**NNIPCamp Thursday Session 2**

**Integrated Data Systems**

Attendance

* Lisa
* Greg
* Erik
* Emily
* Cathie Walsh
* Rebecca Lee

Cathie: What was your impression of the session this morning?

Greg: For me this this is something I’m new at, but really immersed in. We’re working closely with the state, the state of Illinois is really striving to improve data. We’re trying tot ake what they have, make it available to researchers, and make applications for the data.

Cathie: Chapin has been doing this for a while.

Greg:Yes, I started this 6 months ago. Research can’t do what they do without us.

Erik: I’m more interested in the technology of it. I’m not sure what exactly this means. In our data library, we use a set, but there are different ones by fields. I’m not sure how these all relate.

Greg: Peopledata is very different than place data. A place is a plce, but people move, and we’re lucky if we have a name. There’s a lot more grey area.

Emily: I work for DHS and we house the data there, and we have external sources as well. WE get information from public benefits.

Erik: What’s the interface?

Emily: We have a few. Since we are a service organization we use it for case planning. We’re focusing on how to use this for integrated case planning. It’s primarily “operational data” for individuals. Schools districts, half of them we know about from other sources, and we have matching algorithm. All match by individual.

Cathie: Traditional data warehouses didn’t do the case management piece. It’s a whole file. How to access the data varies by field and location.

Erik: I have to call and get an extract.

Rebecca: For Rhode Island, it’s very case by case, but VA has robust interface for researchers to make requests. It really just depends.

Cathie: Ohio also trying to develop this. They have a state board with every head of the dept. on the board. Then they have a request process, and the board decides. The data will most likely be unlinked, or individual with an IRB.

Erik: WE have 2, but they’re only about social services. One takes imports from a variety of sources.

Emily: We’re just formulating ours. It’s nowhere near and IRB, but we give de-identified aggregate data. We’ve rarely said no.

Greg: Chapin traditionally only works with university resources. Record linking is the hardest thing even within the same data set. What algorithms do you (Emily) use? The most interesting thing that we’re doing, they brought together school district, preschools, pediatricians, and the goal is that every child with risk factors, and they will be allocated additional resources. They don’t discriminate on anything other than does this child needs help. We’re helping them link primary data to state resources. If this works, you could scale it to other medium size communities.

Emily: Our IDS revolved around early warning systems, and it’s pretty powerful. This past week, we ran a list of all kids that were becoming eligible for kindergarten to send advocates out.

Greg: Now solid evidence, that these early interventions have been very successful. If we can do this, this si perfect.

Cathie: Legislatures want to know what they’re getting out of it.

Greg: Working on data agreements in school districts.

Cathie: One reason Casey is so interested, the day has passed that every intervention needs a million dollar evaluation system. IDS’ are a way to do this without an expensive retrospective evaluation. IDS has real potential as a tool for evaluation. Working with 8-11 states on a set of shared measures using administrative data systems. They’re building it once, and want it to be part of the overall system. How are things being implemented across areas. Much interest in ways to partner with state systems and local evaluators.

Emily: We just put out RFP for helping people build tools for us. We do recidivism, DoL data. We’re investing to have an efficient longitudinal system.

Greg: That has to be done at a very painstaking level.

Cathie: These systems are not currently in place. I would love to hear your perspective of the added value of IDS. i.e. state dept data that you would like to have.

Emily: Yes, our education data. We started our first partnership with Pittsburgh public schools. It’s not an efficient way to do it. Every analysis we do our sample is cut by moving sample. We collect data for 10 districts.

Cathie: Erin ? was talking about this as an issue.

Rebecca: The challenge is that we’ve had a longstanding relationship with schools and states, but the providence data is much richer. We’re getting more push-back from Providence, and saying to get data from state. Our biggest struggle is convincing human services the value.

Emily: Our data being housed internal gives people much more confidence.

Rebecca: Some people really believe this is a govt function. Can work as an advantage or disadvantage.

I was curious to hear about people’s questions and concerns. Wage data?

Greg: We get wage data at Chapin. The question is once you have all the data, what do you do with it. Most data sharing has sharing restrictions.

Cathie: We have tons of data, we publish aggregate data that’s not raw at all. Would it be more efficient for state dept to publish this online. Users could do analysis of that data however they wanted. If we had a set of priorities to have people put it online. Would save so much time. If we had a state that every state should be publishing.

Emily: We’re going to start outing them on the web. The only way to do this is to have everything linked. Cathie: So many pieces to this puzzle. Various levels of data consumers. So much of our data would be better as open data, but you have to get states to sign off on.

Rebecca: Have you spoken with … he’s working with various agencies. I’m curious to see what he’ll accomplish.

Emily: We’re just starting in Pittsburgh.

Cathie: Would people be interested in conversation about using administrative data systems for evaluation. Consistency across agencies would be great. I’m on the advisory committee for project launch. Doing an evaluation, and build it into the data base. So that its continuation is more efficient.

Emily: We going through a process of documenting outcomes, for services that we pay for. Forcing providers to report at the individual level.

Rebecca: In terms of outcome measurements, is it self-reported?

Emily: Most are self-reported, but on the jail side we have a system that track the request flow for services. For education classes, we look at tests and whether or not they obtained GED. Career programs as well, we’re tracking participation and employment. We’re redoing contracts to incorporate performance.

Greg: Could encourage them to fudge the data.

Emily: Exactly which is why we need Dept of labor data.

Greg: I’m glad that now people really recognize that data is important for decisions. 10 years ago nobody cares. Now everyone realizes the importance.

Cathie: What’s challenging is the reality of the staff time required within state departments to use the data and to use it well. Child welfare in particular, it’s such a CES based system, and it’s hard to get it to work in the aggregate.

Rebecca: I totally agree.

Greg: We have an ecosystem where if the state doesn’t want to do, but there are other who are willing. IF the recognize the role, they are better off. There are partners who can do it and some who really can’t.