but further analysis could be done to determine where transfer students attend.

Dr. Shaprio thanked Dr. Kellogg for the work being done on the teacher pipeline and noted that research and analysis on this topic was a key motivator for the development of the MLDS. Dr. Kellogg also noted that the Center was assisting USM by providing data on the impact of the Regional Higher Education Centers (RHEC) and whether graduates are working and staying in the region served by the RHEC.

Next, Dr. Henneberger began by presenting the Research Branch priorities. The first priority is to complete in-depth statistical analyses, able to support causal inferences where appropriate. This has been achieved through work on various analyses on pathways from high school to the workforce, including the analysis on outcomes of students who complete a bridge project in lieu of the State Assessment. In addition, the research branch has continued to work on research to disentangle the role of student and school poverty. Dr. Henneberger also noted that the Research Branch received a research request from Delegate Eric Luedtke to conduct an analysis of the impact of school resource officers on academic and arrest outcomes. Currently, Dr. Henneberger is determining what data are available and arranging opportunities to discuss this sensitive topic with key stakeholders including MSDE, DJS, and the Commission on School Safety.

The second Research Branch priority is to develop technical documentation to guide staff on the use of the System, data, appropriate methods, and best practices. This priority is being addressed through work to determine whether predictive analytics can be used with MLDS data. Dr. Henneberger noted that one of the Board members had asked on several occasions whether such an analytic approach could be utilized by the Center.

### **Review of Managing for Results Submission**

Mr. Goldstein began noting that Managing for Results (MFR) is a strategic planning, performance measurement, and budgeting process utilized by DBM. It is used to ensure that state resources achieve measurable results, accountability, efficiency, and continuous improvement. Mr. Goldstien also noted that MFR is a good tool for assessment of the agency's performance.

Mr. Goldstein reported on the Center's 16 performance measures, noting that this year produced mixed outcomes.

1. Increases in performance measures were as follows:
  - a. Dashboards and other analyses and summaries increased from 53 to 61.
  - b. The percent of data requests fulfilled within 30 days increased from 87% to 100%
  - c. The number of new reports increased from nine to ten;

- d. The number of times MLDS data were cited in reports and articles increased from two to three; and
  - e. The number of reports published in scholarly journals increased from one to four.
2. Decreases in performance measures were as follows:
- a. The Center did not complete a security audit, compared to two in the prior year. Mr. Goldstein noted that Ms. Cherry worked closely with DoIT, which had an arrangement with the National Guard to perform IT security audits. This audit never came to fruition and the arrangement has ended. Ms. Cherry is looking into engaging a private auditing firm this year.
  - b. The number of website page views decreased from 33,000 to 24,000. Mr. Goldstein noted that the decrease occurred despite more email notifications to the Center's contact list and stakeholders of new content. The Center's web developer is exploring different search optimization tools and may explore creating a social media presence.
  - c. The number of seminars conducted decreased from 56 to 24. Mr. Goldstein noted that this was likely a result of COVID and the fact that there were fewer opportunities to attend meetings and conferences. However, Mr. Goldstein credited Dr. Kellogg with creating new opportunities by conducting webinars.
  - d. The number of data requests also decreased from 38 to 36. This was also related to COVID. The Center was on pace until March - and then there was a complete drop off in data requests. The early end of the legislative session may have also been a factor.
  - e. Finally, the number of written responses to formal requests also decreased from 22 to 18.
3. Mr. Goldstein reported that the Center added new measures on external research and grant funded projects. The reason for this inclusion is that the Center spends considerable time on the process. It also adds value to the state by providing resources at no cost. In addition, it also serves as an indication of the quality of the MLDS and how attractive it is to researchers and funders.
- a. The first new measure is the number of external funding opportunities applied for or supported each year. There were six funding opportunities.
  - b. The second measure is the dollar value of those funding opportunities. There were \$4.2 million in funding opportunities.
  - c. The third measure is the number of grants awarded each year for projects applied for or supported. There were three funding opportunities awarded.
  - d. The fourth measure is the dollar value of the grants awarded. There was \$1 million in awards.
  - e. The final measure is the number of researchers provided secure access. There were nine researchers given access.

Dr. Fielder asked if the Center has looked into why half of the grants did not get funded. Mr. Goldstein noted that one reason is that multiple submissions are often required before a grant is funded. Dr. Henneberger noted that a 50% award rate is very good and that she would have expected a 15% to 20% award rate. Dr. Henneberger also noted that in order to get awards grant funders want to see a track record of published research. The Research Branch has seen a lot of recent success in building up its publications. Dr. Sterett agreed noting the many factors and intense competition surrounding grant awards.

### **Annual Report Recommendations**

Mr. Goldstein explained that the Governing Board must submit an Annual Report in December to the Governor and General Assembly. One of the required sections of the report (Section 5) is to provide any recommendations made by the Governing Board. This year we are starting the discussion on the recommendations early to provide more time for discussion and consideration. Mr. Goldstein noted that the Board was provided a list of the prior year recommendations. Generally, past recommendations have either been focused on directing the Center to do something or to recommend a policy or favorable action on certain legislation.

