

NCLDS – Data Use Convening

Date: Thursday, September 5, 2024

Time: 9:00 – 11:00 AM

Convening Attendees:

Elizabeth Stoddard and Eva Gifford, NCCCS; Catherine Kurilla and Alice Fleck, UNCSO; Carrie Mata, NCICU; Tanya Morgan, DHHS; Diane Dulaney and KC Elander, NCDPI; Meihui Bodane, Commerce; the NCLDS Team (Trip Stallings, Ashley Sieman, Jessica Wilkins, Patrick Callahan, Virginia McIlwain)

Guests:

Sasikala Nagarajan, Jess Kuhn, Jessica Hagins, Eileen Francis, Christie Burris, Jeff Ebbrecht

Agenda and Notes:

Welcome

Orientation to the Purpose and Structure of the Convening

- Purpose
 - Vet and Start to Operationalize a Cross-Sector Data Exposure Rules Metadata Flag System
 - Review the Foundation for NCLDS Data Quality Metadata Flags
 - Share Cross-Sector Data Quality Check Procedures
 - Outline the Contents of an NCLDS Data Availability & Use Policy Guide / Manual
- Structure
 - Attendees join one of three workgroups (separate Teams meeting for each)
 - Workgroups tackle one topic each
 - Workgroups reconvene to report out and share cross-workgroup feedback

Group 1: Exposure Management

- Review and recommend modifications to NCLDS's proposed exposure flags
 - Review the default flags: [Modified Version](#) of UNCSO classifications:

- **Security (Exposure) Classification:**
 - 4 - Confidential – Sensitive
 - 3 - Confidential – Regulated
 - 2 - Enterprise
 - 1 - Public
 - **Share (Transferability) Classification:**
 - A - Not Shareable
 - B - Highly Restricted
 - C - Shareable – Restricted
 - D - Shareable – Unrestricted
- Review the proposed general association of exposure flags to each category of Requester:
 - NCLDS Data Contributor internal designees / Requesters formally sponsored by one or more NCLDS Data Contributors
 - NCGA & Affiliates / Governor's Office / Education Cabinet & Designees / Council of State & Designees
 - All other Requesters
- Develop an outline of a process for Contributors to assign and then share exposure flag metadata with NCLDS
 - *Question for this Group:* Is there any value in attempting to identify common cross-sector elements for which we may be able to develop cross-sector exposure rules (e.g., birthdate, IDs, etc.), or is it better to leave assignment of these flags to each Data Contributor?
- Propose a plan/process for (annually?) reviewing/updating this flagging system

Group 2: Data Quality Flags

- Review and recommend modifications to NCLDS's proposed quality flags
 - Review the default flags: Modified Version of NCCCS confidence levels:
 - 4 – Reliable, based on common historical use across sectors and/or other factors (metadata quality notes optional)
 - 3 – Usable despite known but limited or isolated quality issues that may require metadata clarifications and/or recommendations for care in use (i.e., Contributor-provided metadata quality notes optional)

2 – Questionable reliability and/or consistency of quality, but a critical element or an element with a history of past use; requires metadata clarifications and/or recommendations for care in use

1 – Unreliable, but exposure required; requires metadata that urges extreme caution in use and clarifies all known issues

- Develop an outline of a process for Contributors to assign and then share quality flag metadata with NCLDS
- Sketch a draft process for NCLDS to formally elevate to Contributors any element-level data quality issues discovered by the NCLDS Team (or by Requesters)
 - Propose a mechanism for NCLDS to:
 - Regularly share back with Contributors what we find/learn
 - Record a Contributor's planned pathway to resolution for that element (e.g., immediate resolution in source data, scheduled resolution [with proposed resolution date], noted but no planned resolution, etc.)
 - *Question for this Group:* Should NCLDS consider including “known quality issue currently under review” or something similar as a metadata flag for any Contributor element so identified, unless/until the quality issue is addressed?
- Recommend components of a regular (web-based) publication (or facet of the online data dictionary) of current known and unresolved issues

Group 3: Data Quality Check Procedures

- Review and annotate
 - Each Contributor's [data quality check rules](#) (*Note:* NCLDS was not able to collect all Contributor quality check rules ahead of this convening)
 - Commonalities/overlaps across two or more
 - Best Practices rules (e.g., whether currently in use by any Contributor or not, what are the quality check rules that all Contributors should consider adopting?)
- Suggest a format for sharing these rules with Contributors (and with new NCLDS Contributors, during onboarding) that will allow them to identify approaches they might want to consider adopting internally
- Finally, draft the beginnings of top-level, default data quality review/error-checking procedures for use by NCLDS when assessing the quality of raw data from Contributors that do not have data quality governance/review processes (e.g., licensure data)

Reconvene and Share Out

- Share out:
 - Exposure Management Report-Out and Discussion
 - Data Quality Flags Report-Out and Discussion
 - Data Quality Check Procedures Report-Out and Discussion
- Together, Brainstorm the Structure and Content of a Possible Data Availability & Use Policy Guide / Manual
 - Guide could capture all known data use limitations/guidelines identified above (i.e., so that we do not rely solely on warnings captured in metadata alone)
 - NCLDS Team will develop & update regularly (annually?)
 - Other highest hopes / greatest needs for this manual?

Homework

- Begin planning for how your agency or organization will assign exposure and quality flags to elements exposed to NCLDS
- *[If your agency/organization hasn't done so already]* Schedule time to meet with NCLDS to review your agency's/organization's validation and quality check procedures
- **BONUS:** Identify elements considered for NCLDS exposure but ultimately withdrawn (and reason[s] why not exposed – for NCLDS records when Requesters ask about existence of certain elements)

Closure