The meeting began with one representative from each state discussing the specific data elements and derivations that would be needed in the exchange on Monday, January 9th. This work fed into the meeting of the whole group that began the following morning.

**January 10**
The group spent considerable time on making relatively fine-grained adjustments to the MOA without really changing anything fundamental. Some state-by-state adjustments were discussed, i.e., Hawaii and Idaho want to supply the labor data via the SLDS housed within the education agency.

Following the MOA discussion, the group took up the question of what data elements are necessary to collect and to derive centrally. This built off of prior conversations in October and off of the data element derivation subgroup that met on Monday. By and large, the larger group accepted the judgment of the subgroup, but there were discussions of note on a few variables, including

- Full-time status: the issue is whether to capture an integer for credits attempted in order to derive full-time status and whether to do it by term or somehow for the entire academic year, and then how to do it given that students’ enrollment intensity varies with time. It has analytical implications because policymakers may have different expectations for student success among those who are consistently enrolled full-time than for part-time students, and they may be concerned about the share of students who are part-time or who are full-time only by cobbling together courses from multiple institutions. Also, since the data being supplied are usually kept in term-by-term fields, the exchange’s ability to provide this information back to them makes most sense if we do so on a term-by-term basis, as opposed to one academic year.

- Another key issue is deriving flags to cut the cohort file, because as data are added over time to the collection, the size of the cohort (and therefore the denominator) will be unstable. This is a dicey messaging issue.

- Degree/certificate-seeking flag: WICHE proposed a behavioral definition based on credits attempted, but the discussion also raised the question of whether expanding that definition based on specific course-taking might be useful, i.e., any math course. WICHE’s proposed definition also added students who wound up with a degree to the flag, even if they wouldn’t have earned it through the behavioral definition.

- There was a lengthy discussion of how “dirty” the UI wage record data can be and some descriptions of what analysts have been doing about it. WICHE will have to try to benefit from their experiences when the time comes to do aggregate reporting. One particularly interesting discussion centered around whether to exchange an employer ID (one that wouldn’t identify the actual employer) that would allow states to try to get at questions of whether individuals changed employers in order to get a higher wage or immediately following completion of their education. Lots of issues were involved with this proposed field, but since it was not sounding onerous to the labor agencies to populate it, it could be
exchanged and analyzed by states as they saw fit, although probably not by WICHE at the aggregate level.

- Labor agencies were unwilling/unable to provide data on who received UI benefits, so those individuals will be mixed up in the data file without a flag to distinguish them.

**January 11**

The group was invited to provide feedback on the brief discussion document on long-term governance distributed in advance of the meeting.

One additional point is that the governance model we wind up developing shouldn’t be unwieldy for new states to join, or sign on to. WICHE has a working model for putting that together in WALF and WACCAL, in which WICHE serves as the secretariat. Or it could be a separate 501(c)3. Or the Smarter Balanced consortium also provides a useful model.

Although the group has worked to develop the MOA, once we began the governance discussion, the group considered the following four architectural/governance options with sustainability in mind:

1. a database for all human capital activity in the participating states?
2. a service provided by the NSC using its data under an agreement with states (and possibly the institutions who supply the data to the NSC), with periodic supplements from the LMI agencies?
3. a WRIS-like model with just the crosswalking identifying information being held in state agencies in the states?
4. a flexible architecture with business rules for repeatedly creating cohorts to answer specific questions, either case-by-case or for standard periodic reports?

WICHE will consider these alternatives and the tradeoffs associated with them, which will provide background for further conversations. The group then began to outline the roles and responsibilities of a governing body.

**Roles and responsibilities of the Governing Body**

- Managing the Exchange
  - Enforcing responsibilities
- Procurement
  - “Agent” for convening the governing body
  - Matchmaking vendor
  - Additional data providers (i.e., NSC main collection, WRIS, Census LED, etc.)
  - Analytical resources
- Communications
  - How do we release data reports using data from the exchange? Both “centrally” and as states employ their own “matched” data?
- Membership (by state)
- Fiduciary responsibilities
• Fiscal – how do we get the money and how do we spend it?
  • Legal

• Data governance
  o Schedule of data exchange (potentially different elements need to be collected on
different schedules in order for them to be most useful for some of the agencies)
  o Fielding data requests (overlap with revenue-generation to charge requestors for
the data)

• Rules of engagement
  o Representation among member state agencies
  o Rules for making decisions, i.e., quorum

• Analytical direction
  o What we do
    ▪ Analyses focus on mobility among states and on the transition points
      between states and sectors
  o What we don’t do, or what we intentionally leave to the states to do for themselves
    ▪ Data exchange doesn’t meddle within state agencies' areas of responsibility,
      i.e., examine the productivity of a specific institution within SBCTC
    ▪ State agencies have access to multi-state data for their own analyses

Other valuable observations:

• For the exchange to be most valuable to K-12, exchange and matchmaking has to be done
  more frequently than annually, in order to know where “alleged” dropouts are going. Is
  there room for a state K-12 agency to send along more student data (i.e., a cohort of 9th
  graders) to have them matched through the pilot, if they wanted to?

• What are FERPA’s limitations on keeping (and adding to data)? In other words, how feasible
  is it to keep the data indefinitely, since reassembling data is a huge cost and sustainability
  problem.