



Maryland Longitudinal Data System Governing Board
Meeting Minutes
December 11, 2020

The meeting of the Maryland Longitudinal Data System (MLDS) Governing Board was held on December 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)
- Mr. Victor Henderson, Performance Management Program Analyst (Designee for Ms. Tiffany Robinson, Secretary of the Department of Labor)
- Dr. Nancy Shapiro, Associate Vice-Chancellor for Education & Outreach (Designee for Dr. Robert Caret, Chancellor)
- Dr. Karen Salmon, State Superintendent of Schools
- Dr. Farzad Moazzami, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, Morgan State University (Designee for Dr. David Wilson, President)
- 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
- Mr. Maurice Good, Program Director, Maryland New Directions

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 September 11, 2020 meeting. Dr. Salmon made a motion to approve the minutes, which was seconded by Mr. Dykstra. The motion was unanimously approved.

Center Output

Dr. Kellogg began by presenting the Center's 2020-2021 reporting output goals and noted that many projects have either been completed or substantial progress has been made. Some of the completed work has laid the groundwork for additional phases. For example, the Associate's Degree report will next look at outcomes by career type degree as compared to transfer degrees. In addition, the Center met with a community college workgroup to develop metrics for their accountability reporting. For the remaining six months, the Center will focus on supporting partner agencies with their reporting needs, including career and technical education reporting for the State Department of Education, adult education reporting for the Department of Labor, and data tables to support the State Plan for Higher Education. The Center is also working on a series of dashboards related to teachers in consultation with different stakeholder groups.

Dr. Kellogg noted that the Center is also responding to a number of data requests; fewer requests than past years, but some more substantive. For example, the Center completed a request for the University System to support a JCR report on regional higher education centers.

Finally, Dr. Kellogg noted that the Center submitted its first set of student data to the Comptroller and received aggregate data back on earnings reported on federal and state taxes. The Comptroller was able to respond within one week. From the initial data request, there are a number of questions that staff will work with the Comptroller's staff to resolve. Additional information about Center update is available in the Center's Annual Report.

Dr. Shapiro noted her appreciation for the work the Center was doing to study the teacher pipeline starting with students in an Associate of Arts in Teaching program (AAT). Center staff met with the AAT Oversight Council to talk about dashboard information that would be useful for State policymakers to better understand and evaluate the AAT pipeline. Dr. Shapiro noted that the AAT route was not recognized by the Kirwan Commission, but they are aware of it and additional information would be beneficial.

Next, Dr. Henneberger provided the update on the Research Branch output over the past six months. First, Dr. Henneberger reviewed the overarching priorities:

1. Complete in-depth statistical analyses to support decision-making, able to support causal inferences where appropriate.
2. Develop technical documentation to guide staff on the use of the System, appropriate methods, and best practices.
3. Applications for external funding to support priorities 1-2.

Dr. Henneberger also reminded the Board of a research request on the impact of school resource officers on arrests and academic outcomes. Thus far the researchers have consulted with a national expert on the issue, Dr. Chris Curran, met with stakeholders, and is gathering information. Currently, the MLDS does not have sufficient data to support the research inquiry.

For the first priority area, the Research Branch provided three research series presentations, three reports, a presentation for the Maryland Health Equity Conference, and a presentation for the SLDS Sustainability Webinar. The Research Branch is nearing completion of a project for MSDE on the postsecondary outcomes of students who complete a bridge project in lieu of an assessment exam. For the second priority, Dr. Tracy Sweet of the Research Branch is working collaboratively with MSDE and MHEC to explore how predictive analytics may be used with MLDS data. For the third priority, the Research Branch has submitted three federal grants to the Institute of Education Sciences (U.S. Department of Education) and one federal grant application to the National Science Foundation (\$20 million infrastructure grant).

Mr. Rizzi stated that going through the materials that were sent prior to the Board meeting and reflecting on his 10 years of experience with the MLDS he is amazed by the progress the Center has made and what has been accomplished this past year. Dr. Fielder agreed and noted that there is more use of the MLDS by state policymakers.

