



RILDS

RHODE ISLAND LONGITUDINAL DATA SYSTEM

Rhode Island Longitudinal Data System Executive Governing Committee Minutes

Tuesday, October 24, 2023 – 2:00 PM

Zoom Meeting: <https://uri-edu.zoom.us/j/98999314324>

This meeting was RECORDED

Department of Administration, 4th floor Executive Conference Room
1 Capitol Hill, Providence, RI, 02908

COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Shannon **Gilkey** (RIOPC); Jonathan **Womer** (DOA) (arrived at 2:26 PM); Brian **Daniels** (OMB) (arrived at 2:27 PM); Matthew **Weldon** (DLT); Brian **Tardiff** (DOIT); and Angélica **Infante-Green** (RIDE), Dana **Brandt** (RILDS), and Rebecca **Lebeau** (OHHS delegate).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Ashley **Deckert** (DCYF)

GUESTS: Harris Hameed (DOIT); Kevin Simpson (OMB); Scott Gausland (RIDE); and Michael Matkowski (OMB).

STAFF: Kayla Weststeyn (OMB); and Kim Pierson (RILDS).

Meeting of the Rhode Island Longitudinal Data System Executive Committee was called to order by Co-Chair Gilkey at 2:07 PM EST.

- 1. WELCOME (Gilkey) - Gilkey** opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. He asked for a motion to accept the agenda.
MOTION: Brandt
SECOND: Tardiff
VOTING IN FAVOR: Gilkey, Infante-Green, Weldon, Tardiff, Lebeau and Brandt.
ABSENT: Daniels, Womer, and Deckert.
VOTING IN OPPOSITION: None
ABSTENTION: None
- 2. VOTE on adoption of minutes (Gilkey) - Gilkey** introduced the first order of business to adopt the September Executive Committee meeting minutes. **Gilkey** called for a motion to adopt the minutes.
MOTION: Weldon
SECOND: Tardiff
VOTING IN FAVOR: Gilkey, Infante-Green, Weldon, Tardiff, Lebeau and Brandt.
ABSENT: Daniels, Womer, and Deckert.
VOTING IN OPPOSITION: None
ABSTENTION: None
- 3. DISCUSSION of the IDS Report due Nov 1 to the Governor, House and Senate (Simpson) - Simpson** presented a 10-slide overview of the draft IDS Report which he described as currently 48 pages in length, including 8 recommendations and addressing all 9 requirements outlined in the legislation. The presentation highlighted the Rhode Island Longitudinal Data System (RILDS) Act that was signed into law on June 16, 2023 which moved RILDS from URI to OPC, provided general revenue funding for more flexible research, established governance structure, and requires the RILDS Executive Governing



Committee to provide a plan (IDS Report) to the Governor, the House and the Senate by November 1, 2023 on how to establish a statewide integrated data system.

The Report addresses 9 required elements as laid out in the RILDS Act legislation:

1. The role an IDS can play in improving program operations; reducing fraud, waste, and abuse; and establishing a culture of program evaluation.
2. Providing agencies with evaluation services and granting state analysts access to data based on their role.
3. Providing researchers with access to state data.
4. The importance of data privacy and security.
5. The importance of public transparency and the role of the state transparency portal.
6. Creation of a state chief data officer.
7. The role of data federation.
8. Sustainable funding and governance for the IDS.
9. The timeline for implementing the IDS.

This overview included a summary of the 8 recommendations included in the report:

1. Maintain Agency Autonomy while Facilitating Statewide Collaboration
2. Connect Existing IDSs via a Federated System
3. Establish a Structured IDS Governance
4. Launch a Data Center of Excellence at DOA
5. Develop a Sustainable Funding Model
6. Implement Robust Privacy and Security Policies
7. Prioritize Public Transparency
8. Establish a Realistic but Aggressive Timeline for Implementation

Gilkey opened the discussion of the proposed IDS Report due November 1.

Infante-Green requested more information on the Data Center of Excellence (COE) component of the recommendations and how it was developed in response to the legislation.

Tardiff responded that with the federated governance model a body is needed to organize the participating members of the federated infrastructure and computational governance. The intent behind the Center of Excellence, he explained, is to bring the participating parties to a common place within the Department of Administration which is where Enterprise Technology Strategy and Services (ETSS) lies and is legislatively mandated to direct all IT activities across state agencies.

Gilkey inquired if the ETSS was for IT generally or specifically for IT and a longitudinal data system.

Tardiff responded that it was from an IT standpoint. Tardiff explained that this is the body that the newly proposed Chief Data Officer (CDO) would oversee and pull all of the stakeholders together to develop the governance model.

