



Maryland Longitudinal Data System Governing Board
Meeting Minutes - June 9, 2023 - DRAFT

The meeting of the Maryland Longitudinal Data System (MLDS) Governing Board was held on June 9, 2023, via teleconference. Mr. Jason Perkins-Cohen, designee for vice-chair, Secretary Portia Wu, 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:

Mr. Jason Perkins-Cohen, Deputy Secretary, Maryland Department of Labor (Designee for Secretary Wu)
Dr. Sanjay Rai, Acting Secretary of Higher Education
Dr. Sylvia Lawson, Deputy Superintendent for School Effectiveness, Maryland State Department of Education (Designee for Superintendent Choudhury)
Mr. Kirill Reznik, Assistant Secretary for Inter-Departmental Data Integration, Department of Human Services (Designee for Secretary Lopez)
Mr. Shane Hall, Assistant Director of Research and Evaluation, Department of Juvenile Service (Designee for Secretary Schiraldi)
Dr. Nancy Shapiro, Associate Vice-Chancellor for Education & Outreach, University System of Maryland (Designee for Dr. Jay Perman, Chancellor)
Mr. Matt Power, President, Maryland Independent Colleges and Universities Association
Dr. Phyllis Keys, Acting Interim Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Professor of Finance, Morgan State University (Designee for President Wilson)
Mr. Jason Dykstra, Executive Director, Instructional Data Division, Anne Arundel County Public Schools
Dr. Susan Sterett, Professor of Public Policy, University of Maryland, Baltimore County
Ms. Hussainatu Blake, Education and Workforce Strategist, Patrick J. McGovern Foundation
Mr. Arian Lenzondzo, President and CEO of Global Affairs Network LLC
Ms. Laurie Kendall-Ellis, Executive Director of the Maryland Board of Physical Therapy Examiners

The following MLDS Center staff were in attendance:

Mr. Ross Goldstein, Executive Director, MLDS Center
Dr. Angela Henneberger, Director of Research, MLDS Center and Research Assistant Professor, University of Maryland, School of Social Work
Dr. Ann Kellogg, Director of Reporting Services, MLDS Center, and MHEC Liaison
Ms. Molly Abend, Data Management Coordinator, MLDS Center, and MSDE Liaison
Mr. Roy Enehiroana, Data Analyst, MLDS Center, and Labor Liaison
Ms. Jeaneen Johnson, Assistant Attorney General

Approval of the Meeting Minutes

Mr. Perkins-Cohen asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the March 10, 2023 meeting. Dr. Rai made a motion to approve the minutes, which was seconded by Mr. Dykstra. The motion was unanimously approved.

Research Agenda and Supporting Procedures

Mr. Goldstein introduced the first topic by noting that State law requires the Governing Board to establish the Research Agenda of the Center. In 2021, as part of the Center's Annual Report Recommendations, the Board directed the Center staff to undertake a review of the Research Agenda noting that the current Research Agenda was over 10 years old and a review was needed to consider: (1) the purpose the Agenda should serve; (2) whether the current questions/topics are sufficient to address the Center's added scope of work given the legislative changes and new data sources; and (3) how the research agenda can address questions of social equity.

Next, Dr. Kellogg provided an overview of the proposed Research Agenda; beginning with a review of the development process that led to the proposed Research Agenda and supporting materials sent prior to the meeting.

- Staff engaged stakeholders through the *Research and Policy Advisory Board* (RPB) to determine what they wanted to see in a revised agenda. RPB also reviewed research agendas from other states.
- Staff then held a series of meetings to figure out the best way to incorporate the feedback into a new research agenda.
- Staff provided regular updates and items for review to the RPB.
- A decision was made to pause the work briefly after the election and during the transition between administrations since a number of new stakeholders would be coming to the table and staff wanted to make sure all of them would have an opportunity to shape the new Research Agenda.
- Finally, over the last few months, staff presented the proposed Research Agenda and supporting materials to RPB for comment and input. The resulting materials were provided to the Board in advance of the meeting.

Dr. Kellogg noted that what is being presented today is more than just a Research Agenda. When staff first began looking at the feedback from stakeholders, it became apparent that just revising the Research Agenda was not sufficient - there was also a need to review policies and procedures surrounding how the Center decides what to work on, who to work with, and how stakeholders are informed. The approach led to a big shift in the Research Agenda. Instead of the old format, which was essentially 20 questions that created a "to do list," the new Research Agenda has categories of inquiry and a focus on access and equity.

