

Data Management Council
Meeting Minutes – Tuesday Feb. 27, 2013
submitted by Archie George, DMC Secretary

Introductions of attendees: Doug Armstrong-OSBE, Ann Lewis-NIC, Archie George-UI, Georgeann Griffith-Lakeland SD, Joyce Popp-SDE, Linda Clark-Meridian-SD, Scott Grothe-OSBE, Tami Haft-NIC, Vera McCrink-PTE, Jackie Throngard-OSBE, Todd King-SDE, Andy Mehl-OSBE, Vince Miller-ISU. Joining later were Selena Grace and Jennifer Peterson from SBOE. Absent were Jeanie Meholchick-IDOL and Devan Delashmut-SDE.

Discussed Agenda, Andy pointed out addition of “Idaho Education Data Usage Agreement” that will “pop up” whenever anyone accessing the Data Request web site.

Discussed the fact that there is no penalty, per se, for violating the terms of the use agreement. Some discussion ensued regarding responsibility for responding to or paying for liability in the event of a data breach. Andy indicated that the SBOE received a legal opinion more than a year ago indicating liability couldn't be transferred solely to the SBOE. Several committee members felt that this was an important consideration and should be addressed in the Data Security and Access policy and procedures. Andy offered to follow up with this.

Reviewed SLDS project plan. Andy has suggested to the SBOE that a “full-blown” data warehouse is not necessary to accomplish the objectives, but rather a set of “materialized views” of the data submitted by the various constituencies. The SBOE wanted assurance that the DMC review and approve this approach.

Regarding reporting priorities, these are (1) to build the P-20 SLDS and (2) to create certain reports to comply with ARRA requirements. These reporting requirements are specified on page 9 in Phase 2 of the “Overview of Current Status of P-20W Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS).”

Andy reported that the first five tables required for these reports have been collected from the higher education institutions. Andy indicated a request for data in the additional tables would be sent out to the institutions soon.

Discussed the Performance Based Funding initiatives and which data would be included and whether all these data are currently included in the SLDS, except for other reports, such as the Cost of College reports.

Andy led a discussion of the phases in the plan, pages 8 through 10 in the “Overview” document. In this context the committee discussed what the DMC's responsibility is, for this meeting and subsequently, regarding approval of the plan contained in the document and how modifications and potential delays would be handled. One suggestion, for example, was that the “materialized views” and associated reports associated with the data sets already collected should be developed sooner than

collecting additional data. This would demonstrate the viability of this reporting strategy. Some committee members suggested having more data on hand would lead to an increase in the demands for ad-hoc reports, thus possibly slowing down progress on the broader goals.

Discussed the research request proposal policy, which is another major decision that needs to be made regarding the SLDS and approved by SBOE. Andy indicated Virginia has spent over \$9 million on their report request process and data provision system. Andy has received an initial quote from the Virginia system for their assistance in implementing a similar system for Idaho, which was about \$1.2 million, while the grant funding specified \$250 thousand. So we have a funding gap. However, the Virginia system is more fully automated than we anticipate the Idaho system being and, due to state law, the Virginia system is not allowed to store individual student IDs while Idaho is allowed to store the EDUIDs. These factors should make it somewhat less expensive to implement a similar system in Idaho.

The committee discussed handling of data requests currently, the length of responding to data requests and factors contributing to major delays. Andy continued with discussion of approval processes and retention of approved researchers, their requests and the sql-code created, for archival and repeat purposes. Tracking systems in use at the school districts, college and universities were discussed, with suggestions for systems, such as SharePoint, that might be considered for request tracking. Additional discussions about data access and report writing procedures at the institutions and SDE provided context for the DMC and Andy deciding which way to go with the SLDS. The focus of these discussions was to determine which decisions need to be made and how soon in order for the SLDS project to meet the goals specified, including, most particularly at this point the reporting requirements.

Selena Grace and Jennifer Peterson joined the group in the afternoon, at the point where the committee moved to the discussion of the data tables requested so far, which fields have been populated and what remains to be done in this area. These are the advanced credit (e.g. courses challenged through AP), financial aid tables, and the instructor assignment table. One existing process that these additional tables would alleviate is the state scholarship data, which now requires sharing lists of students to all the institutions since centralized data is not currently available.