Procedures for New Collections

Ms. Molly Abend began by noting the increase of new data being added to the MLDS, which led to the need to formally document the process for incorporating new data. This procedure is for data that is from partner agencies and not external data that is provided for a limited purpose or study. The procedures have been reviewed by the Center's two advisory boards.

The procedures include an overview of the process, a definitions section, and a section that outlines possible rationales for collecting new data; such as it is necessary to comply with state law or to address a need of a partner agency. Next, there are fifteen steps that are followed as part of the process. The steps include meeting with the partner agency and working through a list of questions about the data including details about the data elements and an understanding of how the data are collected. The steps also include working with the agency to make sure the Center can meet the agency's data and research needs. The procedures also include a review of data elements for identity resolution and research purposes. Once that is complete, a file layout is developed and shared with the partner agency. A data loading plan is also created. Next, a sample file is sent by the partner agency and reviewed by the Center. Once that is complete, a final data set is submitted. Dr. Fielder also noted the detailed procedures that take place to ensure the confidentiality of student data.

Annual Report

Mr. Goldstein presented the Annual Report. The report is due to the Governor and General Assembly every December 15th. The Annual Report has five required sections. The first section requires reporting on the implementation of the MLDS and the activities of the Center. Under implementation, Mr. Goldstein noted that he reports on system management, including providing a records count (3.6 million individual records) and match rate (which is 94%, calculated based on 12th grade exiters matched to one or more sectors). The system management section also discusses system security audits and actions taken and provides an overview of data governance activities. Under activities of the Center, the report discusses the Center's COVID response and move to a virtual office. The report also provides lists of the following completed work and activities:

- COVID response - move to virtual office
- Stakeholder engagement activities
- Data Requests
- External Researcher and Grant Funded Projects
- Researcher Series and Presentations provided
- Publications in Peer Reviewed Journals

The report also provides a summary of the completion of the Synthetic Data Project, the Comptroller data sharing project, work being done to collect census block and tract data, and the Center's participation in the Eastern States Longitudinal Data Collaborative. Finally, Section 1 notes that the research branch won a prestigious research award: first place winner for AERA 2020 - Outstanding Publications - Advances in Methodology, for their synthetic data project report.

Section two of the report requires a listing of all studies performed. This section includes a listing of all research reports, new and updated dashboards completed, and summaries of the Dual Enrollment Report, Career Preparation Expansion Act Report, and the Report Associate Degree Earners Report. The report also provides our research priorities for the year and provides an overview of planned research (which was discussed earlier in the meeting).

Section three requires a listing of all data that has been determined to be unnecessary and removed from the system. The section was left blank since no data were eliminated this year. Section four provides all new data elements added this year, which includes 97 new data elements from the following sources:

- Department of Juvenile Services
- Apprenticeship
- Additional MAPCS data elements
- Higher Education Course information Data (SRS and CIS)
- Adult Correctional Ed

Mr. Rizzi commented on the potential that the Comptroller data has to fill in important gaps in our understanding of workforce outcomes. Similarly, the census block and tract data will also add important information not currently available about socioeconomic status. Mr. Goldstein responded that both collections are in the development phase. For the census data, a workgroup has been formed and a project plan has been established for the data collection from the local school systems. The collection will take at least a year until fully implemented. Similarly, there is still a lot more work to understand the Comptroller data and how it can supplement the Unemployment Insurance data.

Dr. Salmon addressed her concerns about studying the feasibility of collecting data for teacher certification. That data is in the hands of the local school systems - MSDE does not have a data collection for teacher certification. Dr. Salmon stated that it would not be fair to have the Center go directly to the districts to collect this data. Dr. Fielder asked if MSDE has plans to collect that data, to which Dr. Salmon responded "no."

Next Mr. Goldstein presented the recommendations to the Governing Board, noting that the first two were discussed with the Research and Policy Advisory Board and presented at the last Governing Board meeting.

Recommendation 1: The Governing Board recognizes the importance of the following two new data collections being implemented by the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC): non-credit data from community colleges and enrollment and degree data from private colleges and private career schools. These data collections will support important research in currently unstudied components of the workforce development pipeline. The Governing Board directs the Center staff to consult with MHEC in the design, development, and review of these data collections.

