Opening Comment: Time to move forward – get issues on the table and move forward

**Group reflection on feedback** gathered by Bruce in his calls as external evaluator - took some work to get people engaged.

- More frequent interaction/communication would be helpful
- Progress reports from the states
- Gauge progress against others
- Have meetings in locations other than Portland and Seattle
- Extend the length of meetings

Need to clarify the research questions
- Broader questions may be required to sustain data exchange

Develop formal memo to principles
- Inform state executives and others on other states’ activity/thoughts
- Question: Are executives already on board anyway?
- Goal to get all executives the same message – consistent talking points
- Urge a timeline – signed agreements by “x” date

**General Discussion of Data Elements**

States are responsible for ensuring they have good data matches within each state first

- Sending state accepts responsibility for getting data as clean as possible
  - 1 record per person
- Send “known as” name data as well as other name fields
- Preference to have state’s clean up issues before sharing

States have to assume matches with other state are good. Need for some validation process.
- Data will change over time and appropriately – need to know from originating state
- Multiple records for same students with different data is frequent issue

**Decision: There will be 2 cohorts:**
- Graduating from high school 2004/05
- Entering college 2005/06

Ethnicity is a poor element when used for record matching
- Include resident aliens

**Decision: Data will be gathered for the academic year**
- Note that there is a wide variety on term lengths/definition
- Issue of term is valuable/critical for research
- Want to be careful not to limit to any one specific time period
- We likely need a data advisory group to manage dates.
Collecting data term by term is simpler.
Create a table with states’ start/stop dates and academic years.

**Revised Decision: States will provide data on students by term with start and stop dates**

*WICHE will aggregate up to whatever time frame is required*

Individual states will use dates they need for their analyses; aggregate reporting for all States could differ – need to be accepting of any differences

Business rules will be necessary

Significant data cleaning and massaging will be necessary at state level

Reminder that this is a pilot study – details could follow once validity is proven. Some details could be deferred.

**Discussion of Specific Data Elements**

1. SSN coverage still very limited. Small and decreasing in K-12.
   - No definitional issues but there are inconsistencies within states.
   - If available, the SSN will be collected along with other identifiers.
   - Created ids will need to come back to original state for internal matching.

2. School codes
   - IPEDS for pse
   - Multiple schools codes for k-12 – use NCES school code

3. Address
   - Not everyone collects address
   - County may not be necessary for current research questions

4. Race/Ethnicity
   - US citizen non-resident alien not necessary

5. CIP
   - Agreement to collect CIP for degrees
   - CIP not necessary for enrollment records but may be valuable for analysis of pilot.
     - Reasonable and easy to collect.

6. Degree seeking status
   - Much debate on what this really means.
   - “It’s garbage.”
   - May not need to collect but may be needed for cohort definition
   - Cohort definition is critical especially for workforce analysis
     - Certificate students critical to them

**Cohort definition**

The 3 previously-identified research questions partially address cohorts

Two cohorts confirmed

1. HS diploma recipients
Consider diploma type, summer awards, continuing (post-HS) award, dual enrollment

2004-05 high school graduates
   Trailing summer is included
GED included (include diploma type)
Include students reported to USED CCD plus GED

2. First time postsecondary enrollees
   2005-06 first time postsecondary enrollees
   Include leading summer
Undergrads only
Exclude dual-enrolled students who have not graduated from high school yet
Only include students taking credits applicable to a degree or certificate
   Exclude someone totally non-credit
Credit bearing plus remedial (flag for exclusively remedial – not necessary for pilot)
First time, first year enrolled anywhere in state – IPEDS first-time definition

Recognize there will be some noise and we should be comfortable with that. This is an attempt to “prove a concept.”

It requires a statewide file; someone will have to create that file each reporting period from multiple data sources.

Data submitted will include:
   Cohort – 1 record per student
   Enrollment – 1 record per institution per term
   Awards - all awards per term (multiple records per student)

Staff will create a data dictionary – list of expected elements
Derivation discussion will then follow – 1 person from each state (Melissa, Andy, Pearl, ?)
   Detailed discussion required and will be scheduled; likely in conjunction with next meeting

FERPA Discussion with Dave Stolier – WA attorney
   “Educational agency or institution” refers to institutions that serve students directly
   When the language means to include state agencies, it directly says so
   Governing boards may “control or direct” day to day operations
   Can disclose to “authorized representatives” of state/local educ. authorities subject to 99.35
   Section 99.35 – in connection with audit or evaluation and must be grounded in state law
   No disclosure allowed
   Can’t just authorize other state agencies as an “authorized representative”
      Have to have direct control over the contractor
      Data has to flow from labor to education or manually controlled
   April 2011 guidance loosens up definition of “authorized representatives”
   “No problem authorizing WICHE as a representative”
      Data can flow from states to WICHE who can then develop aggregate data
Working with Enrollment data OK, award data probably OK
The challenge (barrier) are data that are not directory information
Can return directory data from one state to another
More than aggregate data but must still be directory data only
   Essentially what happens now with NSC
Summary data can flow but not data that can be identified even if it's data on students that have started in one state and then gone elsewhere.

WICHE is a state compact; are they an extension of the states’ public education agencies?
   Possibly. Need to review but compact makes things different – big key issue.
   Brian to send Dave compact documents.
   Problem not in designating WICHE as a designated agency; problem may be in sending information on to others.
   Is WICHE a multi-state version of ERDC?

Suggestion to give FPCO an answer to the question we raise:
   Here’s our interpretation of the new guidance and here’s how we are proceeding.

Research whether there is collection of what states consider directory information – DQC?
   Publically-released graduation lists (announcements) could be de-facto directory information.

Memorandum of Understanding Discussion and Next Steps
   Consider whether “data sharing agreement” is a better name for this document?
   If WICHE functions as a contractor rather than an agency, does that make a difference?
   What needs to happen to get Attorneys General to bless the pilot process?

   OR – structural changes are underway and legal status may be changing.
   Their attorney (and possibly others) is likely to say “wait for updated FERPA guidance.”
   Can’t let this impact getting ALDER ratified.
       Need ALDER done to get the data and ALDER is waiting on FERPA.
   MOA needs to be adjusted to account for an initial exchange of cohort data; could be done soon but exchanging any other information has to wait on ALDER.

Decision: The MOA needs to be revised to address concerns over exchange details.
   Could be a two stage process:
       Start with aggregate data based on directory information and expand later.
   Needs to be more explicit on using a cohort as the initial step
   Directory information will be all that goes back to states
Workforce data could be sent to WICHE on a disk. Brian, acting as a contractor, goes to each state and gets data appended, and then returns modified data back to each state. Exchange has occurred and aggregate reporting can take place.

WA – no problems from K-12 but need a judgment from Attorney.

HI – would feel more comfortable having WICHE as a contractor
    Labor likes the term "contractor," education likes "agency."

ID – will need to take revisions to AG.

Having a data exchange meeting with all labor reps present would be helpful.

Next meeting – January 10-11, 2012