In the context of whether to prioritize enhancing the comprehensiveness and quality of the already collected five tables versus sending out requests for the additional five tables, and the "limited resources" issues for reporting causing the institutions to request clear priorities, Selena pointed out (1) the DMC is a policy making group which should avoid getting too bogged down with discussions of individual data elements and (2) the institutions received invitations to request funding to hire additional staff and purchase software or technology. Have those funds been effectively utilized? What

recommendations should the DMC make to the SBOE to elevate the prioritization of these data submissions and associated data quality?

Discussed the additional tables to be requested, the importance of complete and accurate data and the most critical data elements in each.

Discussed procedures for obtaining EDUIDs for all postsecondary instructors' who teach dual credit courses. Current procedures are too complex and duplicative, sometimes requiring the postsecondary institution obtain the instructors' EDUIDs and then send them to the districts for data checking and data entry. Issues with the classification of secondary teachers into "highly qualified," which does not apply to postsecondary faculty, for example, were discussed. Solutions seemed to be possible for most issues, such as specific crosswalks between the secondary and the postsecondary courses using the unique course identifiers at each institution. A "Postsecondary Dual Credit Instructor" workgroup defined as Joyce Popp (chair), Tami Haft, Archie George, Vera McCrink, Jackie Throngard, Georgeann Griffith, Dana Kelly and Cindy Sisson (Meridian SD) was specified to come up with proposals for defining the issues and proposing solutions.

Discussed learning opportunities associated with the WICHE high school to postsecondary student tracking pilot study. Scott Grothe volunteered to come up with a draft proposal to be submitted to the DMC and ultimately to the SBOE. As this was a pilot study it is not permissible to conduct "research" on the data, i.e. publication of findings is essentially prohibited, but findings regarding how well the matching went, the effectiveness of involvement of the National Student Clearinghouse, for example.

Discussed the Labor data elements, including supplementing the current plan, which is for Labor to use the same name-birthdate->EDUID and then matching on EDUID, with the possibility of embedding the EDUID in Labor data tables for subsequent matching. **<don't think I've got the whole picture here, Andy, please correct/supplement>.**

The DMC committee members reviewed the (long) list of data elements in the Labor databases, attempting to gain a better understanding of these for potential reporting. Many of the data elements, e.g. data on taxes, are inspirational and not expected to materialize, at least in the short term.

Vera McCrink with head up an ad-hoc group to automate PTE reports, focusing on those that might be produced directly from the SLDS.

Scott suggested that, as we define the schedule for SLDS data priorities and data loads, we put our recommendations, including the impact of the workload required for compliance, into a specific recommendation either to the Presidents' council, the SBOE or CAAP. This would be in order to educate them as the project's importance, benefits and resource requirements. This is essential in order for OSBE staff to be confident that reporting requirements and deadlines can be met.

Data Management Council
Meeting Minutes – Tuesday Feb. 28, 2013
submitted by Archie George, DMC Secretary

Attendees: Doug Armstrong-OSBE, Ann Lewis-NIC, Archie George-UI, Georgeann Griffith-Lakeland SD, Linda Clark-Meridian-SD, Scott Grothe-OSBE, Tami Haft-NIC, Vera McCrink-PTE, Jackie Throngard-OSBE, Todd King-SDE, Andy Mehl-OSBE, Vince Miller-ISU. Joining later were Joyce Popp-SDE and Jennifer Peterson-OSBE. Absent were, Jeanie Meholchick-IDOL and Devan Delashmut-SDE.

Called Jenifer Marcus, legal council for SBOE, to discuss liability for data breaches and FERPA violations. Jennifer pointed out that FERPA laws do not actionable by individuals, but rather institutions are subject to loss of federal funds for repeated violations. (Andy subsequently indicated he believes the penalties for violations of FERPA laws have changed.)

Discussed issues surrounding obtaining, verifying, and using EDUIDs. These discussions touched on uses and potential uses of the EDUIDs, such as for electronic transcripts, checking with the National Student Clearinghouse. Andy mentioned that some of the grant funding had been budgeted for the K-12 schools to potentially add additional information to the EDUIDs, has not proven feasible. These funds could be repurposed to studying how to improve the EDUID system in other ways, specifically research into data quality and education on best practices in obtaining and using the EDUIDs. Some particular issues having to do with Adult Basic Education (ABE) / GED students. The GED process is changing with federal rules that permit completely online programs and testing for obtaining the GED. How would these students be captured for assignment of an EDUID. Vera will initiate a meeting with ABE and the OSBE staff to discuss the benefits and challenges of incorporating the ABE/GED information with the SLDS.

