



Meeting Minutes September 10, 2014

Members Present

Chair Bill McConnell, Mr. Scott Feeny, Mr. David Galvin, Commissioner Teresa Lubbers, Commissioner Scott Sanders, Mr. Andrew VanZee

Members absent

None.

Staff present

Ms. Jackie Dowd and Mr. Shane Hatchett

I. Call to Order

Chair McConnell called the meeting to order at 10:03AM.

II. Chair's Welcome and Report

Chair McConnell welcomed members and introduced new participants, Commissioner Lubbers and Mr. Galvin. Chair McConnell recognized presence of a quorum. Minutes for August 7, 2014 meeting were presented to members. Commissioner Sanders motioned to approve minutes for the Executive Session and Public Meeting on August 7, 2014. Mr. Feeny seconded the motion, and members unanimously approved both minutes.

III. Public Comment

Chair McConnell indicated there were no sign-ups for public comment, but that there would be an opportunity, time permitting, at the end of the meeting for comments.

Pre-adjournment Public Comment

Josh Towns, IDOE IT Director, spoke about the need for dedicated staff to ensure sustainability and greater collaboration between stakeholders and the agencies. He noted that currently the partner agencies shoulder the burden of work through in-kind staff time contributions.

Julie Whitman spoke on behalf of the Indiana Youth Institute, which is part of the Early Learning Advisory Committee (ELAC) and Commission on Improving the Status of Children (CISC). The ELAC have an annual report due every June 30th to discuss broad need-based analysis for early learning. They are working towards longitudinal data system on pre-kindergarten. She also noted that the CISC are currently reviewing ways to use INK data to promote better outcomes for vulnerable youth.

Jeff Gill, DWD General Counsel, spoke on data confidentiality and security provisions within the current IWIS MOU. He noted that almost every agency is governed by different federal privacy law. Therefore INK must examine all relevant confidentiality agreements and must require the



strictest one for INK. Restrictions must also be set in place for contractors and other users of the data, in contract, stating specifically date restrictions of access and such.

IV. Data Governance Discussion

Mr. Hatchett presented revised governance framework for the Committee's review. He noted this document reflects changes requested by the board and committee members' concerns, as well as resources shared by USDOE state support team, and other stakeholders. Mr. Feeny asked how the INK Working Group fits into greater INK mission. Mr. Hatchett responded that this framework better aligns with the structure the statute envisions—with the INK Executive Director being the focal point of engaging agencies and other stakeholders. This also creates a relationship whereby the Governance Committee has charged the Executive Director with being the face of INK and will act as liaison. The research advisory group will function to solicit feedback from partner agencies and external stakeholders; additionally, the members will work to stay abreast of emerging fields of inquiry in workforce, Pre-K, K-12, and postsecondary in order to develop a more robust research agenda for INK.

Chair McConnell asked how data requests would be handled in this process. Mr. Hatchett expressed that this model does not yet account for that as the Executive Director should have input on that. Commissioner Lubbers asked if MOUs will allow agencies to talk about data shared. Mr. Hatchett responded that Executive Director should have authority to facilitate the sharing of data across agencies, to create an information clearinghouse with INK. He noted source agencies still have control over their own data, by statute, and therefore can enter into agreements as needed; however, the Executive Director can help create a routine process for sharing to ease the burden on the agencies. Baked into this discussion of governance is the fact that the Governance Committee still needs to determine the disclosure review process once data has been released to researchers to ensure the data have not been manipulated or represented poorly. Chair McConnell asked for clarification about how personally identifiable information within the databases is protected, whether personal information would ever be given out, and under whose authority. Commissioners Lubbers and Sanders said such sharing would be illegal under federal and state law. Commissioner Sanders added the data are regularly aggregated prior to release to prevent the data from being identified. Mr. Hatchett added that state agencies will use varying suppression methodologies depending on the type of data to ensure privacy. Ms. Dowd explained that no personally identifiable information is available in the production warehouse because it is removed from the records after the data are matched. Furthermore, she added, unlike in healthcare where privacy laws may allow for personal information to be released in limited circumstances, FERPA and the state's privacy laws do not permit such disclosures. Mr. Sanders further explained that INK data releases to the public would only be done at the report level, nothing more specific or personal than that.