Board Action - Dr. Fielder asked if there was a motion to approve the first recommendation. Dr. Shapiro moved to accept the recommendation, which was seconded by Mr. Biggs. The motion passed unanimously.

Recommendation 2: The Governing Board directs the MLDS Center staff to explore the feasibility of collecting data on applicants for teacher certification, including applicant demographic information, the type of certification, all subject areas in which the applicant is certified to teach, certification testing completed, the highest degree of the applicant, college attended, and prior teaching experience. The feasibility study should determine the available sources of the data, the challenges or barriers to collecting the data, legal constraints, and the cost and resources required to collect the data.

Mr. Goldstein noted, in response to Dr. Salmon's prior comment, that the recommendation does not propose having the Center collect the data. Questions about teacher certification come up a lot and the goal of the recommendation is to better understand what data may be available, from what sources, and what are the challenges to collecting it.

Motion - Dr. Shapiro made a motion to approve the recommendation, which was seconded by Mr. Biggs.

Discussion - Dr. Fielder began the discussion on the motion by obtaining clarification from Mr. Goldstein that the intention of the recommendation is in fact a feasibility study and not a proposal to begin collecting the data. Dr. Fielder also stated that currently the agencies are the conduits of the data and he does not agree with the idea of MLDS collecting data directly and therefore, has reservations about supporting this recommendation if it means going directly to the local school districts. Dr. Salmon agreed, stating that she does not want the MLDS Center going directly to the districts. This opens the door to a new operating system and therefore she intends to vote against the motion.

Dr. Shapiro noted that teachers are a critical part of the P20 pipeline and that the teacher certification gap is a significant barrier to our understanding of teachers and their impact on the P20 pipeline in Maryland. Specifically, state policymakers need to know whether teachers are teaching in their certified fields, whether they were trained in another state, whether they go onto obtain advanced certification. The current inability to collect the data is not a compelling argument. If it is a matter of resources, that could be accounted for in the Kirwan Commission's blueprint legislation. Dr. Shapiro also noted that

researchers currently do not know if teachers are teaching in their certified areas. The only way to find that out is through the local school districts. Finally, more information is needed on teachers coming from out-of-state. A feasibility study leads to an analysis of what is possible.

Dr. Fieler asked whether the MLDS Center has the legal authority to directly collect the data. Ms. Luedtke responded that the Education Article, § 24-707, authorizes the Center to go directly to the districts to collect student information. Mr. Goldstein agreed but noted that the question presumes a conclusion that the recommendation did not intend to make. The feasibility study is to determine how the data can be collected - not how the data can be collected by the MLDS Center. Dr. Salmon responded that conversations behind the scenes have indicated the intention for the Center to go directly to the locals and that is how this recommendation has been understood.

Ms. Fidler noted her support for the recommendation as it is written and that it does not imply any answers to the questions being raised. A feasibility study should not be avoided because someone might not like the answers. Dr. Sterett also agreed, noting that the data would create a benefit to P20 analyses and that there is no commitment to do the work - only understand whether it is feasible to do the work.

In response to Mr. Abed, Dr. Fielder noted his concern with having the Center go directly to the districts is that it could result in data collection without the knowledge and background that the partner agencies possess. Dr. Salmon added that the issue is also that there are a lot of onerous data collections required of the local school systems. It is a concern that we would go directly to the local school systems for this information since it would not allow MSDE to preserve the local school system workload.

In response to a question from Dr. Fielder about the timeline for the feasibility study, Mr. Goldstein stated that it would take at least a year to talk to different stakeholders, including partner agencies, affinity groups, teaching colleges, and other stakeholders, and then synthesize information gathered into a final report.

Mr. Abed noted his opinion that the feasibility study is trying to explore what it takes to gather this particular data and that the benefit could be to strengthen the training programs. Dr. Shapiro agreed but also added that it would provide important staffing information to state leaders who will be grappling with teacher shortages post-COVID.

Mr. Dykstra stated that he sees both arguments. Public schools are already struggling with teacher shortages and it is going to get worse before it gets better. This data is needed to understand the problem and seek solutions. However, he is concerned about how the feasibility study would be conducted because it would require a lot of input on locals for information - specifically the Human Resource officers which are woefully understaffed and will be inundated with implications of the pandemic.

