

**Early Childhood Cabinet**

**Data Systems**

Notes October 4th, 2011

9:00-11:00 AM

Linda Goodman co-chair	x	Beth Petroni-DCF	x
Sheryl Horowitz – co-chair	x	Lori Schroeder-DSS	x
Sherry Linton – staff	x	Sherri Sutera-Child Care 211	x
Marcie Cavacas-DPH	x	Sue Wilson-Charts A Course	x
Diane Murphy-SDE	x	Anne Littlefield-Privacy Expert	
		Claudia Sawyer-Charts A Course	x
		Matt Storeygard-XSector	x

Topics of Discussion	Recommendations	Action Steps
<p><b><u>Cabinet Updates</u></b></p> <p>Linda updated group on the status of the RTT-ELC application process as it relates to the group, including the need to finalize the Data Table A(1)13, review the outline of the high quality plan being proposed in section E(2) and finalize the Logic Model to precede the narrative of that section.</p>	<p>Group reminded that the depth and breadth of each Agency’s role in partnering to develop an interoperable state data system will be outlined in the RTT-MOU developed amongst the Commissioners of the agencies and the Governor’s Office.</p>	<p>The MOU from the Data Workgroup will be embedded into the greater MOU of agencies for the RTT application.</p>



<p>Clarification offered regarding the request for access to data by local communities. The data will be aggregate and de-identified. The request was initiated by the CT Data Collaborative who wants to ensure that Discovery Collaboratives involved in community planning have access to local data.</p> <p><b><u>High Quality Plan Review</u></b></p> <p>Emphasis placed on the point that establishing a common id is only step one in the process of linking data systems.</p>	<p>The data to be shared need to be already existing data sets, not new data points to be created in the system.</p> <p>An interoperable data system should include,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard reports, cleaned up data, clarity on who has right to what data, mapping all the current work going on re: data systems and matching timelines, determining how data will be displayed, articulating the difference between live data and data reports, developing common format and clear articulation of the responsibilities of every agency as it relates to building out their current data systems.</li> <li>• Establish Common Naming Conventions, aligned to standards guidance from the National Information Exchange Model (NEIM) and/or Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)</li> <li>• Point made that there is need for a standard governance structure. Suggestion made that the Office of Policy and Management (OPM) may</li> </ul>	<p>The Data Collaborative will be presenting at the November meeting of this Workgroup.</p> <p>Need to educate non-specialists, on issues such as why data often does not match cross agency.</p> <p>CT staff have been involved in the review and feedback process on a national education data model being developed by CCSSO and the National Center on Education Statistics (NCES).</p>
---	--	---

<p>Group reviewed Key Activities of the High Quality Plan. The following thoughts emerged from that discussion,</p> <p>Who will be utilizing data and what info is needed governs the timeline?</p> <p>As we look to make data system changes, we should be cognizant of the fact that currently a process is in place which allows for recommended changes in data fields annually by Superintendents.</p> <p>An in depth discussion of the Activities and Timelines took place, in attempt to frame each activity with the big picture goals.</p>	<p>need to be the one to govern, and guide DOS-BEST through this welding process.</p> <p>Linking data systems and determining a timeline requires responses to questions of what, why, and how.</p> <p>Governance of the work in E(2) should at a minimum involve the information technologist (IT) that can respond to the questions of how, and a policy person to ensure the process responds to the purpose of collecting the data. (Capacity to do this must be at the forefront of our thinking).</p> <p>The recommendation was made to review the activities within the following context,</p> <p>Business Requirement Planning which could take approximately one year.</p> <p>Design of the Architecture that takes approximately six months, and development of codes with testing, taking an additional six months.</p> <p>The final step would be going live.</p> <p>Suggestion was made to have the process of Business Requirement Planning mirror Joint</p>	
---	--	--

<p>Finally the Governance discussion was revisited, with group members stressing the importance of having key policy and business partners(data system owners) at the table who have sufficient authority to be decision makers.</p> <p><b><u>Grant Budget</u></b></p> <p>Agencies asked to consider the budget impact of their participation in the work plans of the grant, including the repurposing of funds and in-kind contributions.</p>	<p>Application Development Sessions (JAD), where decision makers meet strictly to make decisions around data systems work.</p>	
---	--	--

Next Meeting November 18<sup>th</sup>, 9:30am, location TBA.