Scott led the discussion of data quality in the EDUID assignment system. Todd pointed out that his experience indicates training for appropriate use of the assignment system, which often creates duplicate EDUIDs inappropriately. The system is being refined, address difficulties with separating students who have been inappropriately merged. While the process can be refined, there will never be an end to the challenge of keeping these data clean. Some estimates indicate as many as 30% of students move between school districts, thus creating challenges with assigning students unique EDUIDs and use of additional data elements, especially where they were, i.e. which school, to verify the appropriate EDUID. Various approaches to investigating the extent of EDUID duplication were discussed, including the use of the Clearinghouse “concurrent enrollment” reports. **Tami made a note to ask the Registrars’ group whether dual credit students were being included in the SLDS data submission.** The question of what to include in the MOU for institutions to sign was prominent and an immediate need.

Andy led a discussion of the high school feedback reports. He has run two years of ISEE data (high school graduations) through the Clearinghouse to determine the percentage

of Idaho high school seniors who go on to postsecondary. The percentage of postsecondary enrollments was the same for the two years. Reports based on these data are nearly ready for distribution, pending merging the graduation status. Andy is setting up a task force to determine next steps in determining the priorities for the high school feedback reports.

Scott brought the committee up to date with the formulation of the DMC “remediation” task force, with DMC members and others from K-12, postsecondary and Labor, (Jackie Throngard as chair, Scott Grothe, Georgeann Griffith, Staci Low, Kylene Lloyd or Ann Lewis, Andy Mehl, Don Coberly, a representative from PTE, another from Labor, Todd King, Bob Lokken with IBE/White Cloud Analytics). This group is being formed to work with the emerging common definition of who “needs remediation” (from the two remediation reform task forces) to work with the postsecondary institutions to bring more consistency to the postsecondary course offerings and placement of those students who have been classified as “needing remediation.” K-12 members of the committee stressed that the feedback reports will need to have enough information to tell which courses the students took and how well they did in order to make programmatic improvements at the secondary level. **<Andy & Scott – please check the content here and make changes as appropriate>.** Vera pointed out that many of the topics in this discussion have been under consideration by the Education Attainment Task force, which was charged by the Governor to make recommendation to support the 60% goal. **Andy will draft a charter and present it to the DMC at the next meeting.**

The committee discussed the postsecondary data tables, timing for submission, which tables and which years. Based on these discussions, Andy will put together a schedule and send to the committee members and institutions so we can prepare appropriately.

Joyce joined the group and answered questions we had held until her arrival. She took the opportunity to emphasize that it is important to minimize the addition of data elements, by determining the most appropriate place to collect data, with an eye toward not collecting information from more than one place, and to avoid collecting information directly when it can be calculated from other data being reported. Timing of addition to any new data elements, such as to ISEE, in order to work with vendors to give them time to modify the software to capture and report these changes. The committee reviewed the EDUID discussions and the high school feedback reports.

Joyce reviewed some of the challenges with using SchoolNet, how the data comes in, what happens to it and how it can be best utilized. SchoolNet was designed for use in a single district, while Idaho has adopted it on a statewide basis, which creates unique challenges when dealing with the vendor, Pearson. She mentioned Pearson will be setting up a separate instance for use in teacher education programs at the postsecondary level. Data request should go through Joyce, so she can answer three questions, “Is it repeatable”, “Is it auditable”, and “Is it defensible.” Joyce answered a question about completeness and accuracy of the PK-12 data by pointing out that all the data provided is better than ever, with dozens of warnings issued upon data entry, such

as for acceptable ages. Joyce pointed out that it's not appropriate to use the umbrella term of ISEE for all K-12 data, especially considering SchoolNet is a separate system. There are some issues that have led to lack of confidence in these data, which Joyce discussed with the committee, and how data issues were prominent in the "pay for performance" system. Many of the problems with SchoolNet have to do with failure of the vendor to meet many deadlines, which caused the system to initially fail, and this makes teachers and other data entry people reluctant to reengage with the system. The committee discussed ways OSBE staff could assist with data quality issues. Challenges in moving from aggregate reporting to unit record reporting has caused some transitional issues, sometimes involving school funding allocated by rules formulated based on how "school" was done in the past, so "accurate" data entry causes potential loss of funds. Also, individuals who were not hired to be "data people" are put in the position of working in exacting data positions. Joyce referred to surveys conducted by Tom Taggart, chairman of the Idaho Association of Business Officers, that assess the perceived accuracy of the student tracking system, which revolves around the accuracy of the EDUID, even without transitional issues (i.e. secondary to postsecondary).