Next, turning to the Research Agenda, Dr. Kellogg noted that it includes a series of inquiry categories to guide our work going forward. The categories are flexible and allow the Center to absorb new data and address changes in policy. The old agenda was not responsive to these types of changes. The new agenda is shaped around: (1) Pathways and Pipelines; (2) Educational Service and Workforce Outcomes; (3) Program and Policy Evaluation; and (4) Methodological Inquiries. This new format allows the Center to have a flexible agenda that can speak to whatever the State's current policy priorities are. It can also work with any data that are added into the system. Dr. Shapiro noted that the categories are fantastic and that they bucket content in ways that are very relevant to the work of the Center.

In addition to developing the broad categories of inquiry, a lot of time was spent considering how the work of the Center should address issues of access or equity. In the end, three broad themes were developed that must be included in all work done with MLDS data:

1. Supports and Barriers - considering the structural and administrative factors that impact progress;
2. Social Determinants - considering the environmental conditions in place that impact a wide range of outcomes; and
3. Equity and Inclusion - considering access and opportunities available to historically under-represented individuals.

The Center is firmly committed to embedding these themes into all projects that use MLDS data. Finally, Dr. Kellogg noted that the Research Agenda provides a series of definitions of each category and examples of questions and topics relevant to each category.

Next, Molly Abend provided an overview of the requirement in the Agenda for cross-sector research. The rationale behind the requirement is to ensure that the MLDS Center is conducting work that a data sharing partner cannot do with their own data linkages. Ms. Abend referenced a slide that lists the names of the sectors. All research and reporting projects must include data from at least two of the sectors. As the Center has added more data from agency partners, new sectors have been added. Generally, cross-sector data is cross-agency data - for example linking data from MSDE to MHEC. In some cases, one agency provides data that falls into more than one sector - for example Labor provides UI wage data (workforce sector) and apprenticeship data (adult education). Those are two separate sectors and it would be permissible for the Center to research or report on wages earned following completion of an apprenticeship program (even though it is only one agency's data).

In response to a question from Ms. Blake, Ms. Abend clarified that data on school personnel (i.e. teachers and guidance counselors) would fall under the workforce sector even though the data are provided by MSDE.

Dr. Shapiro commented that the addition of all of the new data and sectors represent an incredible evolution of the scope of the MLDS and further emphasizes that this is the perfect time to update the Research Agenda and these policies.

Board Action: Dr. Shapiro made a motion to approve the Research Agenda, which was seconded by Mr. Power. The motion was unanimously approved.

Next, Mr. Goldstein presented the *Project Approval and Management Procedures*, which are intended to replace the *Procedures for External Researcher and Grant Funded Projects*. The old procedures were implemented as a way to provide a consistent process for oversight and review of projects that were not being directly done by the Center. Specifically projects that were being funded by a grant or being brought in by a researcher not affiliated with the Center's Research Branch (or both). The old procedures generally addressed: (1) the requirement to work on a project that conforms to the research agenda and that provides value to the State; (2) lays out the application process including the content of the research proposal; (3) the requirement to identify the data needed for the research; (4) the requirement to provide a Product to the Center - i.e. a report or presentation of research findings; (5) the review process; and

administrative requirements including the signing of a Restricted Use Data Agreement, reimbursement of costs, Institutional Review Board approval, and steps to manage the project.

The new proposed procedures are generally consistent with the old procedures. Mr. Goldstein highlighted the differences. First, the new procedures apply to all projects that seek to use MLDS data. In comparison, the old procedures only applied to research projects proposed by an external researcher or a project that was being funded through a grant. This change was made in recognition of the fact that the application and review process ensures a consistent approach to projects that is transparent and accountable to stakeholders. Currently, projects that are not subject to the procedures are generally still reviewed by the Center's internal review group and most are presented to RPB. Accordingly, this change will provide more structure and formality to the project review process, but will not result in an unreasonable burden for the Center or RPB. Because of the broad applicability of these procedures, a new section (see 1.4) was added to the new procedures to clarify that the procedures do not apply to data requests.

