Midwest Collaborative Spring Convening Report of Proceedings

March 4th – 6th, 2020

Contents

Overview

A group of state workforce and education agencies and research universities in the Midwest have worked together to design a system that enables individual states to answer critical questions that are relevant to society. An earlier workshop, held in Chicago in September 2018, resulted in the creation and delivery of three classes in Ohio, Indiana and Missouri focused on a regional approach to describing educational and workforce transitions. Three more are planned for Kentucky, Tennessee and Michigan.

Over three days in March, 2020, the workshop brought together nearly 50 individuals from over 20 organizations and nine states to build on the success of that work. The first day of the workshop summarized recent work in demonstrating the value of organizations working collaboratively. The second day had working groups focused on three core topics: Governance, Data Models, and Projects. Each working group established a base understanding and identified next steps, as outlined in the "looking ahead" section below. A complete agenda, including slides presented during the session, is available on the workshop website.

This document summarizes the proceedings of the Midwest Collaborative: Data for Evidence-based Policy Spring Convening, which was generously supported by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the Overdeck Family Foundation.

Agenda

The convening began with a welcome dinner on the evening of Wednesday, March 4th, hosted by the Coleridge Initiative. The following morning, Dr. Julia Lane of New York University and the Coleridge Initiative, and Dr. Josh Hawley of The Ohio State University and the Ohio Education Research Center convened their counterparts from Indiana University, Rutgers University, the University of Chicago, the University of Kentucky, University of Michigan and the University of Missouri for a breakfast discussion of the role of university research partners in the Midwest Collaborative.

The full agenda (appended to this report) began at 9:00 on Thursday, March 5th, at the Ohio Union with welcoming remarks from Josh Hawley, Fred Church, Vice Chancellor of Finance, Ohio Department of Higher Education, and Bruce Madson, Assistant Director, Ohio Department of Job and Family Services.

Panel Discussions

The first panel discussion of the morning featured George Putnam, Director Labor Market Information, Illinois Department of Employment Security, Chris Slinkard, Director, Missouri Division of Employment Security, Diana Barrett, Assistant Director, Indiana Department of Workforce Development, and was facilitated by Coretta Pettway, Chief, Bureau of Labor Market Information, Ohio Department of Job and Family Services. The purpose of the panel was to set the stage for the next two days, making the case for the collaborative and describing their motivation for formalizing the partnership. The panelists shared their experiences to date sharing data and conducting analysis using the Administrative Data Research Facility (ADRF), as well as participating in training (either themselves or their staff) in advanced data

analytics through the Coleridge Initiative. Each of the panelists referred to practical analyses generated through their engagement in the ADRF. Examples are posted on the [event website](#).

The second panel went more deeply into the products and analyses that have been produced and could be extended through a cross-state data collaborative, with a particular emphasis on workforce and education outcome measures. The panel featured individual presentations from Bob Goerge, Senior Research Fellow, Chapin Hall, Josh Hawley, Director, Ohio Education Research Center, The Ohio State University, and Jason Owen Smith, Executive Director, Institute for Research on Innovation and Science (IRIS). Jessica Cunningham from KYSTATS served as moderator for the panel. Slides from are posted on the [event website](#).

Following lunch, Clayton Hunter, Deputy Director of the Coleridge Initiative, provided attendees with a demonstration of the capabilities and features of the Administrative Data Research Facility (ADRF). The presentation emphasized the newly-developed data stewardship functionality within the ADRF, which will facilitate multi-state data governance. The slides from this presentation are posted on the [event website](#).

The final panel presentation of the event featured a national perspective on cross-state data collaboratives. Panelists included Tiffany Smith, Program Officer at Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (participating via video conference), Jon Sotsky, Director of Strategic Impact & Learning, Overdeck Family Foundation at Two Sigma, Nancy Sharkey Administrative Data Division: State Longitudinal Data Systems Branch, National Center for Education Statistics, United States Department of Education, and Steve Rietzke, Division Chief, National Programs, Tools, and Technical Assistance, Employment & Training Administration, Office of Workforce Investment, United States Department of Labor. The panel was facilitated by Julia Lane, Coleridge Initiative. The panelists discussed the potential return on investment for developing a more robust data infrastructure - time, human resources, better services, better outcomes. They shared their vision of potential products that this collaborative could generate over the next 18 months. They also discussed the possible role of common data and a common infrastructure like the ADRF.

