FINISHED FILE

ATLAS RESEARCH
SAMI COUTOURE/NELS R. BENSON
AUGUST 13, 2019

PDG B-5 DATA SERIES COMMUNITY OF CONVERSATION
DATA INTEGRATION
2:00 PM CT

Services provided by:
    Caption First, Inc.
    P.O. Box 3066
    Monument, CO 80132
    800-825-5234
    www.captionfirst.com

>> EVELYN KEATING: Hi there, folks, if you have just joined our webinar, thank you. The silence is correct. We don't have any hold music. So you're in the right spot. We will get started in just a minute or so.

Hi, everyone. Thank you for joining us. We've reached our start time.

All participants have been remuted. You can push star 6 and then push it again to unmute yourself. This meeting is being recorded -- sorry. I will start the recording. The meeting is being recorded. Please check out the attachments pod right to the right of the PowerPoint. You'll see that the PowerPoint slides from today can be downloaded.

This presentation was made possible by the Preschool Development Grant birth through five initiative from the office Of Child Care, administration for children and families, US department of health and human services, and the US Department of Education.

We're excited to welcome our expert from AEM and the States today. Without further ado, I'm just going to turn this over for a couple words of wisdom from Jim Lesko.

>> JIM LESKO: Thank you, Evelyn. Well, welcome, everyone that's on the phone today. So today we are concluding our four-part series on integrated data with the Preschool Development Grant birth to five project. We have had three previous communities of conversation.

One on data governance, the second one on data privacy, and a third conversation around the use of a single ID. So today we're bringing all that information together to address the issue of what an integrated data system can and would look like.

I'm happy to introduce Bill Huennekens and Tony Ruggiero. They hail from the AEM Corporation and part of their data team. They were part of an earlier webinar. Tony was part of an earlier webinar process and Bill is joining the group today.

We want to remind everybody that the invited participants, some of you may have heard earlier, include all of the PDG B- 5 grantees and we also encourage the grantees to include their partners and consultants that they may have involved in their project.

On the line today as well are all of the PDG B- 5 TA team members. Likely have many of the project officers and regional office staff also listening in, as well as some of our other PDG B- 5 TA partners, specifically the State Capacity Building Center and their colleague also part of the office Of Child Care, communities of conversation are always voluntary. Hopefully the States find it worth while to participate.

We will have select presentations and resources made available. There's an open discussion and dialogue. The lines are muted for the time being. If you do have questions that surface during this conversation today, we do encourage you to

put them into the chat. And we'll make sure that the presenters are aware of those questions and we'll do our best to get to those questions during the conversation today.

We will specifically focus on the early childhood integrated data system ECIDS conversation. That will be an overview. We'll have participant questions and discussion. We have three states that have -- that we are so fortunate to have volunteered to be a part of the conversation. They will join us later in the presentation.

We'll look at a series of best practices. And then we'll have some concluding remarks.

So I'm going to turn this back over to Bill and Tony to start the presentation. So take it away.

>> Tony Ruggiero :Great, thank you very much, Jim. Thank you, everyone, for joining us today. To kick us off we have a question for you. What do you think of when you hear the term early childhood data integration? Please enter one or two words into the chat box that come to mind when you think of early childhood data integration: We see people entering in chat, coordinated systems, time, state-wide data, ROI, return on investment. Wow. Complicated, difficult, streamlined, all great answers.

Things we need to keep in mind as we plan, develop, and implement our integrated data systems. Thank you.

What is an ECIDS? It's an early childhood integrated data system that collects, integrates, maintains, stores, and reports information from early childhood programs across multiple agencies within a state that serve children and families from birth to age eight. The birth to age eight some like to go with age five, that's dependent upon the state and their stakeholders. Another key word is report. We're starting to think about or we are thinking about data use when we are building these systems. We'll have a little more on that in a bit.

Typically the data included in ECIDS are related to the individual child, the child's family, classrooms, programs, and or providers and other services that provide comprehensive care and education for young children and for our young students. I do want to mention before we move any further that integrated efforts take place, not only in an ECIDS but it also integrates early childhood data into their state longitudinal data systems as well. We'll also have a little more on that later. And you will hear different perspectives from our state guests today in terms of the systems that they're working with.

