# **Privacy and Cloud Computing in Public Schools**

#### Research Team

#### Joel R. Reidenberg

Microsoft Visiting Professor of Information Technology Policy, Princeton Stanley D. and Nikki Waxberg Chair and Professor of Law, Fordham Academic Study Director

#### N. Cameron Russell.

Executive Director, Fordham CLIP

#### Jordan Kovnot

Privacy Fellow and Interim Director (through July 2013), Fordham CLIP

#### **Thomas Norton**

Project Fellow, Fordham CLIP

#### **Ryan Cloutier**

Project Fellow, Fordham CLIP

#### Daniela Alvarado

Dean's Fellow, Fordham CLIP



LHCSS Briefing Tarrytown, NY January 10, 2014

## **Introduction**

- •Private vendors are gearing cloud services specifically for the education sector to advance data-driven decision-making and IT based learning opportunities
- •Cloud services in K-12 schools are increasingly becoming contentious as a result of privacy issues
- The treatment of privacy when K-12 public schools transfer or share student information with cloud service providers is generally unknown to the public

## **Goals**

- Provide national picture of cloud computing in public schools
- Assess how public schools address FERPA, COPPA and PPRA requirements as well as generally-accepted privacy principles in their cloud service agreements
- Make recommendations on the protection of privacy that address any problems identified by the research

## <u>Methodology</u>

- National Sample
  - •Selection of Districts: 2 large, 2 mid-size, 2 small from each U.S. census geographic division (54 total)
  - Document Collection
- Phone calls
- Open public record act requests
- •Web sweeps
  - Documents Sought
- Agreements involving transfer of student data
- Computer use policies for teachers/staff
- Notices to parents about student privacy
- Notices to parents about cloud computing services
- Data Set
  - •Respondents: 23 districts
  - Data set: 20 districts

## **Methodology**

- Analytic Approach
  - Checklist based on statutory obligations + FIPS norms
  - Research team coded documents based on checklist
  - Purpose: general assessment, not compliance audit of any responding district nor any vendor

## **General Findings**

- 95% of districts outsource student data
- Wide diversity of cloud services in use across every type of school
- Typology of cloud services
  - Data analytics functions
  - •Student reporting functions
  - Guidance functions
  - Special school functions
  - •Hosting/Maintenance/Back Up functions
  - •Classroom functions
  - Unidentifiable functions

## **General Findings**

- Weak transparency
  - Absence of publicly available information
  - Districts failed to respond to public records requests
  - •55% of districts did not provide parental notice; only 25% addressed cloud computing explicitly
- Obstacles to Public Disclosure
  - Ignorance of district's use of technology
  - Attitude

"I have real problem [sic] with you using this law to complete a research project ... thank you for your abuse of the system and wasting our time"

Letter from Superintendent (Western Region School District) to Professor Reidenberg

- Dubious motives
  - •High fee request
  - •Illegal confidentiality clause in contract

## **General Findings**

## •Weak Data Governance and Contracting Practices

- Poor in-house understanding of student privacy implications
- •20% of districts had no policies addressing teacher use of IT
- •Vendor agreements allow sharing to recipients without privacy policies
- •Agreements allowed for vendors to make unilateral modification without notice

#### Poor Documentation

•Rampant gaps in contract documentation, e.g. unexecuted agreements, missing appendices describing privacy policies, etc.

## **Analysis of Agreements**

- Prevalence
- Contracts
- Types of student identifying data transferred to vendors
- Data control: sharing, mining, and re-disclosure
- Parental notice, consent and access to collected data
- COPPA obligations
- Data Security

## Analysis of Agreements

#### Prevalence

Data analytics functions: 25% of districts

Student reporting functions: 25% of districts

Guidance functions: 25% of districts

Special school functions: 25% of districts

**Hosting/Maintenance/Back Up functions: 50% of districts** 

Classroom functions: 50% of districts

Unidentifiable functions: 25% of all agreements

### Contracts

Attribute	Frequency Weakest for Privacy	Frequency Strongest for Privacy
Fully executed agreement	50% (Guidance)	100% (Analytics; Student Reporting)
Incomplete agreements	55% (Special functions)	17% (Guidance)
Right to audit and inspect vendors' compliance	0% (Guidance; Special functions)	33% (Analytics)

Types of student identifying data transferred

Attribute	Frequency Weakest for Privacy	Frequency Strongest for Privacy
Specifies any type of data	11% (Special functions)	83% (Guidance)

### Data Control

Frequency Weakest for Privacy	Frequency Strongest for Privacy
0% (Student reporting, Hosting, Classroom)	22% (Analytics)
33% (Special functions)	89% (Analytics)
0% (Analtyics, Student reporting, Special functions, Guidance)	7% (Hosting)
67% (Guidance)	11% (Analytics)
	for Privacy  0% (Student reporting, Hosting, Classroom)  33% (Special functions)  0% (Analtyics, Student reporting, Special functions, Guidance)

## • Parental Notice, Consent and Access

Attributes	Frequency Weakest for Privacy	Frequency Strongest for Privacy
Notice provided	0% (Guidance, Student Reporting)	36% (Classroom function)
Consent	0% (Student reporting)	41% (Classroom functions)
Access	0% (Student reporting)	17% (Guidance)

## COPPA Triggers

ency gest for cy
Hosting)
Classroom ons)

## Data Security

Attribute	Frequency Weakest for Privacy	Frequency Strongest for Privacy
Requirement for data deletion at end of contract	0% (Special functions)	67% (Analytics)
Requirement for data security	22% (Special functions)	78% (Analytics)
Requirement for data breach notification	0% (Special functions, Student Reporting, Guidance	13% (Hosting)

## **Recommendations**

### Transparency

- Existence and identity of cloud service providers should be available on district websites
- Notice to parents

### Contracting practices

- Districts need executed agreements
- Districts need complete documentation

#### Data Governance

- •Districts must establish policies and implementation plans for the adoption of cloud services by teachers and staff
- •Districts must address directly and publicly policies on use of student data for advertiser supported services when not prohibited by FERPA
- States and larger districts must have CPO

## **Recommendations**

#### Contract Terms

- Specification of the purpose of agreement and the authority to enter into the agreement
- Specification of the types of data transferred or collected
- Prohibition or limitation on re-disclosure of student data
- Prohibition or limitation on the sale or marketing of student information without express parental consent
- Assurance that districts have exclusive control over data access and mining
- Prohibition on new or conflicting privacy terms when parents are required to activate an account for their child
- Allocation of responsibilities for granting parental access and correction capabilities

## **Recommendations**

### •Contract Terms (continued)

- Specification of whether foreign storage and processing is allowed
- Specification of whether other gov't agences may have access
- Specification of data security and breach notification
- Prohibition on unilateral modifications
- Inclusion of a right for the district to audit/inspect vendors

### • Creation of a National Research Center and Clearinghouse

- Prepare acedemic and policy research
- Convene stakeholder workshops
- Draft model contract clauses, privacy notices and consent forms for common functions
- Create repository for research, model contracts, and policies