Following the day's panels, the state agencies and their university partners were grouped together to begin synthesizing the information shared over the course of the day. Yvette Chocolaad of the National Association of State Workforce Agencies and Erin Joyce of the Ohio Education Research Center provided the groups with guidance to help them answer the question, what do states hope to achieve from this collaborative? State teams were given planning templates, asking them to identify policy and/or program solutions that could be developed through the collaborative, as well as specific products that the collaborative could develop over the next 18 to 24 months. Teams were given an hour to discuss the guiding questions and prepare to share their responses during the opening session on the morning of March 6th.

State and Topical Working Groups

The morning of March 6th began with reports from each of the state groups. Detailed notes are appended to this report. Across all of the states, common interests included workforce outcomes of

education and training programs. Education was construed broadly, including K-12, career-technical, 2-year and 4-year higher education, and workforce training and credential programs. Participants identified 2-year and 4-year higher education workforce outcomes as a potential "low-hanging fruit" project among the states. All states are interested in analyses of student and worker in-flows and out-flows within their individual states and among the states in the collaborative. Participants also expressed interest in geographic analyses, including cross-state MSAs (Cincinnati, East St. Louis), and urban/rural analyses. As a next step, states would like to expand to data sets beyond education and workforce, including health and human services and corrections.

Over lunch, Patrick Lane of the Western Interstate Collaborative for Higher Education (WICHE), shared his perspectives on cross-state collaboration and data sharing with the group.

Next, the participants assembled into topical discussion groups: governance, facilitated by Jason Owen Smith, data and data models, facilitated by Josh Hawley, and projects, facilitated by George Putnam. Detailed notes from the group discussions are appended to this report.

Governance group

The governance group focused on three issues: (1) developing a shared sense of general principles that should guide governance, (2) identifying questions and challenges that governance will have to help address, and (3) outlining a process and next steps. The group created a draft set of principles and identified questions (see appendix) to circulate to the broader membership for comment and consensus. The group envisions a subcommittee to create a draft charter that articulates key goals and queries for governance that all can agree on. Second, the group proposes that a subgroup should collect existing governance models (department of education, WICHE etc.). Reviewing these documents in light of our shared principles can identify governance components that fit the collaborative's needs. Third, with common principles and possible models in hand, the collaborative can collectively decide whether to draft formal bylaws and formalize organizational structures. Who should be involved in that process, how formal the results should be, and how they should be approved remain to be determined.

Data and Data Models group

The data and data models group sought consensus among the discussants on the concept of a "data model", a conceptual and practical approach to organizing data entities that structures data in a way that lends its way to analysis, along with metadata. The group shared existing data models, noting that education has better-developed data models, with workforce data having less-developed models. The group discussed some of the advantages and disadvantages of existing models such as Ed-Fi, CEDS and T3. A common concern noted was that many models are designed with the frame of federal accountability and may not map well to state administrative data. The group brainstormed future activities for a working group, including: mapping each state's data, identifying agency barriers to sharing data within states, conducting a data quality review and creating a quality-assurance report for states to review, and creating standardized controls agreed to by all state partners.

Potential Projects

The third group discussed potential projects for the collaborative to engage in over the next eighteen to twenty-four months. Using the priorities surfaced in the state presentations, the group identified four potential projects, with both short-term and longer-term time horizons:

1. Cross-state record linkage and population migration

- Short-term: investigate education and workforce transitions of post-secondary graduates using current Collaborative states
- Longer-term: expand analysis to vocational training graduates, non-completers and other populations of interest; outreach to adjoining states not in Collaborative to expand the scope of origin and destination

2. Cross-state record linkage and migration of Metropolitan area populations

- Short-term: investigate education and workforce transitions within interstate Metropolitan population and rural to urban population migration
- Longer-term: augment investigation with human services and corrections

3. Skill-based labor supply/demand

- Short-term: investigate teacher shortage (establish replicable research design and methodology)
- Longer-term: apply replicable research design and methodology to nursing shortage

4. Career technical education

- Short-term: education to workforce transition; OH working currently IN, KY in Cincinnati MSA
- Longer-term: expand scope to other origin and destination geographies; expand record linking capacity with the CTE population

Next Steps

To continue the momentum generated at the convening. The organizing committee will initiate the following next steps:

General

1. Formalize the charge, leadership and rosters of each group for the governance, data/data models and projects working groups and establish a regular meeting schedule;
2. Identify partners to respond to near-term proposals; and
3. Work with NASWA to plan for a fall convening in conjunction with the 2020 Workforce Summit and UI Directors' Conference.