Here we see a graph that shows the different domains, child, family, classroom, program, and workforce data that can contribute into an integrated early childhood system. Examples of programs that feed into this data system are public primary education, K-3, head start, and early head start. State pre-K. Home visiting. For example, a state program for parents and

teaches.   Part B Section 619 which is preschool special education and child care. It could be public child care.

Contributing to effort, this provides greater opportunities to ask more complex program and policy questions whereas, a single data set within a single office may not be able to address, which helps us to ultimately use the data to make informed program and policy decisions.

The broad purpose of an ECIDS is to provide integrated cross-program data that inform decisions about early childhood policies, services, and education. The State's early childhood leadership team should find and drive the specific purposes. We'll talk a little bit about that on the next slide with program and policy questions.

This helps support the State goals and meet the information needs of the intended users or stakeholders of this integrated effort.

Here we see essential questions from the early childhood data collaborative. And they address the individual child level data that can be put into an integrated system. It also addresses characteristics associated with positive outcomes for children. It looks at program data. What is the cost of a high quality program, for example. And then as you can see a couple workforce related questions in here as well.

This is a great place to start. When I was in Delaware, we used these as our foundations to look at our state. The nice thing about these questions is they're broad enough where when you share them with stakeholders or your counterparts and other agencies, that everybody can see these questions and identify how they're able to contribute through the integrated effort.

As you can see in talking about stakeholders, here's some examples of stakeholders who are not only intended data users, people who will use the data once the system is built, but also people who should be involved or engaged from the beginning, from planning to designing to implementing integrated data systems. As you can see, we have policy makers, state agency, leadership, early childhood leadership, parents and families are always key in everything we do in early childhood and in education. Our service providers. Our service providers can help us, for example, test the systems we're building. To see if we're providing the reports correctly or reports asked to be built. And then researchers, another great way to broaden the use of our data and to encourage people to use our data.

So what we have here -- so what is the difference between an ECIDS and an SLDS? The primary difference between these two systems are the sectors that are included within each one. So ECIDS bring together data between multiple programs in agencies. SLDS brings together numerous sectors. In SLDS it typically belongs to a P20W effort. Some refer to it at P20 and some P20W plus. And essentially these systems are being built to look at data longitudinally from -- they're actually looking at

longitudinal data from birth all the way through early childhood, through educational experiences all the way through the workforce.

And in turn, an ECIDS is designed to answer questions focused on early childhood as we just saw. And an SLDS is designed to answer questions that span more than one sector. In many states these systems are being designed simultaneously. So it is important for states to establish the distinct purpose of each system and to leverage the commonalities and share best practices and lessons learned. They may be two different systems, but there's an opportunity or opportunities for folks working on ECIDS to learn from those working on an SLDS and vice versa

Also if an SLDS is and the ECIDS is being planned and being built when an SLD already exists, it's important for that communication to exist for the potential to bring some of that data that's going into that early childhood integrated system into that state longitudinal data system.

With that, I will turn it over to Bill Huennekens.

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: Thank you very much. Welcome, everyone. I appreciate the opportunity to talk with you about ECIDS. So before diving into the next slide, I see we have two questions. First from Cody, how can states move towards an ECIDS when shared definitions for eligibility, quality, et cetera, are not yet established?

Well, moving toward those shared definitions would be part of doing ECIDS work. It's part of what -- that governance around definitions for elements, governance around business rules are all part of what you need to do in this process and in this work. They're kind of -- doing that is one and the same with doing ECIDS work. I think that's maybe a good question that our -- some of our state folks may have some experience doing that they can share with us. We'll revisit that one.

Next, what is a P20 W?

So P20W really just in the vernacular in the SLDS world in the state longitudinal data really just means early learning to school age to post-secondary, so 20, so like college, graduate school and so forth and workforce. It's a data system that is designed, as Tony said, longitudinally to essentially pull data together and make it available for study analysis used to improve outcomes across that whole spectrum.