Second, the new procedures do not limit who can apply. The procedures in place now only permitted an application to be submitted by staff or faculty from a Maryland qualifying institution (an institution that provides unit record data to the Maryland Higher Education Commission). A researcher who is not from a Maryland qualifying institution could only submit an application if the researcher partnered with staff or faculty from a qualifying institution. The new procedures remove this limitation. However, the new procedures do require additional consideration be given to a researcher who is not from a Maryland college or university or who is from a private research company, including a determination that the researchers are familiar with Maryland, are conducting a project that meets a specific Maryland research need, and consideration of any letters of reference or endorsement from a Maryland researcher or MLDS stakeholder. Accordingly, not being from a Maryland qualifying institution will still be a factor to be considered, but it will not disqualify a researcher from applying and will not require the researcher to secure a sponsor from a qualifying institution. Mr. Goldstein noted that due to the scope of the MLDS, there is a lot of interest from researchers outside the state. Those researchers can provide important insights to the state, so this proposal is designed to remove barriers that might discourage quality researchers from using the system. In response to a question from Mr. Power, Mr. Goldstein noted that there has been an increased demand in external research, but that staff can manage the demand. Further, the procedures specifically authorize staff to simply defer an external proposal to a later date if demand is too high.

Third, while the application process remains substantially the same, the new procedures remove the provisions that detail the exact application requirements. Instead, a link to the application is provided in the procedures. This change was made to allow changes to the application as needed without amending the procedures.

Fourth, the review process in the old procedures had an Expedited Review Process and a Full Review Process and a set of criteria for determining which review type should be used based on research topic categories and who is making the request. In comparison, the new version establishes a general process whereby the Executive Director makes the determination to approve or reject a project after review and advice from the Center's internal review group and the RPB. The exception to the general rule is that

Governing Board approval is required in the following instances: (1) a unique or novel topic or research method; (2) a topic that is sensitive or plans to analyze and report data in a way that may be contrary to the manner in which stakeholders generally report and analyze such data; or (3) concerns or objections are raised by members of the RPB. This change was made to make the review process more straightforward and provide a little more flexibility. Ultimately the new procedures may result in more oversight by the Governing Board since any project (regardless of how it is classified) that RPB raises concerns about will go to the Governing Board.

Fifth, the project review timeline is essentially the same as the old procedures. The process begins with the Center's internal review group. The new procedures state that a project application submitted at least two weeks prior to the internal review group meeting will be considered at the next meeting. However, the Center may require a delay in the event that additional work or clarifications are required before the application is reviewed.

Finally, the review considerations in the new procedures are essentially the same as the old version. The primary review considerations include: the subject matter of the proposal; the proposed Center product; the intended data use; the qualifications of the project team; and additional considerations, which include the fact that a researcher is not from a Maryland qualifying institution and the funding source for the project.

Mr. Goldstein noted that these procedures were presented to RPB at the May and June meetings and their input and suggestions have been incorporated. In response to a question from Dr. Shapiro, Mr. Goldstein stated that the procedures do not create a distinction between a researcher from a for-profit research entity versus an academic or not-for-profit researcher. Mr. Goldstein noted that the only for-profit entities that have applied to use MLDS data have been working for a state entity (e.g. AIR conducting research for MSDE). The review process requires the project to be of value to the state and address a state policy question. The process also requires a review of the applicant's credentials and funding source. Accordingly, there are opportunities to weed out a proposal that does not conform to an important research and reporting purpose.

Board Action: Dr. Shapiro made a motion to approve the Project Approval and Management Procedures, which was seconded by Dr. Sterett. The motion passed unanimously.

Annual Research and Reporting Output Priorities

Mr. Goldstein began by noting that the new Research Agenda references different procedures and processes that will be followed for making determinations about what research and reporting topics are going to be done during the year. To that end, staff created the *Process for Establishing Annual Research and Reporting Priorities*. While not previously documented, the Center has been following this process for the past few years to establish its annual priorities. So this in essence, simply codifies our current practice. The process lays out a development schedule that includes; internal review; RPB review; and culminates with a final review and input by the Governing Board at the June Governing Board meeting. The process also provides steps for evaluating priorities which include: (1) considering the interests of state policymakers; (2) a review of the Data Gap Analysis; (3) an analysis of the relationship of a topic to the Research Agenda; and (4) a review of staff resources to accomplish the priorities. In addition,

considerations for determining the ongoing relevance of topics and whether they should be removed are also provided.