Dr. Kellogg offered a practical example of how this has worked in the past. A year ago the Center worked to fulfill a data request on teachers. A list of gaps was developed which were communicated with MHEC who in turn determined that the colleges have the needed data elements that could be collected to fill the gap. Since the topic was of interest to MHEC, the data is now being collected.

Board Action - Fielder, Henderson, Abed, Moazzami, Shapiro, Fidler, Dykstra, Sterett, Rizzi, Biggs, and Good voted to approve the motion. Dr. Salmon voted against the motion. The motion passed 11-1.

Recommendation 3 - *The Governing Board directs the MLDS Center staff to explore the education and workforce policy issues related to COVID-19 and the available data at the State and local levels to help address policy concerns with a special lens towards disproportionalities.*

Dr. Shapiro made a motion to approve the third recommendation to the Annual Report, which was seconded by Dr. Moazzami. The motion was unanimously approved.

Next Mr. Goldstein, noting that the Annual Report is a report of the Governing Board, asked for the Board's approval to finalize and submit the entire report.

Board Action - Ms. Fidler made a motion to approve the Annual Report for submission, which was seconded by Mr. Abed. The motion was unanimously approved.

Governing Board Bylaws - Proposed Changes

Mr. Goldstein began by noting that he and Ms. Luedtke reviewed the bylaws and came up with the following series of revisions and recommendations.

1. Clarifying the permissibility of teleconferencing for Board meetings, adding the Department of Juvenile Services, and updating references to the Department of Labor (form Department of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation).
2. Changes to the board meeting agenda to reflect current practice.
3. Remove section 2.4b which encouraged members to personally attend meetings and consistently appoint the same designee. Since this has not been the current practice, the provision is recommended for removal.
4. Creation of a new Cybersecurity Subcommittee. The section establishes the membership of the committee to include certain board members, CIOs of partner agencies, and the Center's chief information officer. The subcommittee would provide more in-depth information about security measures, get input, and remain accountable to stakeholders.
5. Adds a non-discrimination and equity statement

Mr. Rizzi asked whether the membership on the subcommittee includes the state chief information security officer. Ms. Luedtke responded that it does not. Ms. Cherry noted that it was a good suggestion and she would be amenable to including him. Mr. Biggs asked whether the CIOs from the partner agencies would attend. Ms. Luedtke responded that they have a vested interest in the Center's security and a role under the data sharing agreements for ongoing awareness of the security of the data being shared with the Center. Also, the meetings would only be quarterly and therefore would not create an undue burden.

Board Action - Mr. Abed made a motion to approve the proposed bylaws changes, which was seconded by Dr. Shapiro. The motion was unanimously approved.

External Researcher and Grant Funded Projects

Dr. Henneberger began by thanking the Governing Board for their continued support for external research opportunities to support important research initiatives. The Center has received two new applications for grant funded projects; both from MLDS Center Research Branch members. Both projects study the impact of discipline on workforce and postsecondary education. The proposals are similar, but employ different methodologies.

Proposal 1 - The Effects of State and Local PK-12 Discipline Policies on Suspensions, Juvenile Arrests, and Educational Outcomes

Dr. Lincove began by noting that she submitted this proposal to the Institute for Education Sciences for a grant, but is interested in pursuing the research even while waiting to see if funding is received. The focus of the research is the impact of policy changes in Maryland, including the State's increased and varied use of school resource officers (SROs); the new State guidance to school districts on discipline and suspension practices; the updates made to district policies; the prohibition of most suspensions in primary grades; and required reporting and discussion of racial disparities in discipline and school arrests. Dr. Lincove next provided an overview of the research questions the project will address.

1. What are the short- and long-term effects of school suspensions on educational attainment and human capital in Maryland?
2. How do the effects of school suspensions vary by race, gender, and income?
3. Do the uses and effects of suspension vary across districts in Maryland relative to discipline policies or within districts relative to faculty and student characteristics or school programs?
4. What are the most effective policies for reducing suspension rates and disproportionality in suspensions, as well as for mitigating the effects of suspensions on student learning and attainment?