Commissioner Lubbers asked about the relationship between the new Management and Performance Hub (MPH) and INK. Mr. Hatchett noted that the two are functionally separate, but that there may be opportunities to leverage resources or technologies that MPH has in place to limit costs with development of INK. Ms. Dowd added that the MPH is focused on other initiatives and that statute clearly delineates INK's responsibilities. Commissioner Lubbers asked for a lexicon and clear explanation of the relationship to share with legislators and other interested parties.

Chair McConnell asked who is responsible for security to safeguard aggregated, or shared dis-aggregated information held in INK database. Mr. Galvin explained that MOU agreement will

outline process, including flexibility and security, to be taken by the company chosen to build the system. Mr. Sanders spoke of a security presentation given to IWIS a year ago, that talks about protections. He said he would send it out to people. Chair McConnell requested this be on next meeting's agenda. Mr. Sanders said this is responsibility of Executive Director. Ms. Dowd concurred that with passage of 1003 last session, it is in statute for the ED to administer data governance policy. Shane pointed out that there is a policy manual from Maryland, and another from Virginia, and potentially others who have been through this.

Mr. Galvin noted he thought the proposed structure made sense in light of the facts. He asked who would be responsible for managing the data requests since there would be no subcommittees of the Governance Committee. Ms. Dowd noted that it had not been formally addressed yet. She added that it will be critical for the Executive Director to take the lead on some of that work, especially in convening the agency partners for review and feedback. Several members felt that it would be ideal to ensure we get research products back from the requestors to add to our analytical capabilities and bank of resources.

Mr. Feeny asked if the Committee was approving the structure discussed today. Chair McConnell said that no vote will be taken and the conversation continue. He asked staff to compile resources from other states and best practices to inform the discussion at the next meeting. Mr. VanZee noted that the governance committee has the authority to change the governance structure to ensure it aligns with the Committee's vision. Mr. Hatchett echoed this notion and noted the proposed structure is a living document, which will evolve as the view of this board or members of board may change. Chair McConnell asked members to forward any additional thoughts to staff prior to the next meeting.

V. Interagency Memorandum of Understanding

Chair McConnell noted that the Committee needs to provide staff with guidance on how to move forward in establishing a new interagency MOU as the current MOU for IWIS does not include all partner agencies.

Mr. Hatchett added that he shared at last meeting the current MOU, which was signed one year ago and goes through April 30, 2015. The signatories to that document are IDOE, CHE, DWD, and the Indiana Business Research Center (IBRC). After the passage of legislation establishing INK, a new MOU is required to reflect current realities. This is also necessary to show evidence of progress to grant funders.

Mr. VanZee observed that the Governance Committee needs to also think about how data requests will be handled and what agreements must be executed for that. He specifically proposed a baseline agreement between the partner agencies that could be updated to reflect new partners as source agencies begin to collaborate with INK. Third-party data sharing agreements must fall under the purview of the terms set forth in the baseline agreement. Commissioner Lubbers felt that made sense given the way the INK statute is constructed to allow for additional partners. Commissioner Sanders thought that the current IWIS MOU could serve as a framework to start and the Governance Committee could modify it accordingly.

Mr. Galvin mentioned that they should also discuss how data submissions will be handled to ensure uniformity, such as if independent colleges and universities were to participate. Mr. Hatchett noted that it would be preferable to have data submitted through the appropriate

source agency to ensure quality, especially since the agencies are in a better position to be subject matter experts. Commissioner Lubbers added that it makes sense create a uniform process to protect partners from redundant actions or requests. Chair McConnell asked how this might also impact public and private K-12 institutions. Mr. Galvin and Commissioner Lubbers noted that IDOE collects data on all accredited schools. Chair McConnell had a similar question about employer data such as employment forecasts and growth; Commissioner Sanders noted that employers would be wary of sharing such data and that it would not be for public consumption. To that end, perhaps it would make sense to have it reside with DWD to aggregate and summarize for sharing with INK.