The process also addresses how the priority topics are operationalized into a research plan or reporting project. Finally, the appendices include a list of potential research and reporting topics and past and current annual research and reporting priorities.

Reporting Priorities

Dr. Kellogg began with highlights of the reporting accomplishments over the past year, which included the following work.

1. A complete overhaul and expansion of the high school to college dashboard series, which includes over 70 dashboards. Dr. Kellogg noted that those dashboards were used in the Higher Education Overview, which was produced by the Department of Legislative Services for the House and Senate budget committees.
2. The first report on students' experiencing out of home placement and their participation in post-secondary education.
3. Engagement with the *Commission to Study the Health Care Workforce Crisis*, including participating in their work groups and fulfilling data requests that are helping to inform the workgroups. Specifically a report on the activities related to lower division degrees (Associate degrees and Certificates) in health care related majors from Maryland's community colleges and the labor market engagement in the healthcare sector three months, six months, three years, five years, and 10 years after completion.

Next, Dr. Kellogg began her presentation of the reporting priorities for the upcoming year, noting that the workload continues to increase. These reporting priorities were developed in consultation with stakeholders represented on the RPB. A lot of the work is categorized as required annual reporting, which is a result of the work the Center has done to engage with stakeholders to show the value of the MLDS data and how it can support annual reports. Some of the reports in this section are statutorily required; such as the Career Preparation Expansion Act report and the Out of Home Placement report. The legislature also added new reporting requirements on foster care and homeless youth and their postsecondary outcomes.

In response to Dr. Shapiro's inquiry on the need for additional staff support to respond to the increased reporting requirements, Mr. Goldstein stated that the MLDS Center received three new positions in the FY 24 budget and one of those positions will be a full-time employee to work under Dr. Kellogg to meet the Center's reporting requirements.

Mr. Reznik asked whether the reporting on foster care and homeless youth is only postsecondary enrollment or does it include other career ready outcomes, such as training programs and apprenticeship programs. Dr. Kellogg responded that the reporting requirements established by the General Assembly only focused on college enrollment. However, the Center is certainly happy to take on any other types of definitions that are beneficial.

Dr. Kellogg noted that many of the reporting priorities have been established so that they can be easily updated and completed. Dr. Kellogg also highlighted work with the new Higher Education Corrections

Advisory Committee. That committee will be looking at some of the new post-secondary programs that will be offered “behind the fence.” The Center will help them look at workforce outcomes as a result of those programs.

Dr. Kellogg noted that last year, the Center was not able to complete a report on justice involved youth. This Center will prioritize working with DJS to develop reporting on that topic. Meetings are planned to work out the details of the reporting.

As a result of input from stakeholders, the Center also plans to update prior reporting on Brain Gain and Working While in College. The original Brain Gain analysis did not include independent institutions because they did not provide unit record data on out-of-state students until 2014. However, an updated version of the report will include those institutions. The other area that the Center plans to tackle this year is an analysis on the pathways of high school students who don't go to college. The Center now has the data to look at these other pathways such as apprenticeship data and adult education. In the last couple years, MHEC has expanded their non-credit data to include students who are completing workforce sequences through the community colleges. Accordingly, this is the right time to start looking at the pathways of high school graduates who do not go on to college to pursue a conventional degree.

Mr. Perkins-Cohen noted the value that this data has to users, like the Department of Labor. It allows them to understand accomplishments and areas where more attention and work is needed to ensure equitable outcomes. One example is the data showing the low wages of high school graduates who do not go to college. This led to the Grads2Careers program, which engages young people before they exit high school to ensure they have better career opportunities. Mr. Goldstein responded that one of the external research projects that was approved by the Governing Board will be evaluating the Grads2Careers program outcomes. Mr. Dykstra pointed out that the reporting work is very consistent with the Blueprint, which focuses on pathways and opportunities for kids at a younger age.

Research Priorities

Dr. Henneberger began by providing an overview of the Research Branch. The Center has an interagency agreement with the University of Maryland, Baltimore (UMB), School of Social Work to serve as the Research Branch. In turn, UMB has a subcontract with the University of Maryland, College Park (UMCP), College of Education and a number of other departments within UMCP. There are also subcontracts with University of Maryland, Baltimore County, School of Public Policy and Morgan State University. These arrangements result in a diverse and robust set of expertise.