The research plan involves collecting and coding district policies regarding suspensions and SROs; identifying district-level variation in discipline policies and practices; integrating policy with the student-level MLDS data; estimating the short-term and long-term effects of policy changes on student outcomes; and identifying policies that successfully reduce the use of suspension, improve disproportionality in suspensions, and mitigate long-term effects of suspensions on educational attainment and involvement in the juvenile justice system. The study takes advantage of policy changes that occurred since 2012 and allows the researchers the opportunity to figure out which discipline policies lead to a reduction in suspensions and disproportionality and when suspensions do occur, what supports reduce the impact of the suspensions. Next, Dr. Lincove reviewed the MLDS data that the project would use, which include K-12 attendance, enrollment, achievement, and discipline data; higher education enrollment and attainment data; postsecondary workforce data; and Juvenile Services data on arrests and involvement in the juvenile justice system. Finally, Dr. Lincove noted that she is seeking funding from IES for \$1.6 million over four years. The grant proposal includes funds to help the MLDS Center integrate the Juvenile Justice data. She is also planning on seeking funds from Spencer Foundation and AERA (both private education research funders that are on the Center's approved funders list).

In response to a question from Dr. Fielder, Dr. Lincove clarified that the researchers would only be collecting information from local school systems on SRO contracts with local law enforcement and school discipline policies - not individual student-level data. Ms. Luedtke noted that the *2020 Annual School Resource Officers / Adequate Coverage Report* by the Maryland Center for School Safety (MCCS) includes the specific number of officers per school. Dr. Salmon stated that she highly supports the project because it seeks to understand how policy impacts practice. Further, the study does not make statements about the students; instead, it focuses on the practices and how they impact outcomes. Dr. Salmon also recommended that the researchers speak with Ms. Kate Hession, the director of MCCS, who has a lot of valuable information for the study regarding the school resource officer questions.

Mr. Rizzi noted that two of the Co-principal investigators were from private research think tanks (Rand and Brookings), not academic institutions. Mr. Goldstein stated that this would be the first time researchers from a non-academic institution are included in a proposal. However, the *Policies and Procedures for External Researcher and Grant Funded Projects* require the primary applicant to be from a qualifying academic institution (as is Dr. Lincove) but does not specify the requirements for the co-principal investigators. The process gives the Center and the Board the opportunity to review the Curriculum Vitae of the researchers. In this case, the researchers are highly qualified and will be required to meet the same requirements for access. Dr. Lincove noted that all of the research team will be covered by the university's institutional review board. Mr. Goldstein offered that private think tanks have a lot of talented individuals and as a policy matter it would not be prudent for the MLDS Center to cut itself off from these resources -

Dr. Fielder noted that Mr. Abed had left the meeting and that his designee John Irvine was participating in his place.

Board Action - Dr. Salmon made a motion to approve Dr. Lincove's external research grant project, which was seconded by Dr. Shapiro. The motion was unanimously approved.

Proposal 2 - School Discipline and the Transition to Adulthood in Maryland

Dr. Wade Jacobsen began by noting his interest is in studying the postsecondary and workforce outcomes of students who experience discipline. School discipline disproportionately impacts students by race and the study wants to determine if the impacts on outcomes also differ by race. The focus will be on the removal of a student from a class or school (in-school and out-of-school suspension).

There are three research questions that the project will tackle. First, what is a student's likelihood of school discipline by each grade? How does this cumulative risk vary by race/ethnicity? Second, what are the relationships among race/ethnicity, school discipline, and justice system involvement? Third, what are the relationships among race/ethnicity, school discipline, and enrollment in higher education and participation in the Maryland workforce?

Next, Dr. Jacobsen discussed the benefits the proposed research will have for Maryland policymakers. First, the research will advance an understanding of long-term experiences of school discipline for those who experience it. Second, the research will inform ongoing reform efforts aimed at reducing racial inequality in emerging adult sectors. Finally, the research will help identify points through which policy can reduce racial disproportionality in the State.