So next I see is the info graphic of the ECIDS something that can be shared? I am sure that we can work with Jim and company to get that shared out.

Okay. So let me go on then to the next -- I don't want to go past that one too quickly. So data system design. It's really a four-stage process. ECIDS is a data system that integrates early childhood education, health, social service information from key participating state agencies. System design can take on many different meanings and definitions,

depending on how it is applied for all ECIDS projects, system design is a component of a larger system life cycle. It can be very complex, IT process to design and translate a state's need into a technical solution. This process often involves four stages that we'll talk more in depth. Assessment, design, develop and implementation.

In the assessment stage, states review their mission and vision and make sure that the goal of the ECIDS will be met by the system design. You don't want to design a system just to design it. You want to design it to meet your needs, your mission, your vision. From there they can have state their business requirements and identify which requirements to prioritize. States should also create data sharing agreements amongst agencies that will contribute data to the ECIDS. While this is considered one of the most challenging aspects of system design, it is a critical piece that will help various stakeholders understand what data is being shared and how that data can be used. What they're going to get out of it.

So next in design, the second stage, the most important technical stage. During the design phase states determine the type of model they would like to implement for the integrated data system, federal or hybrid approach. We'll talk about those later. For many the choice of the model depends on the culture of the agency involved and the degree of comfort the state has with sharing data. Often times there could be regulation or laws involved as well. All three models have business rules that determine how data are extracted and to what degree the data will be integrated depending on how the data will be matched and linked together, these business rules may cover processes for transforming data as they enter the ECIDS.

Many data elements will be unique to their source system, there may be data elements such as those with similar names code sets or definitions that will need to be discussed and reconciled through data governance. Data governance again is something that is crucial to this process.

During the design phase, states should also do the following: Perform an inventory of current systems and the data that is available in these systems. As states are approached with policy questions, an inventory of current data will help them recognize if the right data are available to answer the questions or inform research projects. This inventory should also identify any restrictions on the use of that data. The common education data standards (CEDS) is an excellent tool to do this work that more technical assistance can be provided on.

Heavily documents -- documentation will continue to be an important tool as the system is designed and developed. Next use a unique reliable identifier in data matching process. The use of the UID or other identifiable matching data is the backbone of a state's data system. A resulting analysis would be difficult to use without it. Finally, describe desired

features of the system because an integrated data system is theoretical. States should create tangible items such as screenshots and handouts to help stakeholders understand the system. Essential tables of data that you want to see. Get something concrete for stakeholders to look at and to use.

So next we have development. At the development stage states should adopt a development life cycle process. Project management is a crucial step in the development stage and make sure data points are bringing brought in. Engage a vendor, request for proposal and managing the work of vendors once they're brought on board with the project. Finally we have implementation.

What all the work has led up to and if the work has been done diligently and has been done with care. This is where you start to see success.

In the final stage of implementation, states should be ready to deliver the ECIDS to end users. The ECIDS should be stable and secure and all measures need to have been taken to ensure confidentiality and compliance with federal, state, and local regulation.

So an awful lot goes into it. But in terms of designing the system, if you look at the assessment, design, development, and implement, you will have a good high-level path.

So let's dive into the model one more time or a little more deeply and the type of systems that you can design. A centralized system. So once data in a centralized system is integrated and that has occurred in a centralized system, the data linkages are loaded into a central database or warehouse where it can be used for multiple purposes such as reports and extracts. This integration is remaining, it's stable. It's something that will be held over time in a centralized system.

In a federated model, data sets are made from linked data but don't persist after each use. The linkages are generated after every request. The advantage is that a centralized data warehouse is not needed. They oftentimes do have repeated ongoing work to meet specific needs or requests for data.

Now as with all things, there's hybrid or there are systems in between. A hybrid data model combines aspects of the federated and centralized data models. A model that uses the records are maintained but the records themselves are not necessarily linked. That's a little bit more in depth. But obviously you could go a lot more into it in collaboration with IT and technical folks in a lot more detail than this. Hopefully that gives you an understanding of what we reference when we talk about a centralized, federated or hybrid model for an ECIDS.

