

Minutes of SLDS DMC meeting

Thursday, Feb. 6, 2014

Meeting commenced about 8:15 a.m.

Introductions

Attendees: Andy Mehl, Carson Howell, Salvador Vazquez, Archie George, Ken Campbell, Todd King, Doug Armstrong, Georgeanne Griffith, Tami haft, Heather Luchte, Karen Singletary, Vince Miller (via phone), Joyce Popp (via phone).

Officer elections:

Chair – Linda Clark agreed to continue

Vice-Chair – Heather Luchte elected to replace

Secretary – Vince Miller elected to replace Archie George

Instructor EDUID for postsecondary dual credit courses:

The ISEE system must have an instructor EDUID, which has been a problem because many postsecondary faculty/instructors teaching dual credit courses have not been assigned one. Andy suggested a long term solution would be to have a list on the SLDS system of all faculty/instructors who teach any courses with dual-enrolled students. Andy and Todd will design a process, specify data files and data elements for entering and matching the courses, instructors, students, and, after input from the institutions, communicate these to the appropriate entities throughout the state. Andy will send a request to all postsecondary institutions' presidents notifying them of this requirement so that the mandate will come from the top down at the institutions.

Other issues with dual credit offering and course taking patterns were discussed, mostly involving EDUID instructor assignments, such as whether the postsecondary supervising faculty/instructor needs to be assigned an EDUID, and a potential need for both the high school course identification and the matching postsecondary course identification.

Andy discussed the need for publishing the SLDS Data Dictionary online, modeling this system after the Colorado system. The online data dictionary may soon be required if a bill dealing with student privacy rights, which is working its way through the Idaho legislature, becomes law. (Later in the meeting Andy shared the initial draft of the legislation, see below.)

Andy walked the group through the Research Request Portal Project. We reviewed the Project Service order, including project scope and current status, which is soon to be released for bids. This is a major project, Andy estimates 4500 hours of work. The workflow for this project includes aspects of the pending Idaho legislation. Andy specifically pointed out to the group that any reports and/or publications that result from SLDS data need to be provided to the SLDS project for inclusion in a comprehensive set of reports using SLDS data.

We had a brief discussion of the Financial Aid data being requested. The list of data elements has been refined and contracted, while the definitions and selection categories for financial aid types were expanded and refined. Andy mentioned that the state funded Opportunity Scholarships are being

consolidated, with most types going into one type. Substantial additional funding has been provided by the legislature. Hopefully, all of the new funds will be given out. Individual students have to apply through the SBOE web site, <http://www.boardofed.idaho.gov/scholarship/opportunity.asp>. Committee members were encouraged to contact financial aid offices to let them know that more funding is available and they should encourage students to apply.

Andy led a discussion of the SLDS Institutional Review Board. As Andy and the DMC committee have been unable to find an IRB at a postsecondary institution willing to also take on the same role for the SLDS research requests, Andy drafted a simple policy that says it is an institutional responsibility to approve research requests that involve data from that institution. The committee read through the draft policy Andy had prepared for the DMC committee to approve. Some minor changes were suggested, but postsecondary committee members generally agreed this was a good first draft. Archie suggested we should ask institutional IRBs to review the document as well, which Andy agreed was a good idea. He will distribute the draft to the institutions for further review. One unanswered question was what the process would be for institutions that do not have a standing IRB.

The committee reviewed the draft online Data Request Form, including discussion of the processes that would be contingent on the information provided, and who would be notified when research requests come in and how they would approve these. Archie mentioned that he is on the Board of Directors for the Palouse Land Trust, and they are discussing the approval process policy for that group. Specifically, whether and which decisions requiring board approval can be voted on by email and/or telephone, as well as the definition of a quorum for and records that must be kept regarding decisions that are not made during in-person meetings. Archie will monitor these conversations and send Andy any materials that might be relevant to SLDS / DMC research request approvals.

The summer SLDS / DMC meeting was tentatively scheduled for July 28-29, at North Idaho College in beautiful Coeur d'Alene, with a start time of 10 .a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Monday and 9 a.m. to noon on Tuesday.

As material for the afternoon meeting, Andy sent all DMC members the bill just introduced in the Idaho Legislature, entitled "Student Data Accessibility, Transparency and Accountability Act of 2014." This bill goes beyond what OSBE staff working on the SLDS would have preferred, such as including the EDUID among other items as a "personally identifiable data" that may not be released publicly. Also, there are concerns that some existing relationships and contracts, such as with the College Board (SAT), ACT, the National Student Clearinghouse, may be called into question because they provide very specific, personally identifiable data to K-12 and postsecondary institutions for recruitment and research. We discussed a section (see page 6, line 31) requiring that a "model policy for school districts and public charter schools that will govern data collection, access, security and use of such data" be developed by SBOE and posted and implemented by every public and private school. Linda agreed to contact the bill's sponsor, Senator John W. Goedde, and express the committee's concerns about this requirement.

The committee discussed challenges with data quality regarding high school graduation information for specific students and schools. Data obtained from various sources often have substantial variation in numbers of students graduating each year from specific schools. Postsecondary institutional data is often not complete nor accurate in this area, as well.

Dual credit reporting was discussed next, including when to tally students during a year or semester, whether the postsecondary institutions are able to reliably identify students, courses or both as “dual credit,” whether high school students taking college courses pay regular course fees if they are not dual enrolled.

Andy led a brief discussion of future plans for (developing plans for) compiling high school transcripts from the School Net or other data sources, and data sources are the critical component of such a system.

Andy would like to explore the use of the EDUID “engine” in the ongoing multi-state effort to track high school students in several western states as they move into postsecondary education across these states. We should be hearing more about this in the future.

Andy would like to reinvigorate the High School Feedback reports and mentioned to the group that this would be a priority in the coming months.

Under “Other items as time permits” agenda item, Carson suggested we choose a few data quality initiatives, such as quantifying and resolving duplicate and missing EDUIDs and resolving issues that cause inconsistencies between dual credit reports coming from secondary and postsecondary institutions. The committee agreed that identifying and resolving problems with this alignment should be a priority. Linda suggested a valuable and feasible research project, as an example, would be to quantify assertions, using data now available, that “every dual credit completed while in high school increases the student’s chances of enrolling in postsecondary.” Secondary and postsecondary representatives agreed that lists of students who are showing dual credit enrollments on one side and not the other will be essential for identifying discrepancies. Andy and Carson agreed that this should be an initiative over the next few months.

Linda also mentioned that it would be extremely difficult to meet the SBOE “60% goal” if we depend, as a state, on the four-year institutions. Meeting the 60% goal will depend largely on increasing the proportion of the target population who have postsecondary certificates and associates degrees. Andy mentioned that studies are underway to survey Idaho residents and their postsecondary achievements, especially as certificates are not tracked in census data collection and reporting. School superintendent efforts, according to Linda, have been concentrated almost exclusively on getting students to enroll in four-year postsecondary institutions and programs.

The meeting adjourned about 2:30 p.m.