Dr. Salmon pointed out that the questions being addressed in this study have been well researched and

documented. The U.S. Department of Education recently released a large study on discipline and disproportionality. While Dr. Jacobsen's study does provide a new take with the inclusion of the cumulative impact of discipline, it remains a very sensitive topic. Unlike the prior proposal which was studying policy, this study is pinpointing the student characteristic of race as a predictor of discipline and subsequent outcomes. We already know students of color are predictive for discipline and MSDE is already working hard to come up with strategies to mitigate that fact and to confront institutional racism, which is unfortunately still pervasive. Accordingly, Dr. Salmon concluded that MSDE does not support the proposal.

Dr. Fielder asked whether FARMS data could be used to understand the impact of socioeconomic status on discipline and outcomes. Dr. Jacobsen stated that FARMS is a limited measure, but he could explore its use. Also, in response to Dr. Salmon, Dr. Jacobsen recognized the sensitivity of the topic and the fact that a lot of prior research has been done. However, he asserted that there are remaining questions and the research will be helpful to understand the use of and outcomes of suspension and expulsion.

In response to a question about how the research helps inform policy, Dr. Jacobsen stated that it informs policy by adding information about long term outcomes of suspensions and expulsion. Racial minorities are more likely to experience these outcomes and it is important to understand how it impacts them.

Dr. Henneberger recognized Dr. Salmon's concerns and the sensitivity of the topic. In response, Dr. Henneberger first noted that the research process is iterative and allows for an ongoing conversation with policymakers to ensure the research is aware of and can address their concerns. Second, Dr. Henneberger stated that the research is not pinpointing race as a predictor of outcomes. Instead, it is looking at disproportionalities which will allow the researchers to identify ways to differentially intervene with students to support college and career outcomes. Third, the study builds on prior research by adding the novel component of college and workforce outcomes. Most research on the school to prison pipeline focuses on negative developmental outcomes, while this research looks at positive developmental outcomes of college and workforce attainment, a priority topic for the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS). Fourth, Dr. Henneberger noted that the research informs policy intervention and practices by identifying opportunities to build more support for students who are impacted by discipline.

Dr. Henneberger went on to discuss the two different lines of research that can be done. First, there are policy evaluations that take an actual policy and evaluate it using causal inference methods. Second, there are etiological research questions where the goal is to identify early developmental predictors of college and workforce outcomes, which can inform policy, practice, and intervention. Dr. Lincove's study is an example of the first type of research and Dr. Jacobsen's research is an example of the second.

Mr. Dykstra noted that he is in agreement with Dr. Salmon. The topic is well researched and therefore he does not see the value that this project adds. The education community has the information - even the recidivism aspect. Second, Mr. Dykstra noted that the project does not align with the research agenda as stated on slide seven. Research Question 2 asks whether students are academically prepared to enter postsecondary institutions. However, this research does not address academic preparation. Similarly, the research proposal does not correlate to Research Question 3. Given concerns about the sensitivity of the topic and the fact that this research proposal adds nothing new, Mr. Dykstra stated that he will not support the proposal.

In response to a question from Mr. Rizzi, Dr. Jacobsen stated that he currently has received a small amount of internal funding from his university, but that he also plans to seek additional funding. Dr.

Henneberger noted that the research would require very little MLDS resources. Mr. Rizzi asked what is the role of the Governing Board when judging these proposals. Mr. Goldstein responded that the Board has carved out for itself the role of reviewing and approving these proposals. The criteria used are up to the Board. Mr. Goldstein went on to speak in favor of the project, noting that it builds on existing research and costs the state virtually nothing to participate and add to the body of knowledge on this topic.

Dr. Shapiro noted her support for the research proposal. While Dr. Salmon and Mr. Dykstra raised important concerns, it is nonetheless important to shine a light on the issues being raised by this research and add to the knowledge base about the topic. More awareness can drive more change.

Mr. Irvine also noted his support of the research. DJS is very interested in research that supports positive youth outcome measures, which is something that had been heretofore unavailable to DJS. This research will drive policy work on disproportionality that DJS is interested in pursuing.

Dr. Moazzami also noted his support for the project, noting its sensitivity, but also the need to study the topic and not run away from it.