Potential COVID-19 project

The COVID-19 crisis has devastated American communities socially and economically at all levels.. Weekly unemployment claims reach 3,283,000 last week (Figure 1) – four times the previous recession level in 1982. It was impossible for state to be prepared for this surge. While having up-to-date statistics is necessary for states to respond differentially according to need, state government access to confidential data is spotty and unreliable. Indeed, at the very time that state agencies are trying to model the effect of the crisis using confidential data on individual employment, unemployment claims, and the related impact on the use of welfare and child nutrition programs, many agency staff are

teleworking without access to their data. So governors and the agencies in charge of delivering services have little quantitative information or evidence to guide their decisions.

Schmidt Futures has provided funding to expand the existing MidWest Collaborative infrastructure[1] to enable those states and researchers to access, use and build tools to inform decision-making about the loss of jobs in this crisis that can be used at the state- and, potentially, the sub-state level across the country. The initial request is to build the tools using immediately or imminently available data for key states. It will support researchers and developers in the development of those tools – which will then be made available to all states in the country. In particular, a designated team will

1. Upload weekly UI claims data to ADRF for states that come forward to participate
2. Convert transactional claims to individual cohorts and provide reusable code
3. Provide access to other states and their designated researchers
4. Jointly develop standardized employment and benefit use histories, industry characteristics and outcome measures
5. Develop models of the impact of different sector specific or educational interventions on getting successful jobs
6. Forecast the impact of the crisis on the participation on individuals and families in state income transfer, nutrition, and social service programs.
7. Generate standardized dashboards for governors, agency heads and program staff (with the guidance of the state agency programmatic and subject experts). A very early initial example is here:
https://public.tableau.com/profile/rayid#!/vizhome/eta203/UIData

The dashboard could be structured in multiple different ways:

1. Temporal: compare to comparable period in 2019 and 2008 recession, both point-in-time and year-to-date

2. Stakeholders: Governors (resource allocation) at the state level and regional Workforce Boards (population they serve)

3. Understanding the workforce supply

a. Now:	UI claims intake and characteristics of applicants and occupations of those who are certified
b. In a few months:	What is the need? Who is exhausting claims? Who uses SNAP/TANF/WIC and other services?
c. In a few more months:	Who will need training?

4. Understanding demand   Who is hiring?; What are the earnings of new hires?

---

[1] https://coleridgeinitiative.org/workshop-mar2020

Appendix A: Attendees

Forty-two people attended the event in Columbus. Twenty-three of the attendees represented state workforce and/or education agencies. Eleven of the attendees were faculty or staff from research universities. One person attended as a representative of the US Department of Labor, and one attended representing the US Department of Education. Three individuals represented national or regional associations. Three attendees represented philanthropic foundations. A list of attendees is appended to this report.

First name	Last name	Title	Organization
Ronda	Anderson	Interim Assistant Commissioner	Missouri Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development
Diana	Barrett	Assistant Director	Indiana Workforce Development
Tyler	Brown	Director of Engagement and Analytics	Indiana Management Performance Hub
Yvette	Chocolaad	Policy Director	National Association of State Workforce Agencies
Frederick	Church	Vice Chancellor of Finance	Ohio Department of Higher Education
Ramnath	Cidambi	Chief Information Officer	Illinois Student Assistance Commission
Jessica	Cunningham	Executive Director	KYSTATS
David	Edwards	Director, Office of Research, Planning, & Process Improvement	Missouri Department of Corrections
Robert	Goerge	Senior Research Fellow	Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago
Joshua	Hawley	Associate Professor	The Ohio State University
Lesley	Hirsch	Assistant Commissioner	New Jersey Department of Labor
Lisa	Howard	Assistant Commissioner	TN Department of Labor and Workforce Development
Clayton	Hunter	Deputy Director	Coleridge Initiative
Erin	Joyce	Associate Director	Ohio Education Research Center
Jeremy	Kintzel	Education Research Director	MO Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development
Frank	Kohstall	Chief Data Advocate	Innovate Ohio, Office of Lt Governor Jon Husted

