

Common Identifier Subcommittee Meeting Summary

May 7, 2020

This document provides a summary of key points that emerged from a half-day meeting. More information about the meeting, including the draft Request for Information (RFI), the PowerPoint, and a meeting recording are available at <https://cadatasystem.wested.org/meeting-information/common-identifier-subcommittee>.

The Common Identifier Subcommittee will help to design the technical process that will be used to link student records across partner entities. The May 2020 meeting had the following goals:

- Ground the work of this committee by providing an update on the recommended scope for phase one of the California data system
- Provide information on other statewide projects that also entail master data management (MDM) components
- Edit the draft Request for Information (RFI)
- Identify ways to alert potential respondents

The following representatives attended the meeting:

Jonathan Chillas, Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities/National University; Scott Valverde, Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education; Michele Perrault, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing; Todd Hoig, California Community College Chancellor's Office; Jayson Hunt & Akhtar Khan, California Department of Social Services; Ben Allen, Channa Hewawickrama & Jerry Winkler, California Department of Education; Janet Buehler & Brenda Bridges Cruz, California Department of Technology; Jennifer Schwartz, California Health and Human Services Agency; Amy Fong & Greg Scull, California School Information Services; Jeff Whitney, California State University Chancellor's Office; Joseph Hackbarth, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; Patrick Perry, California Student Aid Commission; Dan Lamoree, Education Results Partnership; Amy Faulkner, Employment Development Department; Eric Goodman, University of California Office of the President; Paco Martorell, University of California, Davis; John Prindle, University of Southern California.

Workgroup Update

The meeting opened with the facilitator providing an update on decisions made by the California Cradle-to-Career Workgroup on their April 28 meeting and answering clarifying questions from subcommittee members.

Guest Speaker: Joy Bonaguro, Government Operations

Joy Bonaguro, who is the new Chief Data Officer, provided some contextual information about other efforts underway to build MDM solutions. First, she noted that the California Health and Human Services agency (CHHS) had developed a proof of concept with the University of Southern California that offers some early lessons on ways to conduct person matching and to make information available. Second, she described a procurement process currently underway to create a Homeless Data Information System (HDIS) that will match records from continuum of care centers with other CHHS information and provide information to both researchers and service providers. Vendors are being asked

to demonstrate a proof of concept this summer, and the full system is slated to be completed by the end of 2020.

In considering ways these efforts could be coordinated, Joy Bonaguro urged the subcommittee members to include lessons learned from CHHS [note: representatives from the CHHS effort sit on the subcommittee]. She also recommended that subcommittee members meet with the vendors developing proofs of concept for HDIS over the summer, to discuss whether that technology could be scaled for the Cradle-to-Career system. The following subcommittee members volunteered:

- Adam Dondro, CHHS
- Eric Goodman, UCOP
- Jerry Winkler, CDE

One participant asked whether block chain technology was being considered, but Joy Bonaguro indicated that it was not a specific criterion for the procurement.

Edits to the Draft RFI

Next, the group reviewed the draft RFI and made suggestions for edits. For example, one participant requested that the RFI ask whether respondents can create matches using unique identifiers, such as birth record identifiers created by the California Department of Public Health. Some comments focused on spelling out acronyms or avoiding acronyms because those specific initials are also used in other contexts. This led to a recommendation that the RFI include a glossary of terms. The subcommittee also recommended adding questions relating to planned changes in the scope of available services and the respondent's financial stability.

The group discussed whether specific documentation related to FERPA compliance should be included, but determined this was not necessary. FERPA issues will be handled as part of the permission process and enshrined in data sharing agreements that are being developed by the Legal Subcommittee.

The group also determined that requiring an ISO 9001 certification, as a measure of quality management, was not needed in the RFI phase. One participant noted that if this is included in the RFP, a more general category should be explored, as there are other ways that well-defined processes and controls can be certified. Another suggested that this question be brought to the Technology & Security Subcommittee when they review the RFI.

Next, the participants broke into small groups to edit specific portions of the RFI questionnaire. This led to several suggested changes, including:

System Features

- Stress California's cloud first policy and remove references to hardware/software
- Specify the number of likely users
- For single sign on and multifactor authentication, use InCommon and Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML) as examples
- Note that the data dictionary/business glossary needs to track versions of data elements over time

Data Loading and Validation

- When the RFI is reviewed by the Technology & Security Subcommittee, determine whether additional language is needed about API functionality
- Provide more specificity about survivorship and differentiate survivorship as pertains to a golden record versus other information stored in the system
- Edit the list in section 3.3 to include unmerging capabilities

Match Process

- Indicate the method used for matching (hierarchical or probabilistic)
- Ask whether the method for how records are matched can be audited, to ensure that the state does not end up with a proprietary solution that limits future options
- Determine whether the solution creates a golden record

In addition, the small groups identified topics that should be addressed in the RFP stage, or in other facets of planning, including:

- Ensure that the match process can incorporate information from birth records
- Specify that hosting must reside in the US and include California's policy in the document
- Determine how users will access the system (i.e., desktop, mobile)
- Specify API requirements for partner entities

The subcommittee requested that an edited RFI be sent back out to the group, to provide further review and clarification. A revised version will be sent out on May 8, and edits will be due on May 15. While all subcommittee members are welcome to provide comments, the following individuals confirmed that they would be part of the editing team:

- Ben Allen, CDE
- Patrick Perry, CSAC
- Jennifer Schwartz, CHHS
- Greg Scull, CSIS
- Jeff Whitney, CSU

Subcommittee members were encouraged to proactively work with their colleagues to review the updated draft, once comments have been added by the Technology & Security Subcommittee, during the window of May 20-27. Workgroup members will vote on whether to approve the RFI on May 28.

Communicating the Opportunity

The group briefly brainstormed vendors and partner entities that would be strong candidates to respond to the RFI. Both CDE and CHHS indicated they would be interested in responding. Some vendors were identified, and one participant suggested asking the same question of the Technology & Security Subcommittee. Brenda Bridges Cruz from CDT noted that she would determine whether partner entities could send out alerts about the RFI.

Evaluating Responses

When asked about whether this subcommittee should convene again in the fall to review responses, all expressed support via a poll. The meeting will be held on September 1 from 9:30am to 2:30pm. In

advance of this meeting, the facilitation team will develop a draft evaluation rubric, which the group will be able to comment on in advance of meeting.