Next, Dr. Henneberger reviewed the 2022-2023 priorities. The first priority was to provide in-depth statistical analyses to inform policy and to support causal inferences where appropriate. The Research Branch continues to make progress on the approved research projects. The researchers have also been working to create more meaningful formats for dissemination of the research. They used to provide in-depth technical research reports, which were not a great way to disseminate findings. Instead, they have turned to more targeted presentations to stakeholders. For example, the researchers provided a number of presentations to MSDE on topics of interest to them. The Research Branch also worked directly with MHEC to develop topics of interest to them. In addition, research by Dr. David Blazar at UMCP was used for a Maryland State Board meeting.

The Research Branch also held seven Research Series presentations to disseminate works in progress and get feedback from stakeholders, including stakeholders at the university and state and local policymakers. The Research Branch also presented at national conferences including the Association for Education, Finance and Policy; the American Educational Research Association, two criminology and criminal justice conferences; and the Society for Prevention Research. In addition, Dr. Henneberger reported that she was invited to present at the National Science Foundation Grantee Conference in Washington, D.C. She was joined by Dr. Laura Stapleton, at the University of Maryland College Park. The Research Branch also recently had a manuscript published in the Journal Prevention Science, which is a top tier journal. The researchers have had a number of other publications, but this is the highest ranked journal to date.

Next, Dr. Henneberger discussed progress in the next priority - methodological documentation. She highlighted the work on data science and machine learning being conducted by Dr. Tracy Sweet, at the University of Maryland, College Park. Dr. Sweet focuses on the application of data science methods with specific focus on equity. She worked with stakeholders from MSDE and MHEC to determine substantive research questions: credit accrual during college; and missing test scores, with specific relevance to missing data during COVID-19. Dr. Sweet presented her initial findings while her work continues. Methodological work also continues on multi-level modeling and multiple membership modeling.

The third priority is to create partnerships with other researchers. Dr. Henneberger highlighted the continued work to strengthen the partnership with Morgan State University. Two faculty members at Morgan have been working with the Research Branch to develop a research proposal on the differences in school experiences and outcomes within the black student population in Maryland. In addition, Dr. Frim Ampaw has joined the Research Branch. Dr. Ampaw is the Chair and Professor of Higher Education in Advanced Studies, Leadership, and Policy Department in the School of Education and Urban Studies at Morgan State. She's a great addition to the team.

Finally, Dr. Henneberger reviewed work on Priority Four - seeking external funding, which included: (1) submitting a proposal for a State Longitudinal Data System, State Policy Making Request for Applications. This was a million dollar partnership between the Center, MHEC, UMBC, and UMB to examine computer science teacher shortage solutions in Maryland. This grant proposal missed the cutoff by a very slim margin. There's a new call for proposals and the team plans to resubmit. Dr. Henneberger also recognized Dr. Emily Dow's contributions to the grant application and development of relevant policy topics; and (2) completed ongoing research on IES and AERA funded grants, including work on topics involving career and technical education and the positive behavioral interventions and supports program.

In response to a question from Dr. Shapiro, Dr. Henneberger explained that grant development varies: in some cases researchers come with specific topics and grants that they're interested in pursuing; and other grants are initiated by the MLDS Center. The IES State Policy Making grant specifically required researchers to work with a state policy making entity. In response to a question from Dr. Keys on how institutions join with the Research Branch on different projects, Dr. Henneberger stated that at times it was a result of a researcher bringing a topic in and other times Dr. Henneberger knows of a topic and puts together the team among agency and university partners. Mr. Goldstein noted that Dr. Henneberger has done a really good job of making sure that the research community in Maryland knows her and the MLDS

Center. Dr. Shapiro concurred noting that Dr. Henneberger has supported USM on a lot of really important projects.

Next, Dr. Henneberger turned to Research Priorities for 2024. Dr. Henneberger noted that she removed the priorities related to partnerships and external funding; not because they are not priorities but because, based on the new policies and procedures for setting priorities, the priorities should be about research topics rather than partnerships and grant funding.

One addition to the Research Priorities is the focus on workforce outcomes for DJS students. This came out of conversations with the Department of Juvenile Services. The Research Branch has done some work this past year on the high school and college outcomes of DJs involved youth. The next step is to focus on workforce outcomes for DJs involved youth. Dr. Henneberger also noted the addition of social work as a critical workforce area, not because the Research Branch is in the School of Social Work, but because it was actually suggested by someone outside of the School of Social Work. In line with data additions from this past year, research priorities related to DHS involved students and overlap between DHS and DJs involved students and outcomes were added as priorities.