Tim	Kolar	State Office Administrator	Department of Labor and Economic Opportunity - State of Michigan
Julia	Lane	Professor	New York University
Patrick	Lane	Vice President of Policy Analysis and Research	WICHE
Bruce	Madson	Assistant Director	Ohio Dept of Job & Family Services
David	Mahan	Assoc VP Data, Research and Adv Analytics	KY Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE)
Kiyokazu	Matsuyama	Labor Market Research Economist 3	Iowa Workforce Development
Peter	Mueser	Professor	University of Missouri
Ryan	Murphy	Bureau Chief	Iowa Workforce Development
Lisa	Neilson	Research Scientist	Ohio Education Research Center
Jason	Owen-Smith	Executive Director	Institute for Research on Innovation & Science (IRIS)
Coretta	Pettway	Chief, Bureau of Labor Market Information	Ohio Department of Job and Family Services
Jason	Pontius	Associate Chief Academic Officer	Iowa Board of Regents
Scott	Powell	Director of Research	State of Michigan
George	Putnam	Director Labor Market Information	Illinois Department of Employment Security
Maryann	Rainey	Program Officer	Ascendium Education Group
David	Ramsay	Director	New Jersey Department of Labor & Workforce Development
Steven	Rietzke	Division Chief	US DOL/ETA
Daniel	Rizo-Patron	Workforce Analytics Project Manager	Ohio Department of Job & Family Services
Nancy	Sharkey	Research Scientist	National Center for Education Statistics
Sean	Simone	Director, New Jersey Education to Earnings Data System	Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Timothy	Slaper	Co-Director, Research Director	Indiana Business Research Center
Chris	Slinkard	Director	Missouri Division of Employment Security
Tiffany	Smith	Program Officer	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

Jonathan	Sotsky	Director, Strategic Impact & Learning	Overdeck Family Foundation
Eugenia Dustin	Toma Weeden	Wendell H. Ford Professor of Public Policy Senior Policy Analyst	University of Kentucky State Higher Education Executive Officers Association

Appendix B: Agenda

Midwest Collaborative: Data for Evidence-based Policymaking

Spring Convening

Ohio Union, The Ohio State University

March 4-6, 2020

Wednesday, March 4, 2020

7:00-9:00 p.m.   Welcome Dinner

Spagio, 1295 Grandview Ave, Columbus, OH 43212

Thursday, March 5, 2020

8:30-9:00 a.m.   Registration and Coffee

Cartoon Room 1, Ohio Union

9:00-9:30 a.m.   Welcome and Introductions

Cartoon Room 1, Ohio Union

Speakers:

Josh Hawley, Director, Ohio Education Research Center, The Ohio State University

Fred Church, Vice Chancellor of Finance, Ohio Department of Higher Education

Bruce Madson, Assistant Director, Ohio Department of Job and Family Services

9:30-10:30 a.m.   Motivation – The Case for a Collaborative

Cartoon Room 1, Ohio Union

Panelists:

George Putnam, Director Labor Market Information, Illinois Department of Employment Security;

Chris Slinkard, Director, Missouri Division of Employment Security;

Diana Barrett, Assistant Director, Indiana Department of Workforce Development

Facilitator:

Coretta Pettway, Chief, Bureau of Labor Market Information, Ohio Department of Job and Family Services

10:30-10:45 a.m. Break

Coffee will be available outside of the Cartoon Room

10:45-noon   What has been done

Presenters:

Bob Goerge, Senior Fellow, Chapin Hall

Josh Hawley, Director, Ohio Education Research Center, The Ohio State University

Jason Owen Smith, Executive Director, Institute for Research on Innovation and Science

Facilitator:

Jessica Cunningham, Executive Director, KYSTATS

Noon-1:00 p.m.   Lunch

Buffet available outside of the Cartoon Room

1:00-1:45 p.m.   Building common foundations; ADRF and Data stewardship

Presenter:

Clayton Hunter, Deputy Director, Coleridge Initiative

Facilitator:

Scott Powell, Director of Research at State of Michigan, Bureau of Labor Market Information and Strategic Initiatives

1:45-2:45 p.m.   A National Perspective

Panelists:

Tiffany Smith; Program Officer at Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

Jon Sotsky, Director of Strategic Impact & Learning, Overdeck Family Foundation at Two Sigma

Nancy Sharkey A*dministrative Data Division: State Longitudinal Data Systems Branch, NCES*

Steve Rietzke, Division Chief, National Programs, Tools, and Technical Assistance, Employment & Training Administration, Office of Workforce Investment, United States Department of Labor

Facilitator: Julia Lane, Coleridge Initiative

3:00-3:15 p.m.   Break

Refreshments will be available outside of the Cartoon Room

3:15- 4:15 p.m. Identifying cross-state connections

Cartoon Room 1 – State Groups

Facilitators:

Yvette Chocolaad, Policy Director, National Association of State Workforce Agencies

Erin Joyce, Associate Director, Ohio Education Research Center, The Ohio State University

Grouping

Table 1 – Ohio

Table 2 – Missouri

Table 3 – Michigan, Illinois, Iowa

Table 4 – Indiana

Table 5 – Kentucky, Tennessee, NJ

4:15-4:30 p.m.   Day 1 Closing

4:30-5:30 p.m. – Reception

Midwest Collaborative attendees are invited gather in Woody's Tavern on the first floor of the Ohio Union for a social hour.

Friday, March 6, 2020

9:00 - 10:30: Moving from concept to reality, program of work for Midwest

Cartoon Room 1

Each State group has 15 minutes to present a vision for their involvement in the collaborative based upon the prior afternoon's discussions

9:10-9:25 – Indiana

9:25 – 9:40 – Missouri

9:40 – 9:55 – Ohio

9:55 – 10:10 – Michigan, Illinois, Iowa

10:10 – 10:25 Kentucky, Tennessee, NJ

10:30-10:45 Break

Coffee available outside of Cartoon Room 1

10:45-11:45 Affinity Mapping Exercise

Cartoon Room 1

As a group, identify common themes based upon the morning's report-out from each state

12-1: Lunch (WICHE Presentation)

Boxed lunches will be available outside of Cartoon 1

1:00-2:00 Tactics and Prioritization

Cartoon Room 1

Identify specific next steps in four domains:

Organization/Governance

Data

Data Models

Products/Solutions

2:00-2:30 Report Out from working groups/closing session

Appendix C: Notes from State Group Reports: What do states hope to achieve from this collaborative?

Missouri

Data to inform policy/program objectives:

1. Cross-state flows:
    a. Credential rates;
    b. Employment rates;
    c. Wages and outcomes measures
2. Students leaving and coming into Missouri – about education system – where do graduates work and live
3. Corrections – where do they go – and the effectiveness of training

Data to solve program needs:

1. Governor's office; commissioner of education; leadership team – focus on workforce and infrastructure
2. Program evaluation and development – to see how people can progress in their career

Developing structures to collaborate with partners:

1. Standardize – map common elements with CEDS and map with cross state flow – apples to apples
2. Common definition of employment – particularly time period

Tangible products

1. More data partners – ADRF – six state agencies in SLDS; seventh into table. Cross-pollinated look at our resident
2. Mapping common elements
3. Map employment
4. Map of state migration – any age after they leave – that would help
5. Change training model – to two day classes – statistics and evidence

Standardization of metrics – workforce and education/training outcomes

Using that structure to look at cross-state outcomes and corrections

- Department of Corrections; Department of Human Services; health partners – need to have standardization so that we are speaking the same language

New Jersey/Kentucky/Tennessee

Vision for engagement in the collaborative:

- Get a better understanding of our populations and how we serve them so we can have an impact in a positive way

Advance important policy/program objectives

1. Continue to show the benefits of the (Collaborative) program and what it has to offer
2. Have a communications plan for the Collaborative
3. Road show – go on a road show/listening tour – what the ROI is for the work that is being done
4. Advocates – support the work

Solve immediate policy program/data need

1. Answer question of out migration in our state – 15% of NJ workers go to NY
2. Provide guidance on how to build collaboratives; data stewardship
3. Standardize privacy and confidentiality – big concern for partners
4. Events like these – seminars, forums, collaborations, webinars

Tangible products

1. Model legislation - in order to do this work we need to get legislation across states with partners
2. Move beyond education and workforce to include other sectors such as health and human services;
3. Democratize the data – reducing technical hurdles for researchers

Goals and stakeholders

1. Data stewards; potential partners with other states
2. State executives
3. Other workforce professionals; employment and training colleagues
4. Legislatures
5. General public

Structures to support the work

1. Common ground in research agendas
2. Shared vision among states – identify questions

New Jersey has state funding for SLDS – grant funding

1. Cost recovery – making data available for a price

Early wins – gain trust amongst partners – mid-term – give access to outside data

Ohio/Indiana

Policy/program objectives

- K12 mobility; Career Technical Education workforce outcomes

- Analyses of cross-state MSAs
- Eligible training provider data – might help us produce workforce outcomes

Project need

- Data sharing agreements – consider using electronic signatures such as Docusign
- Project review through ADRF
- Meetings to share knowledge and identify problems –

Tangible products

- Maps showing teacher mobility
- Better Career Technical Education and eligible provider data files
- Performance reports for DOL for eligible training providers

Both IU and OSU are involved

- Develop a structural engagement for research sector.