Chair McConnell asked how the research agenda would be governed by the MOU. Mr. Hatchett noted at the previous meeting he shared the INK statute with the Governance Committee to help shape some of these discussions; specifically, the Governance Committee is responsible for adopting a research agenda, but a great deal of effort has already been undertaken under the auspices of IWIS to define K-12, postsecondary, and workforce-related questions. The ELAC are currently defining their questions, but all will be brought before this committee so that you can use or modify them to create an agenda. Chair McConnell added that the Executive Director can also solicit input from stakeholders and agencies for the committee's review.

Mr. Galvin noted that agencies have varying statutory requirements for data privacy and confidentiality which must be reconciled in this MOU. Mr. Feeny added that not all of the private colleges and universities have made a determination about their participation. Mr. VanZee wondered if some of this reconciliation could be achieved by work already underway through the Management and Performance Hub. Chair McConnell asked staff to draft to that effect and based on current IWIS MOU with the understanding that this is a starting point for consideration.

VI. STAFF UPDATES

(a) Executive Director

Ms. Dowd informed the committee that interview process for three candidates was complete and a candidate has been chosen. Background checks were underway and barring any unforeseen issues, that person will begin work as INK Executive Director on October 6 or 13.

(b) Procurement Update

Mr. Hatchett spoke about the ongoing RFP process, which is still underway. Vendor oral presentations are complete and final proposals were submitted yesterday. Scores are being tallied. After final calculation, IDOA will propose a vendor for selection followed by a mandatory five-day protest period. Following that, negotiations for the contract can begin. Staff will provide additional updates at next meeting. Mr. VanZee asked what the timeframe and scope for the contract was. Mr. Hatchett noted that Phase 1 is a gap analysis and feasibility study to engage agencies and stakeholders. From the interviews, the vendor will determine what the stakeholders want INK to be capable of doing and use that to set the scope and requirements of development. The feasibility and gap analysis should be completed by end of January 2015. The overall work will not be done before 2016 based on current conversations and timelines.

(c) U.S. Department of Education SLDS Site Visit

Mr. Hatchett noted that next week the U.S. Department of Education is coming to IDOE for a Statewide Longitudinal Data System Grant site visit. IDOE has been a recipient of SLDS funds for several years now and this directly affects what we do here and how INK will function. Mr. Hatchett acknowledged that by way of the SLDS grant, Indiana has access to a great deal of resources and best practices, which IDOE staff have been willing to share.

(d) Cross-Agency Collaborations

Mr. Hatchett shared that he was recently approached by the Commission on Improving the Status of Children's (CISC) data and mapping taskforce to talk about potential collaborations and data sharing. The CISC is looking to analyze educational and workforce outcomes for vulnerable youth. Based on preliminary discussions, it does not appear that they are seeking full membership as a partner agency, but they would like to continue exploring ways to leverage the work of INK to fulfill their statutory mission.

Mr. Hatchett added that the Early Learning Advisory Committee (ELAC) has also reached out and he joined their data coordination and system building workgroup. This group is defining the needs for pre-K longitudinal data in Indiana, some of which will be internal to FSSA and some of which will be cross-sector and part of INK's purview. Dr. Molly Chamberlin, who has worked on a number of Indiana's longitudinal data efforts, is leading the workgroup through defining the research questions. Stakeholders have been sent a survey to help prioritize and define audiences. The next step will be to map the data elements required to answer these questions. Mr. Hatchett noted that he would continue to keep the Governance Committee apprised of developments.

VII. Adjourn

Chair McConnell reminded members of the next meeting on October 22, 2014 at 10:00AM. Staff will send a poll next week to schedule a meeting sometime around mid-November and early December.

Commissioner Lubbers motioned to adjourn; Commissioner Sanders seconded. The meeting adjourned at 11:38AM.