

Technology & Security Subcommittee Meeting Summary

July 14, 2020

This document provides a summary of key points that emerged over the course of a half-day meeting. More information about the meeting, including the materials, the PowerPoint, and a meeting recording are available at <https://cadatasystem.wested.org/meeting-information/technology-security-subcommittee>.

The July 2020 meeting had the following goals:

- Update on key decisions
- Refine the intake architecture for the managing entity
- Finalize the security framework
- Provide input on the rubric for the Master Data Management Request for Information

The following representatives attended the meeting:

Formeka Dent, Antelope Valley Union High School District; Helen Norris, Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities; Clarissa Serrato-Chavez, Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education; Andy Manguia, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing; Daryl Lal, California Community College Chancellor's Office; Rodney Okamoto, California Department of Education; Karissa Vidamo, California Department of Social Services; Janet Buehler & Michele Robinson, California Department of Technology; Dan Lamoree, Education Results Partnership; Adam Dondro & Lloyd Indig, California Health and Human Services Agency; Amy Fong & Greg Scull, California School Information Services; Subash D'Souza, California State University Chancellor's Office; Gurinder Bains, California Student Aid Commission; Todd Ibbotson, Employment Development Department; Jenni Abbott, Modesto Junior College; Chris Furguele, Matthew Linzer & Hooman Pejman, University of California Office of the President

Workgroup Updates

The meeting opened with the facilitator providing an update on decisions made by the Cradle-to-Career Workgroup at the June 30 meeting, including adopting a vision, mission, and strategic objectives for phase one, as well as expanding and approving the technical and legal framework. Then the group reviewed the draft scope of responsibilities for the managing entity and a flowchart showing how data would be processed in the system.

Subcommittee members asked clarifying questions including:

- *What is the relationship between the P20W data set and the public dashboards and query builder tool?* The P20W Data Set will be created to populate the public dashboards and query builder tool.
- *How will employment and earnings data be matched by the Employment Development Department (EDD)?* Currently, the Legal Subcommittee is working with EDD to draft a data sharing agreement between EDD and the managing entity that would allow for the creation of the P20W Data Set (and thus the public dashboards and query builder tools) and the Partner Research Data Set. In this model, data including names and social security numbers will be provided to EDD to conduct a match and EDD will load matched data to a secure cloud repository that can be accessed by the managing entity. A policy decision is needed to determine whether employment data for individual

partner entities would be processed through the Cradle-to-Career system, or if each partner entity would continue to maintain separate agreements and payment structures with EDD to address their specific needs.

- *How will payment be handled, particularly for EDD, which must follow federal guidelines to recoup costs?* The planning process will include the development of a payment policy.
- *Which entities would have access to the secure repositories?* Only the partner entity populating the repository and the managing entity.
- *How will the master data management solution index available data and how will sensitive data be flagged?* The Legal Subcommittee will create a draft classification policy, which will be reviewed by the Technology & Legal Subcommittee. Additional specifics cannot be determined until a master data management solution is selected.

These questions helped to clarify ways that the diagram could be amended to provide greater clarity (see page 4 for an updated version) and surfaced the importance of clarifying how requests from partner entities to EDD would be handled, beyond the P20W and Partner Research Data Sets.

Security Framework

Next, the group discussed a draft security framework that had been developed by a homework team made up of Technology & Security Subcommittee members, which will be used by the managing entity to create the blueprint for how to address security concerns. One homework team member indicated that the proposal provides a clear and comprehensive listing of frameworks and standards that will help to ensure adequate security controls. One subcommittee member clarified that it will be important to ensure the cloud provider adheres to these policies, and another suggested that the legal agreement with managing entity require that it ensures the mandated provisions are implemented. The subcommittee voted unanimously to adopt the proposed security framework, with Subash D'Souza of the California State University Chancellor's Office noting that it will be important to have a thorough review of the technical implementation, once the data system has been developed, to ensure no details have been missed.

Master Data Management (MDM) Request for Information (RFI)

The subcommittee next reviewed a draft approach for reviewing responses to the RFI, which was developed by a homework team made up of both Common Identifier Subcommittee and Technology & Security Subcommittee members. Homework team members noted that the process can help clarify what is most important among the many desired features, which can help to inform the requirements for a later Request for Proposals (RFP). The rubric will also help the subcommittee to craft a recommendation to the legislature about possible solutions for assigning unique identifiers to individuals. Other subcommittee members asked questions, which clarified:

- Entities that do not respond to the RFI will still be eligible to respond to the RFP
- The RFP may not require all options listed in the RFI, based on what seems most feasible, with the caveat that some eligible entities may not submit a response to the RFI
- The cost estimates will be broad, but may help to better understand the necessary budget to build to the desired specifications
- While a data dictionary is desired, and definitions for the public-facing tools will be crafted by the Data Definitions Subcommittee, the RFI does not require the ability to provide a data dictionary

Several subcommittee members volunteered to serve as readers for the responses: Jenni Abbott, Modesto Junior College; Subash D'Souza, CSU; Barney Gomez & Alex Jackl, CCCCCO; Matthew Linzer, UC; Helen Norris, AICCU; and Michele Robinson, CDT.

Post Meeting Note: After the meeting, a question about the rubric was submitted to CDT, regarding whether readers would review responses even if minimum security, accessibility, and features were not addressed in the response. CDT clarified that all responses will be read and complete rubric responses documented, whether or not the response provides information on minimum qualifications prioritized by the subcommittee. In addition, the rank ordering of respondents was removed from the rubric. Please see attached for an updated rubric, dated July 21, 2020.

Next Steps

The group committed to provide additional written feedback to the draft rubric (note this deadline was extended to by July 28 given CDT's clarification about reviewing all responses).

The August 4 meeting has been canceled.

Additional meeting dates and topics will include:

- September 1, 2020: Review RFI Responses
- October 6, 2020: Service Level Agreement with the Managing Entity and Operational Tools
- November 19, 2020: Data Classification Policy, Deidentification Policy, Personally Identifiable Information Definition, and Common Identifier Guidelines
- December 3, 2020: Data System Architecture
- January 19, 2021: ETL Requirements and RFP Specifications
- February 16, 2021: Public Interface Tools
- March 18, 2021: Permission Protocol and Security Authentication Methodology
- April 27, 2021: Data Quality Management