The topic of possible recommendations was discussed with the Research and Policy Advisory Board (RPB). At that meeting, Dr. Emily Dow noted that the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) is implementing two new collections: one for non-credit data from community colleges; and one for private career school data. Both data collections are important and would allow insight into important components of the workforce development pipeline. The Governing Board could consider a recommendation in support of these collections and the Center's involvement in their development and design. RPB also discussed the data needed to understand the teacher pipeline from education to a career in teaching and noted that currently, the data provided to the MLDS does not include teacher certification. The Governing Board has already noted the importance of this information during the discussion of the Data Gap Analysis at the June 2020 Governing Board meeting. During that discussion the Board decided to make teacher certification its own data gap and assign it a high priority. Accordingly, the Governing Board could also consider a recommendation on this topic as well. However, Mr. Goldstein also noted that MSDE's representative (Dr. Shaw) at the RPB meeting noted that MSDE does not collect this data.

### **2021 Legislative Session**

Mr. Goldstein began by reminding the board that last year the Governing Board gave its approval for the Center to pursue legislation making changes to the Career Preparation Expansion Act. The result was HB 850, which passed the House but ran out of time during the shortened legislative session. The Career Preparation Expansion Act (CPEA) required MHEC to collect and provide to the Center the following information:

1. Professional and occupational licenses from Labor and Health;
2. Vocational Certificates from Maryland Community Colleges; and
3. Industry certifications from a national certifier that receives state funds.

The goal of the legislation was to have MLDS instead of MHEC collect the data. The legislation specified that the data must include personally identifiable information which the Department of Health indicated was necessary before they could share their data. The bill also added a representative of the health occupations boards to the MLDS Governing Board. The bill also clarified that it is the duty of the licensing authority to provide the data. Finally, the bill classified the licensing data as student data.

*Ms. Luedtke noted that the Department of Labor had left the meeting, but a quorum was still present.*



Next, Mr. Goldstein stated that the RPB also discussed HB 711 - MLDS - Inclusion of Out-of-Home Placement Data, from the 2020 legislative session. That bill, which was sponsored by Delegate Kaiser also passed the House and ran out of time. As the title suggests, the bill authorized the Center to include out-of-home placement data from the Department of Human Services, which is currently prohibited. Unlike the DJS data, which made juvenile data a type of student data, HB 711 made out-of-home placement data its own category of data along with student data and workforce data. The RPB discussed proposing changes to the sponsor to make this bill consistent with the DJS approach (thereby establishing child welfare as an aspect of student information). Also, the bill required a report on the experience of former out-of-home children and how placement affected participation in higher education. Last year, Mr. Goldstein worked to change that requirement to a dashboard, which is easier to keep up-to-date and better for reporting numbers and tables.

### **Budget Briefing**

Mr. Goldstein began by reminding the Board that at the June Meeting the Board approved the FY 21 budget plan. That budget plan reflected a mandatory 10% reversion of funds, which was part of a cost saving measure required by DBM. The Center's reversion was \$248,000. However, by the time it went to the Board of Public Works for final approval, the Center's reversion amount was reduced to only \$50,000. Accordingly, this update is to inform the Board of that change and discuss how the Center intends to spend the additional funds.

- a. Small procurement (under \$15K) for a database analyst consultant has been entered into. This expenditure was approved by Dr. Fielder in his capacity as chairman. The need for this contract was the result of the recent retirement of Bob Murphy who had been with the Center since 2014. Mr. Goldstein noted that the Center conducted a competitive procurement that resulted in Mr. Murphy receiving the award.
- b. Additional funds will be put towards the contract for a Senior Database Engineer. This will allow the Center to avoid any cuts in this contract. This resource also leads the Center's IT security efforts.
- c. Funds will also be used to procure the services of an independent IT auditor.
- d. Finally, the Center is working to establish a longer term consulting contract for a data analyst to allow the Center to have the resource on retainer. The Center can utilize the data analyst for grant funded projects which would not disrupt efforts of ongoing staff and would allow the Center to better understand and track the costs of the grant-funded projects.

### **External Research and Grant Funded Projects**

Dr. Henneberger noted that there were no specific projects that needed approval. Instead, Dr. Henneberger provided a summary of recent grant submissions. The MLDS Center Research Branch submitted four grants applications to the Institute of Education Sciences for almost \$4.5 million. Award decisions are expected in the Spring of 2021. The proposals involved research on:

1. Long-term follow up of outcomes for students subject to the PBIS program;
2. The impact of teacher characteristics on student outcomes;
3. The impact of discipline policy and student outcomes; and
4. Efforts to diversify the teacher workforce.

The research branch also submitted a grant to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to study student homelessness.

The Research Branch also supported several external research applications. Dr. Henneberger noted the varied nature of the research and stated that it indicated the scope and robustness of the MLDS. She thanked the Board and Center staff for their support and openness to these research opportunities.

With respect to the research on diversifying the teacher workforce, Dr. Fielder noted that MHEC administers the teacher scholarship program and noted that this type of research could help identify policies to utilize the scholarship to help improve teacher diversification.

**Old Business**

There was no old business.

**New Business**

There was no new business.

**Closing**

Dr. Fielder thanked everyone for their attention and passion for the topics discussed and announced that the next meeting would be held on December 11, 2020. A motion to adjourn was made by Dr. Phillips and seconded by Mr. Biggs. The motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,  
Ross Goldstein  
Executive Director

**Approved:** December 11, 2020