#### Kansas Data Collection Concerns

**By Paul Schwartz** 

## Agenda

- Vulnerability of electronic data
- \* Demonstrate the number of attacks
- \* Emphasize the value of children's information
- \* What data are the schools collecting?

### Data security and privacy

- \* In our world today we assume we have a level of data security and privacy.
- \* As adults we regularly turn over data to companies and organization and it's protected.
- \* Examples:
  - \* HIPAA (health data)
  - \* PCI (credit / debit card data)
  - \* FFIEC (financial data loans mortgages etc)
  - \* SAR/OX (publicly traded companies data)

#### The value of Data

#### \* ITWorld says:

- \* A survey by Unbound ID and Compass Intelligence reveals that executives would be willing to pay up to \$124 per head to get their hands on your personal information or about 100 times more than they're willing to pay for anonymized data.
- \* FTC Testifies on Children's Identity Theft:
  - \* "Protecting consumers especially vulnerable consumers such as children against identity theft and its consequences is a critical component of the Commission's consumer protection mission."

### Identity Theft

- \* According to the FTC:
  - \* "Recent studies suggest child identity theft is more prevalent than even identity theft against adults," said Toporoff, an attorney in the FTC's Bureau of Consumer Protection. "Children are being targeted because their credit history is nonexistent. That makes them very attractive to organized crime and other thieves."

#### Fire Eye

- \* FireEye, a leader in providing cyber security solutions, protects the most valuable assets in the world from those who have them in their sights.
- \* The FireEye Global Defense Community includes more than 2,500 customers across 65 countries, including over 150 of the Fortune 500.
- \* https://www.fireeye.com/cyber-map/threat-map.html

### Fire Eye Cyber Threat Map



- \* Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS)
  - \* http://community.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=2508















This resource serves as the KIDS Collections data dictionary.

#### This document contains:

- · Formatting requirements for SIS Collection Export Batch Files including the header and trailer record requirements
- Definitions and permitted values for all data elements collected via KIDS
- · References to supporting resources

#### This document does not include:

- · Collection specific requirements and recommendations, see the KIDS Submission Detail Documents
- KIDS Collection edit checks, see the KIDS Business Rules
- Information about KIDS Reports, see the Report Descriptions on the KIDS website

#### Header Record Layout

Field Ref#	Header Record Layout			
	Field	Maximum Length	Format Details	Comments/Values
H1	Record Type	2	TH	Must contain the characters "TH"
H2	Extract Date	10	mm/dd/yyyy	Date export file was created. Month and day must include any leading zeroes.
H3	Extract Time	8	hh:mm:ss	Time export file was created.
H4	Transmission ID	10	999999999	An arbitrary number. Must match the Transmission ID in the Trailer record.
H5	Version	10	10.0	Always "10.0". This version number differentiates the possible versions of the file structure.
Н6	Delimiter Character	25	delimiter=c	Should be the character literal or the hex representation of the delimiter that is used in the detail records (either tab or comma). For a comma delimiter, the character literal would be 'delimiter=,' and the hex representation would be 'delimiter=0X2C'. For a tab delimiter, it is recommended that the hex representation be used. In that case, it would be 'delimiter=0X09'.

D33 Primary Disability Code  2 Alpha ASGT, ENRL, TEST, EOYA, MILT, EXIT	that the student receives special education service area of disability.  Allowable values are:  Blank = None  AM = Autism  DB = Deaf/blindness  DD = Developmentally delayed (ages 3-9 only)  ED = Emotional disturbance  HI = Hearing impairment	Act (IDEA-Part B), which document ces. Report the student's primary  LD = Specific learning disability MD = Multiple disabilities OH = Other health impairment OI = Orthopedic impairment SL = Speech/language disability TB = Traumatic brain injury VI = Visual impairment
---	---	--

# Are there safety or security procedures for this data?

- \* In our world today we assume we have a level of data security and privacy.
- \* As adults we regularly turn over data to companies and organization and it's protected.
- \* Examples: HIPAA (health data)
- \* PCI (credit / debit card data)
- \* FFIEC (financial data loans mortgages etc)
- \* SAR/OX (publicly traded companies data)

There are No Standards, No Annual audits, No Security checks on our children's data!

#### Proof of Data Collection for Profit

**SafeGov<sup>a</sup>** 

Promoting trusted and responsible cloud computing for government

About us

Home

Cloud Economics

**Best Practices** 

Security

Privacy

Tags: Experts' Corner Privacy Education

#### Google admits data mining student emails in its free education apps



by Jeff Gould, Peerstone Research Friday, January 31, 2014









307

When it introduced a new privacy policy designed to improve its ability to target users with ads based on data mining of their online activities, Google said the policy didn't apply to students using Google Apps for Education. But recent court filings by Google's lawyers in a California class action lawsuit against Gmail data mining tell a different story: Google now admits that it does data mine student emails for ad-targeting purposes outside of school, even when ad serving in school is turned off, and its controversial consumer privacy policy does apply to Google Apps for Education.

#### Proof of Data Collection for Profit

In a remarkable pretrial document filed by Google's lawyers, Google explicitly admits for the first time that it scans the email of Google Apps for Education users for ad-serving purposes even when ad serving is turned off. The issue at stake in the case is whether Google has properly informed its users and obtained their consent for data mining and ad serving in Gmail and, by extension, in Google Apps for Education. In the filing in question Google's lawyers seek to prove that email users must have consented to Google's email scanning practices – if only "impliedly" – because these practices have been widely discussed in the press and can thus be considered to be universally known. The lawyers seek to establish this point by supplying a long list of published articles that discuss these practices.

# Questions?