Discussion:

- Teacher shortages – examine how cross state mobility might be affecting teacher supply/demand
- K-12 mobility issue, particularly in border MSAs
- Eligible training and DOL
- CTE – Career and technical education – both state and federal funding.   From tax revenue at state and local model
  - Some states have stand alone CTE; others have run through secondary schools; some in prisons – juvenile and adult
  - In some states it's convenient to do the CTE but in a lot of states it is less so
  - CTE gives in-roads into K-12 systems for people who are interested into workforce transitions – people in education don't think about jobs, but CTE think about jobs – and they can bring the others along

Michigan/Iowa/Illinois

Data frame

- Need for well-defined cohorting practices. Move into K-12 – high school cohorts that lead into workforce
- How do we standardize the wide range of stuff that is not an associates or bachelor's degree such as industry credentials?

Programs/program areas

- Gubernatorial initiative around adult education – 60% of adult population should have some form of postsecondary credential – what is the denominator or numerator?

- Interstate data – in-migration of older adults – mobility by credential type across age bands – to look at the short-term win work;
- Poverty/equity/ geographic differential – states are not monolithic – how the states differ by urban/rural – better measures for rural areas; and case studies that focus on the border metros across states – pilot report plus a set of templates

Sharing information

- Playbook for making case – for stakeholders and impeders
- Develop onboarding materials – here are examples of projects that have shown value

Practical products

- Age band credential flows
- Geographies – and developing a collaborative pilot across cities
- East St. Louis – bring to bear – education/workforce outcomes/corrections

Research access

- Learning Python and SQL is too high a lift within the bounds of the course
- Make a data file in the ADRF and make a STATA file
- Refer to how the statistical agencies create a product –
    o Research questions are Pre-identified
    o Produce 20 or so data products
    o EG High school cohort study across state lines

Data confidentiality

- Is there any way we can simplify the DUA's – to make life simplified for external researchers
- Investigate questions that are actionable by government
- ADRF discussion has to be around programs more efficient - how do you operationalize

Discussion

- Tension between need for confidentiality – how safe the data is
- Mechanism for once a year have an RFP; have academics write a proposal – quality and reciprocity
- Reciprocity – need NY and PA – do research studies that are on metro area – about the dynamics of the metro area are terrific

Appendix D: Strategic Planning Group Reports

1. **Governance**

Notes from the governance discussion
Compiled by discussion leader, Jason Owen-Smith
Overview.

      The discussion was framed by a handout Jason Owen-Smith created (text follows) that highlighted some best practices for governance in "network forms" of organization. Such organizational arrangements are particularly useful for managing the kind of decentralized, collaborative work being undertaken here. The group focused on three issues: (1) developing a shared sense of general principles that should guide governance, (2) identifying questions and challenges that governance will have to help address, and (3) outlining a process and next steps.

Principles.

      Participants shared a strong set of principles to guide our efforts. What follows highlights the points that seemed to have the strongest consensus. These principles provide a general starting point to frame efforts to develop more detailed bylaws if that level of formalization is warranted. All of these are provisional and subject to amendment by the members of the group. The collaborative:

- is dedicated to developing responsible, effective means to use inter-agency and inter-state data to inform evidence based decision-making and policy
- should not be geographically bounded
- seeks to streamline and reduce the transaction costs of responsible, effective collaboration using the ADRF as a technical platform
- commits to strong but flexible privacy/confidentiality protection and responsible data use practices that address all relevant statutory and ethical requirements
- expects all members to benefit from participation *and* to contribute to the collective good of the group ("there should be no bystanders")
- does not and should not require total consensus to undertake projects (minimize veto points, while respecting independence of state decisions)
- should have multiple touch points with states but a single, authoritative representative whose position and expertise allow them to conduct necessary due diligence within each state participant
- respects state sovereignty with regard to data, policy needs, and legal obligations. (We seek data sovereignty without data protectionism)
- encourages individual states to develop internal governance processes that allow multiple agencies to participate without having to negotiate agency by agency.
- supports research access to data with the proviso that external research projects must address needs/concerns of data providers (states)

- favors institutional partnerships that formalize inter-personal connections
- directs use of data through collective identification of common, high value questions that can (a) produce small wins that build momentum and enroll allies, and (b) set guiderails for data sharing
- encourages standardization of agreements, data formats, disclosure processes etc.
- should borrow governance details that fit with these principles from existing consortia where possible

Questions.