Scott led a discussion of potential reports that might reveal the data quality of the EDUID and lead to improvements. Without complete and accurate unique IDs, the "longitudinal" attribute of the State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) becomes untenable. One desired metric to answer the broad question of "how good is the EDUID" is "what percent of students have been assigned more than one EDUID?" Determining the reasons why students might have more than one EDUID is central to designing a study or report to determine the extent of the EDUID "problem of duplicate EDUIDs." The experiences with unique identifiers in Oregon and Washington are relevant, and Joyce discussed her experiences with those systems. She is going to be meeting with representatives from these states. However, in the state of Washington the system is very labor intensive, as appears to be the case with the Clearinghouse as well, and the "joins" that are made (joining two EDUIDs that appear to have been given to one individual) appear to persist without much possibility of modification subsequently. Within the K-12 system there are systems in place to update the information associated with an EDUID, such as legal names instead of nicknames, name changes, birth date changes, etc.

Scott and Andy shared a spreadsheet that listed about a dozen situations that lead to duplicate or missing EDUIDs, estimates of the percentage of individuals affected (e.g. among a group of 20,000 postsecondary students submitted by a particular Idaho postsecondary institution, 99 had missing EDUIDs due to not knowing their gender, or 0.49%). One more relevant metric of accuracy and completeness of the EDUID would be for OSBE staff (Andy) to match students who entered Idaho postsecondary institutions after graduating from Idaho high schools within the previous 12 months, using the birth date, gender and high school only, then this with the data he has from the secondary

institutions and determine how many had different, or missing, EDUIDs. Andy will perform this data match and EDUID comparison and report back to the DMC.

Andy shared his ideas for requesting electronic high school transcripts, as csv or pdf files, to be shared with the postsecondary institutions for their use in admissions and subsequent tracking, course assignments, program improvement, etc. by the postsecondary institutions. This would be as a service to the postsecondary institutions coming from the SLDS project, and to remove some workload from the K-12 schools, such as having someone pull a transcript on short notice or when no one is available at the school. Another possibility would be for these same data to come out of the ISEE system. This would allow for cross-checking with other data submitted to ISEE. But these data would not be the official transcripts either, because official transcripts often contain changes and additions that are not captured in ISEE. Andy committed to drafting a request for exactly what he would like to have so that the various constituents could examine the objectives and the specific data contemplated, so we can comment and/or suggest alternatives.

While this proposed electronic process would potentially alleviate the necessity for requiring the EDUID on all high school transcripts, it would not do so for postsecondary institutions, which would be useful for transferring between Idaho institutions.

Andy led a discussion of whether it would be advisable to distribute funding from the grant to the postsecondary institutions again this year. Alternatives were spending for consulting from Virginia for the data request system and/or potentially scaling back enhancements in the Phase III implementation plan.

Ann and Andy led discussion of the Virtual Framework of Accountability (VFA) for the Idaho community colleges, on a statewide basis. Many of the data elements necessary for the VFA are already being submitted to SLDS, so there would likely be an advantage to obtaining data from the SLDS for those items. Ann and representatives from the other community colleges will be meeting in early April with consultant Jerry Gee, who is a former vice president at NIC and has also worked with others in the state, including the SBOE. This relates particularly to community college performance reports to SBOE and DFM, as well as making some of the best metrics available to prospective students and their parents/guardians. There are potential benefits for the community colleges, Professional Technical Education and secondary education.

Next meeting agenda items were specified, which Andy noted and will distribute with the formal invitation. DMC membership changes that might be appropriate were discussed, given changes in members' roles and responsibilities, organizational participation and perspectives. Andy took these suggestions under advisement and will be following up, keeping the DMC updated.