Under methodological research and documentation, Dr. Henneberger noted that since progress was made on the data science priority last year, the focus has changed to concentrate on equity in data science approaches. In addition, a focus on census data was added to follow some of the great work at MSDE related to census data. The final methodological priority is to study the use of intersectionality in personal characteristics for predicting outcomes. To date the research has focused on one characteristic at a time. Here, the interest is the intersectionality of characteristics as a predictor.

Dr. Rai noted the importance of focusing on the education sector and teacher preparation and asked to see work on teacher preparation especially in the STEM area and whether we are producing enough teachers to meet the job demands. The same is true for the health care sector.

Data Inventory

Ms. Abend began by noting that one of the requirements of the Governing Board is to create a data inventory for all data in the MLDS. At this meeting, there is only one data element to propose for addition to the Data Inventory. The data element relates to the correctional education data collection. The Department of Labor informed the Center that there is an additional data element for their data collection called the Inmate ID Number. This element will be in addition to the Student ID, which is provided by Labor and already in the Data Inventory. Having both of these IDs will help the Center more accurately conduct identity resolution and will help with the data linking process. Ms. Abend also noted that neither of the ID numbers would be used for any purpose other than data matching and identity resolution.

Board Action - Dr. Keys made a motion to approve the new data element for inclusion in the Data Inventory, which was seconded by Dr. Shapiro. The motion was unanimously approved.

Data Calendar

Ms. Abend stated that the Board is also required to approve the Data Collection Calendar. The 2023-2024 Data Collection Calendar is discussed with the Data Governance Advisory Board which includes a representative of each data sharing agency. There are a few changes to this year's calendar. For MSDE,

the census geolocation data collection was removed because that information is now going to be collected in the September attendance file, which is already listed in our calendar. Another change is that the child welfare, out-of-home placement data that we receive from DHS is no longer listed as “under development” and is now listed in its own row in the calendar. The calendar also includes two new additions for the Department of Labor: Correctional education data; and Title 1 and Title 3 data (which are both listed as under development.)

In response to a question from Mr. Lenzondzo, Ms. Abend explained the inmate ID is specific to that collection that the Center is receiving from the Department of Labor. The Center uses that ID to link across multiple files. So, every annual file received from Labor, the Center can make sure that it is linking the correct information for that specific identity. However, for linking across agencies, the Center will have to rely on common identity elements to create a link.

Board Action - Ms. Laurie Kendall-Ellis made a motion to approve the 2023-2024 Data Collection Calendar, which was seconded by Mr. Power. The motion was unanimously approved.

Legislation

Mr. Goldstein provided a final update on 2023 legislation that the Center was tracking.

1. SB 127 - *Maryland Longitudinal Data System Center - Student FAFSA Data - Reporting Requirement* - passed. This bill eliminates the requirement for the county boards of education to report FAFSA completions to the MLDS Center. Instead, the bill requires MLDS to report the information to the General Assembly using student FAFSA completion data provided by MHEC from the federal Student Aid Gateway and collected by the Office of Student Financial Aid.
2. HB 320 - *MLDS - Definition of Student Data - Alteration* - passed. Amends student data to include student disability data by specific disability category.
3. SB 131/HB 124 - *Mandated Reports - Revisions* - This bill is the result of a Department of Legislative Services review of all mandated reports. For the Center the bill repeals the requirement for the Annual Dual Enrollment Report, noting that the content in the dashboards is sufficient. The bill also changes and adds to the Center’s annual reporting requirement on higher education participation by youth who experienced out-of-home placement. The new report expands the population of interest to include Foster Care Youth instead of youth that experienced out-of-home placement and Homeless Youth. The annual report must include the following information: (a) a disaggregation by county, age, race, and ethnicity; (b) the rate of enrollment in institutions of higher education; (c) Type of institution; (d) type of financial support provided to foster care recipients and homeless youth, including the number that received a tuition exemption during the previous academic year and the number that received a tuition exemption at any point during their enrollment in college but not in the previous academic year; and (e) graduation rate.
4. HB 888 - *Education - Pre-Kindergarten Alternative Teacher Preparation Program - Authorization* - failed. This bill added to a mandatory annual reporting requirement established by the Blueprint for Maryland’s Future.
5. SB 938 - *Primary and Secondary Education - School Safety and Student Well-Being - Examination of Policies* - failed. This bill required MSDE to provide an analysis of the effect State and local policies in place from 2018 through 2023 had on school safety and student well-being. MSDE was directed to complete the report in consultation with the Center.