Many questions that pertain to governance were raised and tabled as unproductive for an initial, short, conversation. The following list includes questions that were raised, which either (a) need to be addressed before final decisions about governance are made, or (b) which should be addressed in more detailed governance discussions.

- What is the relationship between ADRF/CI governance and collaborative governance? Is it possible to be a member of one without the other? Should there be a formal MOU for the collaborative that is independent of state-by-state agreements in re ADRF access and data sharing?
- How much, if at all, should the collaborative have an administrative component? More broadly, is the collaborative best understood as a formal organization, or a more informal, but shared, set of guidelines for streamlining collaborations?
- What is the cost model for e.g. researcher access? How do we maintain state control while responsibly engaging outside researchers without overburdening states and agencies?
- What is the best process for developing/approving governance rules (be they guidelines or bylaws)?
- Once established, how much role should the collaborative as a whole play in defining/approving projects?
- What are the "voting" entities in the collaborative? The table consensus was states are the participants.

Process.

Table participants expressed support for the idea that members of the group should undertake several next steps.

First, circulating the principles and questions for feedback should trigger a subcommittee to create a draft charter that articulates key goals and queries for governance that all can agree on.

Second, a subgroup should collect existing governance models (department of education, WICHE etc.). Reviewing these documents in light of our shared principles can identify governance components that fit our needs.

Third, with common principles and possible models in hand, we can collectively decide whether to draft formal bylaws and formalize organizational structures. Who should be involved in that process, how formal the results should be, and how they should be approved remain to be determined.

Orienting ideas about governance (Data Governance Handout)
Jason Owen-Smith
03/05/2020

Working definition
Governance is about oversight, stakeholder voice, strategic counsel, and, most critically, agreeing on processes to collaboratively and transparently respond to problems and opportunities we may not be able to define now.

Goal
1. Outline the components of a governance framework
2. Agree on a process to draft a collaboration charter that
     a. clearly, concretely identifies guiding principles that can inform draft bylaws
     b. includes mechanisms for feedback, revision, and acceptance

Proposed approach
One model for governance in a decentralized, collaborative project is the "network form" of organization. Best practices for network governance can help us think through the key components of a framework

Some key concepts for network governance
- <u>Voice, not exit</u> – governance should support participants to articulate concerns and work for change rather than leave
- <u>Partnerships are fundamental</u> – dyads, bilateral partnerships between independent collaborators, make up networks. Partnerships work best with:
    o Rotating leadership
    o Multiple touch points
    o Clear authority
    o Creative tension between rivalry and collaboration
- <u>Networks go beyond partnerships</u> – effective networks are more than the sum of their parts. They are characterized by:
    o Boundary definitions and processes for entry
    o Legitimate peripheral participation
    o Deemphasis on consensus
    o Trust and forbearance
    o Strong and weak ties
    o Value that scales with participation

2. Data Models

Discussion Leader: Josh Hawley

Notes compiled by Julia Lane

- **What is your definition of a data model?**
    - Don't need a data model like a cellphone
    - Conceptual and practical approach to organizing data entities
    - Structure data in a way that lends its way to analysis;
    - Plus metadata around data
    - Isn't the framework already set up in the ADRF
    - The data structure in the ADRF reflects the data structure
    - Workforce
    - IL and MO sending LEHD data model
    - OH and IN sending in slightly different workforce
- **What are the existing models?**
    - CEDS – what are the schema – you can go to the elements – elements that are defined in the schemas reflect what the states produce
    - Table structures are separate from the definitions
    - The workforce is the least developed
    - Individuals: students, teachers,
    - Institutions:
        - What kind of roles do we want to focus on
        - Which tables – and relations.
    - **Comments from NJ** – NJ didn't use CEDS for K-12 – it was overkill – because it was designed for federal government reporting
        - i. Postsecondary data reporting is through IPEDS, but IPEDS not a data model – states that report on behalf of institutions – may be a starting place
    - **Comment from IA** – CEDS did not map well to IA data so abandoned

- **Are there other models?**
    - T3 innovation network – relevant on
    - Ed-Fi (NJ) ; OH has used to for dashboarding
        - Limited set of tables
    -

