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The State Data Sharing Initiative (SDS) seeks to improve public policy program outcomes by enabling evidence-based policymaking through greater sharing of state administrative records in support of rigorous policy analysis and program evaluation. Our efforts, focused on economic and workforce development, could also inform broader policy areas, like education, health, and criminal justice policy.
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Building Effective Data Governance Structures
Minnesota: Building Effective Data Governance Structures
Minnesota state agencies have varying levels of internal data governance, while some cross-agency data systems have very advanced data governance structures.

Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED) efforts to begin organizing agency-wide data governance initiative stalled.

Focus to work on what we can control – streamline process for internal data sharing and extend that process out, where possible.
Minnesota: Accomplishments

➢ Process for allowing economic development program staff greater access to administrative wage and employment data to verify business goals

➢ Extended this data sharing to quasi-state government agency also involved in business development programs
Minnesota: Persisting Challenges

➢ State statutes limit the scope of how some individual-level administrative data may be shared

➢ We have mandated – and rigorous – evaluations of workforce training programs, but not of business development programs

➢ Sometimes mandates can push data sharing forward

➢ In the absence of mandates, how can we influence greater data sharing and data governance structures?
Minnesota: Next Steps

➢ Leveraging our State Longitudinal Education Data System (SLEDS) which has an established data governance structure

➢ Meeting with potential new data partners and data users:
  ➢ Veterans Affairs
  ➢ Labor and Industry
  ➢ Revenue
  ➢ Human Services
Start with the research staff

Ask a neutral agency to facilitate the conversations

Appeal to agency needs:
- What are your agency’s broad research questions?
- How could answering those questions change the way you deliver programs and services?

Ground conversation in how we can work better together to benefit all Minnesotans
- A focus on equity is included
South Carolina: Building Effective Data Governance Structures
South Carolina: Initial Challenges

➢ Getting all the right players to the table

➢ Eliminate barriers and concerns presented by agencies including legal ramifications that might prevent data sharing

➢ Agreeing to and adopting draft legislation to be recommended to the Coordinating Council for Workforce Development (CCWD)
Approval from the CCWD of draft legislation that will be submitted to the General Assembly to:

- capture occupation and hours worked information through UI
- require longitudinal data sharing
South Carolina: Persisting Challenges

➢ Eliminating silos
➢ Legislature is in the 2nd of a two-year cycle
South Carolina: Next Steps

➢ To receive feedback from the business community and other stakeholders

➢ Educating legislators and legislative staff on how draft legislation was developed and the buy-in from multiple agencies and entities
South Carolina: Sustainability

➢ CCWD By-Laws and Procedures have been adopted to eliminate issues with administration changes
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Engaging Stakeholders & Building Multi-Agency Coalitions
Wisconsin: Engaging Stakeholders
Wisconsin: Initial Challenges

➢ Cultural misperceptions of data sharing

➢ Power struggles
  ➢ Inherent past practices of protecting data
  ➢ Perception of retaining “power over data” by being the subject matter expert if data is not shared

➢ Overcoming the mentality of “We’ve tried this before, it’s just going to fail again.”
Wisconsin: Accomplishments

➢ Solidified leadership to encourage all staff to work together for solutions

➢ Deployment of data sharing survey
  ➢ Used results to verify workplan was on target
  ➢ Identified additional action steps to implement

➢ Hosted a Tri-agency meeting to review survey and discuss next steps
  ➢ Outcomes included recommendation from participants to identify a point of contact at each agency; develop a standardize request form and encourage staff in data sharing roles to network/meet on a more regular basis

➢ Centralized internal lists of existing MOUs
  ➢ Each agency created a catalog of existing data sharing agreements/MOUs; will be used in inventory process and as a prompt for further discussions
Wisconsin: Persisting Challenges

➢ Will need to continue building on advances made towards increased awareness of data sharing needs

➢ Working through lingering legal framework questions related to data sharing between state agencies and public-private entities part of the Executive Branch (such as WEDC)

➢ Prioritizing on-going work groups to complete implementation of identified strategies, review of new opportunities and leadership check-ins.

➢ Identifying technical solutions for data warehousing, including security measures needed to protect data and costs associated with enterprise wide implementation (including security needs and financial resources)
Wisconsin: Next Steps

➢ Leverage momentum of internal stakeholders to complete data inventory

➢ Reconvene meeting with data stakeholders

➢ Establish quarterly leadership meetings to review progress and review/prioritize new opportunities

➢ Catalog efforts to date to present to executive leadership
  ➢ Look at opportunities to expand with other agencies
Wisconsin: Sustainability

➢ Where possible, codify changes to ensure long term data sharing agreements (e.g. WEDC is a part of the Executive Branch/Cabinet level)

➢ Strengthen existing MOUs to reflect best practices

➢ Continue to foster relationships between data stewards/users for greater intra and inter agency collaborations
Iowa: Engaging Stakeholders
Iowa: Initial Challenges

➢ Iowa’s efforts focused on facilitating data sharing through a centralized inventory describing administrative data that State agencies possess, and a standardized application process for data sharing requests between State agencies.

➢ Without any funding dedicated to our efforts, the team had to find free tools to develop a website for managing the data inventory and the sharing process.
Iowa: Accomplishments

- Team has developed a Data Asset Inventory website for Iowa State agencies to search and make requests.

- Iowa Department of Revenue and Iowa Workforce Development have loaded data asset information into the inventory.

- Promotion of the site to all other agencies began with an outreach by the Iowa Department of Revenue Director at the 2017 Governor’s Retreat, Oct. 13.
Iowa: Persisting Challenges

➢ **Getting buy-in** from all State agencies to provide data asset information in the inventory

➢ Concern that some agencies will not want to share OR that they will not dedicate the resources needed to complete the inventory, weakening the benefits to all State agencies

➢ Working on communication to agency directors promoting success stories from prior data sharing among various agencies to demonstrate the benefits from this more systematic and widespread effort
Iowa: Next Steps

➢ Develop a **communication plan** to promote agency participation in adding data assets to the inventory and use the inventory to search for data and make requests

➢ Implementing an automated follow-up on open requests to ensure agency participation

➢ Working through the process to automate reporting of status changes to the requestor of the data asset

➢ If a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is used in the data sharing process, develop a practice and method for the agency owning the dataset to submit a template to the inventory for future use by other agencies
Iowa: Sustainability

- **Institutionalize data sharing** through the website by building ownership and participation among all agencies and their data stewards.

- As agencies experience benefits from data sharing, promote those successes to leadership and data stewards.
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Navigating the Legislative Process
Utah: Navigating the Legislative Process
Utah: Initial Challenges

➢ Silo approach to data stewardship
➢ Culture of limited sharing
➢ Limited data intake
➢ Lack of legislatively mandated access
Utah: Accomplishments

- Passage of HB 25—greater access to tax record data
- Creation of online sharing portal with Tax Commission
- Improved data intake
- Step toward centralized data stewardship via—SB 194 Utah Data Research Center
Utah: Persisting Challenges

➢ Residual silo-effect
➢ Limited funding resources
➢ Federal regulations
➢ Technological solutions
Utah: Next Steps

- Expand legislatively mandated access to information to all incentives—"authorization to disclose language"
- Increase data intake on incentive use
- Legislative tax reform—seek measurements and metrics for all inducements and tax incentives moving forward
Utah: Sustainability

- Clearer legislative mandates
- Centralized data stewardship
- Codify data sharing efforts
Visit StateDataSharing.org for more info
Questions?

For more information please contact:
Joe Jarosckak, Research Analyst, CREC
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