Infante-Green requested more clarification on the additional layer that is being proposed. She stated that her understanding from the legislation was that RILDS was going to live at RIOPC, but she was confused by the addition of the new COE layer.

Gilkey responded that RIOPC was asked to do two things: (1) maintain their higher education data warehouse and (2) help with the operations of RILDS including their budget, staff and other logistics, but not data governance policy (outside their area of expertise). He stated that the legislation established the data system and the Executive Governing Committee to establish governance policy. He asked if the legislation left out the IT aspect of the work.



RILDS

REAL-TIME AND LONGITUDINAL DATA SYSTEM

Brandt commented that DOIT was included in the legislation and appointed on the Executive Governing Committee body and questioned if a new governance model and new system, as proposed in the IDS Report, was needed. She highlighted that RI has multiple data systems, alluding to a comment from the AISP presenter Amy Hawn Nelson at the September Executive Governing Committee meeting in where Hawn Nelson mentioned that RI was data system rich and urged against reinventing the wheel.

Weststeyn suggested that the legislation had two pieces that got merged together: (1) the movement of RILDS under RIOPC and (2) the instruction or direction from the legislature to contemplate the creation of a more centralized integrated data system – a larger IDS – to further drive data decision making throughout the state. She continued that there were two separate ideas, packaged in the same article, and the plan is representative of what that more centralized IDS would need to look like to move the state forward in a different way than we currently have. The two existing IDSs would continue to exist, not be merged into a centralized IDS, but would have their own governance and a broader strategic vehicle and governance to move everyone together in a collective way.

Gausland commented that the legislation established RILDS as the data system for the state. He expressed concern around creating a third data system and oversight body adding more work for each of the members around the table who were already appointed to sit on this board, as well as other data system governing boards, and would need to sit on an additional board to ensure agency representation. He also expressed concern around the new system's recommended appropriation which would then possibly compete with the two existing systems already integrating data in the state, RILDS and the EOHHS Ecosystem, and their respective appropriations.

Brandt inquired if the existing systems could be used to meet the needs of the state without creating a new third data system. She stated that based on the report it seemed that the two existing systems were already fulfilling many of the needs that the proposed data system was tasked to complete. She suggested that increased collaboration between the RILDS and the EOHHS Ecosystem may allow the state to accomplish its goals without building another system, additional infrastructure and more governance bodies.

Lebeau also echoed her concern stating that the new system may add to the collective burden without gaining much from the addition. She recommended instead for the state to collaborate in a different way and avoid adding the proposed additional layer.

Weststeyn stated that not creating a third system was an option and inquired for those in the room to explain why it hadn't been pursued previously. She described a history of inability for the two systems to work together and expressed hesitancy to not explore further the barriers that prevented the state from not achieving cross-agency outcomes already through the two existing systems.

Tardiff stated that the concerns expressed by Weststeyn were the genesis for the new federated system concept.

Gilkey inquired if Weststeyn was referring to the model as established by the RILDS Act legislation or the model as it existed prior to the legislation. **Weststeyn** responded: both.

Lebeau expressed the importance of the conversations that have been started between the two existing systems through the newly established RILDS governance structures in helping to think about things in a new cross-sector way than have been possible in the past. This is the first time they have been around the table together with others helping them to think about how to work collectively, she explained.



Infante-Green agreed and stated that she thought that the intention behind the legislation and governing body was the collaborative effort to bring agencies together and not to create another layer.

[The discussion paused to recap as Womer and Daniels arrived at the meeting].

Weststeyn asked Tardiff if he thought they should talk through the technical elements of the proposed federated system. **Tardiff** responded that it was more important to understand why the federated model was a component of the report. He emphasized that the federated architecture and governance was intended to be non-intrusive to current operations, but to act as an enabler to provide broader sharing of data and data systems.

Gausland expressed his support for the federated approach from a technical perspective, to facilitate linkages between the two existing systems, but his concern lies in where it lives, the creation of a separate entity, and newly proposed appropriations. He was under the understanding that the RILDS Executive Governing Committee would be the governing body of the statewide IDS.

Womer stated that this body may be the body that oversees.

Daniels added that this Executive Governing Committee lacks RIGIS and other agencies of EOHHS. He stated that the long term governance of IDS has not been determined. He proposed an open question to be answered: what do we do with IDS governance going forward? He mentioned one option may be to merge the two data systems governance into one governance body. He recommended that the near term area of focus, which he described as the purpose of the proposed CDO, is to figure out how data requests will be made, policies and procedures established, etc.

Brandt suggested that an area where large gains could be made would be on the relationship aspects and not only the technical aspects and building infrastructure.