- **Capture thought cloud**
    - TANF – Chapin Hall data model
    - Which data model
        - CEDS, IPEDS EdFI
    - Data Structure
        - Relationship
    - Tables

- **Activity**

- o Mapping to each state (focusing on tables)
    - Iterative process
    - Examples of others
- o Agency barriers to sharing data within states
- o Data quality review – metadata – or because of business processes
    - QA report that the states review
    - Add in data element – put flag for not yet verified
    - Core validated data file
    - Having standardized controls that we all agree on;
- o Focus on what tables make sense
    - E.g. OH doesn't look at teachers because there is a requirement to get SSN approval even though certification info is available – matching to wage records
    - Interest because of retirements; overproducing some teachers and under producing others
- o **Comment from Iowa** – enter in all agency data that will flow into common data model within the system

- **Remaining questions**
    - o How do we communicate
    - o Disclosure Review review process – how do you operationalize that at scale?
        - Decentralized
        - Who does that review`
- **Yvette** (NASWA) – consider multi-state disclosure
- **Access**
    - o Which kinds of users eligible to apply – grad student
    - o IRB approval
    - o Private companies – any rules
- **WICHE** –
    - o Umbrella agreement – different choices depending on researcher certification system; certain researchers preapproved to have access to tables rather than
    - o Tiered access – educational outcomes;
    - o No state identified
    - o Standardized handsoff umbrella long term goal
-
- **UI claims**
    - o Profiling models
- **Search and discovery**
    - o Sample code to pull UI for states – **Indiana/OH/IL**
    - o e.g. Andy/Ezra
- **Model legislation**
    - o Uniform Law Commission – set up legisliation – for financial accounting practices – go to website - privacy law.   Taking language of CIPSEA; ACT is in Iowa – privacy law

3. Projects

Discussion Leader: George Putnam
Notes compiled by George Putnam and Ethan Joseph

Goals: To increase understanding of the following:

- in/out flows with regard to urban rural & metro area
- Equity
- MSAs employment sharing
- Migration, including metrics, mapping, and visualization, to create an analytical framework
- Quick wins
- Create proof of concept for health, human services, and corrections agents and new states

Iowa – notes importance of prioritization, given people currently at the table, to generate buy-in

Proposed Collaborative Projects

1. Cross-state record linkage and population migration

- Short-term: investigate education and workforce transitions of post-secondary graduates using current Collaborative states
- Longer-term: expand analysis to vocational training graduates, non-completers and other populations of interest; outreach to adjoining states not in Collaborative to expand the scope of origin and destination

2. Cross-state record linkage and migration of Metropolitan area populations

- Short-term: investigate education and workforce transitions within interstate Metropolitan population and rural to urban population migration
- Longer-term: augment investigation with human services and corrections

3. Skill-based labor supply/demand

- Short-term: investigate teacher shortage (establish replicable research design and methodology)
- Longer-term: apply replicable research design and methodology to nursing shortage

4. Career technical education

- Short-term: education to workforce transition; OH working currently IN, KY in Cincinnati MSA
- Longer-term: expand scope to other origin and destination geographies; expand record linking capacity with the CTE population

Curriculum-related issues

- ADRF training

- o Conduct hackathon in ADRF environment
- o Provide more time between lectures for coding; how to mediate tension in skill sets of class participants; change from two 3-day sessions to three 2-day sessions (although state travel approval and costs for three 2-day sessions may be a problem)
- o Consider "franchising: to university partners; standardization of curriculum; create modules; augment standard training with topical modules (intro to statistical analysis, statistical inference …)

Request For Proposal

- Prioritize Collaborative policy and research agenda to implement projects; ADRF priorities regulate access
- RFP must be specific concerning value-add to Collaborative; producing product/service for Collaborative stakeholders and/or customers

Cost recovery

- Access for state partners covered within contracts; third-party researchers have to build ADRF cost recovery into funder request
- Cost recovery- what are the different models for cost recovery; OH model for base cost and additional cost for data manipulations; RDC model for charging access
- Where does the money land (allocation to Collaborative and socialize cost recovery among partners or allocation to specific state agency)
- Need to consider under governance

Other Questions

- Enhance UI Wage Records with place of work- lend Collaborative support to NASWA effort (coordinate with Yvette)
- Do we continue to call ourselves the MidWest Collaborative or something else to indicate geographic relevance beyond a single region?