Dr. Salmon clarified that she never said that she wants to ignore the problem. In fact, she has spent the last five years working on equity issues in Maryland schools. Her objection is that this study presents a deficit model on students, which is different than looking at adult actions that can impact student outcomes. Further, she clarified that she does not question the expertise of the researcher, but she questions the need for MSDE and local school systems to be involved. School administrators have these data from the school to prison pipeline task force and studies published by MSDE that look at disproportionality in schools. There is no need to rehash the same findings.

Ms. Fidler indicated in the meeting chat (11:47AM) that she had to leave the meeting.

Board Action - Dr. Shapiro made a motion to approve Dr. Jacobsen's research proposal, which was seconded by Mr. Biggs. Fielder, Henderson, Irvine, Moazzami, Shapiro, Sterett, Rizzi, Biggs, and Good voted to approve the motion, and Salmon and Dykstra voted against the motion. The motion was approved 9-2.

Proposal 3 - Expanding the Capacity of the MLDS

Dr. Henneberger noted that the Governing Board approved the proposed research grant project to expand the capacity of the MLDS last year. Dr. Shapiro serves as the principal investigator on the project. Dr. Shapiro noted that they submitted an application last year to the National Science Foundation for this Mid-Scale Research Infrastructure grant. Research infrastructure grant is for \$20 million over five years. The project provides for collaboration between multiple institutions: MLDS Center, USM, UMB, UMBC, UMD, and HBCUs in the State. The goal is to create legal, ethical, governance, and technological infrastructure to fill the data gaps identified by the MLDS Center Governing Board. The preliminary proposal is due January 7, 2021. The grant will allow the team of researchers and the Center to think more broadly and deeply on ethical issues about data collections and the types of research that are done. The grant will also allow us to address the gaps that have been identified and prioritized by the Governing Board. Dr. Shapiro noted that the reviews were very favorable last year, but they did point out a few things to address. First, how do we take what we learn in Maryland and make it more generalizable to the rest of the country and second, how we can expand the grant to build capacity among HBCUs to allow them to participate more fully in the work of the Center.

In response to a question from Mr. Rizzi, Dr. Henneberger confirmed that a large component of the project will be for data analytics - especially as it applies to cross-discipline research and activities. Finally, also in response to a question from Mr. Rizzi about the ethical use component, Dr. Sterett noted her involvement in the project and stated that the topic is an empirical social science question. In other words, it is not a legal question about what is allowed, but rather a question about what should and shouldn't be done. The ethical use and how different disciplines collaborate and determine what to do with the data is a rapidly emerging field and holds a lot of promise.

In response to a question from Dr. Fielder, Dr. Shapiro clarified that the collaborating institutions represent the institutions of the research team. However, all facets of P20 education will be included in the research and analysis conducted.

Board Action - A motion to approve the research grant proposal was made by Mr. Rizzi and seconded by Dr. Fielder. The motion was unanimously approved.

External Research - Partnership Definition

Mr. Goldstein noted that the partnership definition relates to *The Policies and Procedures for External Researcher and Grant Funded Projects*. Those procedures require applicants to be staff or faculty from a qualifying institution. A qualifying institution is a college or university that provides data to MHEC. However, staff or faculty from a non-qualifying institution may partner with staff from a qualifying institution to submit an application. This policy defines what constitutes a partnership; in other words, what oversight and stewardship should be required of the partner.

First, the researcher must be from a Maryland institution and is either a co-investigator on the project, a member of the Research Branch, or current or former staff of the Center who has completed a project for the Center. Second, the partner must be familiar with the professional reputation of and have confidence in the applicant and his or her ability to deliver high-quality research and analysis. Third, the partner must have expertise relevant to the project. Fourth, the partner must help ensure that the applicant adheres to MLDS Center data governance rules. Fifth, the partner must remain apprised of the project. And finally, the partner must be willing and able to review the Center product, including suppression review.

In response to a question from Mr. Rizzi, Ms. Luedtke stated that the legislative intent was silent as to whether researchers outside Maryland were permitted to access the MLDS. However, as a matter of policy, the Board has limited the use of the system to topics that have a value to Maryland and provide a Maryland product (i.e. a report or presentation).