Lebeau suggested joint quarterly governance meetings between the Ecosystem and the RILDS governing boards.

Gilkey asked if there was a possibility of merging the two governing boards.

Lebeau explained that it was possible and would benefit both systems to interact, learn from each other, bring their lawyers together, etc.

Gausland inquired if an extension could be requested of the legislature. **Womer** responded that it was a possibility.

Gausland raised concerns about the additional appropriations and governance bodies. This opened the discussion for further clarifications.

Womer clarified that the intention was that the entity would need governance, but it could possibly still be the Executive Governing Committee overseeing and not a new governing body.

Lebeau agreed that she read the draft report and came to the same conclusion as Gausland.

Gilkey added that different entities interpret the words “governance” and “coordination” very differently. He asked if this discussion was around governance as it pertains to policies and laws or as in coordination between RILDS and the Ecosystem.

Lebeau commented that potentially both were being discussed now.



Tardiff stated that the COE is intended for coordination and not governance with the CDO leading the coordination efforts and relationship building that is critical to moving the overall effort forward.

Brandt asked for clarification on whether the entities participating in the new COE were only agencies or if systems were included as well. She also highlighted the history of one-way data sharing as a barrier to cooperation between the systems and stated that if two-way sharing is part of the proposal then RILDS is willing to share with the Ecosystem in a partnership model if governance and other approvals clear the way first.

Lebeau explained that currently the Ecosystem is not set up to share identifiable data, but a partnership model could happen, with combined governance and legal teams conversing. It will require bringing many people into the room, she stated, but that she didn't have a sense that anyone would be opposed to that conversation happening.

Infante-Green questioned why this Committee wasn't the body providing the coordinating support.

Lebeau agreed and stated that the bigger question that they seem to be wrestling with is if RI actually needs another technical layer and to build more infrastructure or do we have what we need in the independent systems, but need to figure out how to make them talk.

Gilkey questioned if the two systems had the capacity to expand in this way on top of running their own integrated systems.

Daniels stated that if this body were to oversee a larger state IDS it would need to be broadened in membership to incorporate the entities that the Ecosystem also includes.

Lebeau stated that their board is large and made up of every agency and if the boards were combined then all the agencies would be represented. She said that getting representation on the boards felt like the easy part, but actually linking the data is a bit trickier.

Brandt proposed that linking the data isn't the toughest part. She suggested that the entity with the bulk of the data for each linkage, on a project by project basis, be the system that links. She explained that some states find federated linkage to be slower and weaker than centralized linkage. She supports maintaining two centralized systems which partner as needed.

Womer proposed keeping a federated model as an option to be used in other instances such as having updated datasets available to users in a federated way. **Tardiff** defined the model he described as the "publish and subscribe model" with a data catalog of available data sets.

Gilkey asked how to have the most streamlined approach for researchers to access data without a centralized place to ensure that the model currently being discussed met the request of the legislature. He questioned if it would be too confusing to go to two entities for data. He suggested options including a centralized portal, the COE concept, or the joint governing body as potential centralized gateways to RI integrated data access and stressed the importance of figuring that out in the plan.

Infante-Green highlighted all the legality around the use and sharing of the administrative data and recommended that the Committee consider having a dedicated lawyer in the plan.

Womer recommended that a working group should meet later in the week to review the report and work through the language that seems to have caused confusion within the Committee. He stated he would ask for an extension from the legislature if needed.



RILDS

RACON BROAD-BAND LONGITUDINAL DATA SYSTEM

Daniels asked for clarification on the components under review. He proposed long term governance as a main component. **Gilkey** suggested clarification around governance, coordination and capacity.

Womer mentioned the proposed addition of a lawyer. **Gausland** suggested that the report identify that the Executive Governing Committee oversees the COE. Many Committee members agreed, adding that with expanded membership the Committee could be repurposed to serve as a large governance body over both RILDS and the Ecosystem. **Daniels** suggested that the direction of the conversation points to a governance merger of the two systems, but that everyone on the Committee would need to be on board. And if so, then that recommendation should be included in the report. No one in the Committee had an objection as to why they wouldn't want to make the recommendation for a singular merged data governance board.

4. **ADJOURNMENT (Womer) - Womer** asked for a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: Daniels

SECOND: Gilkey

VOTING IN FAVOR: Gilkey, Infante-Green, Weldon, Tardiff, Daniels, Womer, Lebeau and Brandt.

ABSENT: Deckert

VOTING IN OPPOSITION: None

ABSTENTION: None

There being no further business the October 24, 2023 RILDS Executive Committee meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM EST.