External Research

Dr. Henneberger noted that there were no projects requiring Board approval, but that there are three projects for which she will provide an update to the Board.

1. *Using Maryland's SLDS To Strengthen And Diversify The Teacher Workforce Through High School To Career Pathways* - This IES grant was discussed earlier in the meeting. The team narrowly missed an award and plans to resubmit.
2. *SLDS Data and Interoperability Grant* - this IES grant requires MSDE to be the prime applicant. Mr. Goldstein and Ms. Abend have been working to coordinate with MSDE to get the MLDS Center to have a role in that grant.
3. *Access, Impact, and the Computer Science Teacher Pipeline: A Systematic Study on the Expansion of Computer Science Courses in Maryland's High Schools* - Dr. Jing Liu, Research Branch Member and Assistant Professor at UMCP, proposed a project examining the access and impact of computer science coursework and the computer science teacher pipeline. The project is a systematic study supporting causal inference on the expansion of computer science courses, in Maryland, high schools. That grant submission will move forward with the National Science Foundation This summer. The was favorably reviewed by the Research and Policy Advisory Board.

Budget for FY 24

Mr. Goldstein began by noting that this year, the Center's general fund operating budget is \$2.86 million, an increase of \$320,000 from last year. The change is due to an overall increase in salaries and the addition of three new positions. The new positions were received as a result of an over-the-target request that was submitted and approved this year. The new positions are for a senior database administrator, a data analyst, and a research statistician. The database administrator and the data analyst are both positions that MLDS Center currently has through a contract. Accordingly there is a decrease (\$337,000) in the funding for contracts (Object 08).

As in past years, the majority (79%) of the Center's funds are used for staff salaries. The remaining funds are for the Research Branch (13%), IT consulting (3%), support for IT systems (4%) and office needs (less than 1%). The Center's annual budget continues to increase year-over-year, while at the same time, the amount available for contracts continues to decrease. Even with the decrease, the Center is able to increase the Research Branch Budget by \$34,000, for a total allocation of \$380,000.

In addition to the General Funds, the Center has two additional funding sources: federal funds from the Workforce Data Quality Initiative Grant (WDQI); and special funds resulting from reimbursement of costs received from external researchers. The additional funds from the WDQI grant will primarily be spent on IT consulting services to provide additional resources to manage, document, and load the new data being received as a result of the project. A small portion of the funds will be provided to the Research Branch to provide expertise and support to a team of researchers from BEACON at Salisbury University who are going to conduct an in-depth evaluation and analysis of the outcomes of the workforce development programs. The Special Funds will also be used to further enhance the research budget. The Research Branch includes funding for subcontracts with the University of Maryland, College of Education and Morgan State University. Finally, in addition to the normal software expenditures, the Center plans to allocate \$75,000 for Informatica Software and training. Informatica is a data integration tool that will help standardize and streamline the data integration and management processes.

Board Action: Mr. Dykstra made a motion to approve the FY 24 budget plan, which was seconded by Mr. Power. The motion was unanimously approved.

Old Business

Dr. Shapiro asked about AIR’s College and Career Readiness report. She was hoping there would be an update at this meeting and asked whether there could be an update at the next meeting. Dr. Shapiro noted that the predictor AIR is considering is based on success in the first semester and asked whether the study could be extended beyond the first semester.

Dr. Lawson responded that MSDE could not commit to any presentation by AIR on its analysis. There were extensive conversations when the research was approved, which emphasized that this is an independent research project by AIR. Certainly, as with all research, when the study is final, then it will be shared with everyone. Dr. Lawson also stated that it was not feasible to have AIR come and report to the Board because of the need to ensure that this is an independent analysis without any outside influences. Similarly, extending the study is not possible because it would exceed the parameters set at the beginning of the study.

New Business

There was no new business.

Closing

Dr. Keys made a motion to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Dr. Rai. The motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,
Ross Goldstein
Executive Director

Approved: *pending*