Career Preparation Expansion Act Report

Dr. Kellogg began by providing an overview of the Career Preparation Expansion Act reporting requirements. The report must be done each year (this is the third report) in conjunction with the Governor's Workforce Development Board. This year's report looks at students who graduated from high school in 2014 and their workforce outcomes five years later, the second quarter of 2019. The statute requires reporting on the high school graduates' wages earned, hours worked (which cannot be done with Center data), and industry of employment. Each year the Center meets with stakeholders to select topics for additional research. This year, those topics include exploring outcomes for different

demographic and economic groups and exploring degree pathways.

First, Dr. Kellogg presented findings from the report on wages, noting that the population is the same as the last two years as is the distribution of educational attainment. Twenty-two percent of high school graduates had a postsecondary credential (certificate, associate's, or bachelor's or higher) at 4.5 years. Additional exploration about the *Still in College* students found that the majority had an associate's or bachelor's degree and were pursuing a subsequent bachelor's or master's degree. The report showed wages consistent with prior year reports. The median quarterly wages for those with a postsecondary education credential is higher than those that do not. For example, 65% of bachelor's degree earners had a quarterly wage that was at or above the living wage.

The report also focused on students with *No College* and *Some College* to determine if they have the potential for wage growth. For the *No College* group, those always engaged in the workforce showed a definite wage progression that ended up at the five-year point with a living wage. This was a small population, but an encouraging result. For the *Some College* group, the analysis focused on whether there were any returns to attending some college. The findings indicate that a shorter duration of *Some College* (less than 2 years) results in a somewhat better workforce outcome than having a longer duration of *Some College*.

Next, Dr. Kellogg reported on findings related to Bachelor's Degree pathways. Students that obtain a bachelor's degree in Maryland are highly visible in wage data and have higher wages when compared to students who go to an out-of-state college and return to work in Maryland. The report also found that students that start their bachelor's degree at a community college have similar outcomes to those who only attend a four-year college. This is a small population, but it indicates that starting at community college does not diminish the value of the bachelor's degree.

Approximately 69% of the high school graduates with the same employer are concentrated in four industry sectors: Trade, Transportation and Utilities; Business and Professional Services; Healthcare and Social Assistance; and Leisure and Hospitality. Only the Business and Professional Services sector has a majority of high school graduates earning a living wage.

Finally, Dr. Kellogg presented findings that compare the workforce outcomes of different demographic and socioeconomic groups by industry sector and earnings. The different groups include: Male/Female; Race (White, Black, Asian); Ethnicity (Hispanic and Non-Hispanic); and Socioeconomic Status (FARMS Eligible and Non-FARMS Eligible). The analysis compares the state distribution of high school graduates with full-quarter wages into different industry sectors to the distribution of the different groups into those sectors. Some sectors, like Leisure and Hospitality, have the same proportion of high school graduates, regardless of group. However, others, like Healthcare and Social Assistance, have different proportions of males and females engaged in the sector. The report also compares median quarterly earnings by the different groups. The findings indicate higher wage gaps at higher levels of education. For example, the wage gap for males and females with *No College* is smaller than the male and female wage gap for *Bachelor's Degree* students. But, this may reflect some of the limitations of the Unemployment Insurance (UI) wage data. UI wage data only indicates the industry sector of the employer, not the job of the employee. The wage gaps may be more reflective of college majors that feed the sector versus a disparity between people doing the same job. The *No College* students may only have entry-level skill sets and therefore only have access to similar entry-level positions. In comparison, the Bachelor's Degree students can have different majors, different skill sets, and therefore different wages. Accordingly, Dr. Kellogg noted that the next step will be to add college majors to the analysis.

Old Business

There was no old business.

New Business

There was no new business.

Closing

Dr. Fielder noted his appreciation for everyone engaging in the board meeting with thoughtful and meaningful discussion and announced that the next meeting would be held on March 12, 2021. A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Rizzi and seconded by Mr. Good. The motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,
Ross Goldstein
Executive Director

Approved: March 12, 2021