With that, I will turn it over to Tony, who I believe has another poll question.

>> TONY RUGGIERO: Thank you, Bill. So as part of your early childhood data integration effort is your data in an ECIDS

or if a P20+SLDS? Please enter ECIDS, SLDS or if you're just starting with your planning or still deciding, let us know, or if you're absolutely unsure, you can say you don't know.

(Participants answering poll question)

>> TONY RUGGIERO: Wow. Very good mix.

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: That's what I was thinking, Tony. A good mix.

>> TONY RUGGIERO: Yes, absolutely.

(Overlapping Speakers)

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: A good number of folks are still in the planning phase. So hopefully the information is of value.

>> TONY RUGGIERO: Absolutely along with good opportunities to learn from each other as well across states. Thank you, everyone, for participating in our poll. I'm going to turn it back over to Bill. We're going to have our discussion with our state guests.

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: All right. Thank you, Tony. So I would like to introduce Steven with the early childhood Utah health program -- he is the early childhood Utah health program coordinator with the Utah department of health. Howard is the state-wide coordinator with the early childhood division at the Texas agency. And Alejandra is the acting division director of early childhood services at the department of children, youth and families in New Mexico. Folks, thank you very much for joining. And hopefully you've thought about that first question we had from the audience. That's where I would like to begin since it's something they identified as a need.

So could one of you or more of you speak to your experience with coming to shared definitions, things around eligibility or quality, those kinds of things that governance process that needs to be gone through in the early stages of doing ECIDS work.

>> ALEJANDRO REBOLLEDO: Good afternoon. This is Alejandra from New Mexico. Of course. Our work started with race to the top. There was a lot of discussion between the three main agencies that oversee early childhood programs. One of the pieces that we worked together was to define quality and identify essential elements of quality that can be addressed across different early childhood sectors and agree upon some of the data elements that we wanted to collect. From there we then went on to discuss some of the pieces on how to collect the data at the program level and how to start establishing some rules that we can all agree on.

So that took us a few years. It didn't happen overnight. This is work we have been doing for the last five years. We feel that we are at a place now that we have some definitions that have been agreed upon. But it does require a lot of discussion, a lot of compromising. And some times you have to have in place in how you collect that data. For us the biggest challenge was to identify those essential qualities of element

for an early childhood quality program.

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: Thanks for sharing. I really like that that you talk about that -- that it took some time, that you went about it and established those rules and having those discussions, you talk about it taking a lot of discussions is definitely my experience when I was doing this type of work in Washington state. The more of those discussions you have, the more you spend time getting on the same page documenting those rules and definitions and so forth, the better it is in the end. And you spend less time actually working with folks doing the coding and the actual IT work. (28:57)

So Howard, anything else to add to that question?

>> HOWARD MORRISON: Yeah. This is Howard speaking. Relating to our state-wide longitudinal system for our SLDS application, so we have Texas education data standards. So this is a collection of data standards that are based on national ED-5 which have XML4 floating into our database, in our TSDS, that's our Texas student data system. That's aligned with our teams which is our student level organization and information which would populate any reports. We have our core education data standards to ensure that we have that common understanding of the terms and terminology. As we build and are moving towards our ECIDS, we're looking at aligning those standards with other state agencies.

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: Excellent. Thank you very much. Okay. Let's go to the next question then. You really did address this some, Howard, but for the others, what data model did your state use? Is it an ECIDS or an SLDS. Is it centralized, federated, or a hybrid model? Why did you choose a certain model and what were some of the benefits of using that particular model?

>> STEVE MATHERLY: Hi, this is it Steve Matherly from the Utah department of health. Let me start off by saying we call our ECIDS E-KIDS. We are not a Race to the Top early challenge state so it's taken us, We're in our seventh year of putting together our matcher database as well as our ECIDS some funding from the early childhood comprehensive systems grant as well as some funding from the child care development block grant from our colleagues here in Utah.

So our model is a centralized -- we use a centralized system. As I mentioned why, back in around 2013 we had the Utah department of health had an opportunity to utilize Medicaid, technology enhancement grant. We also needed a matcher database that would benefit our entire department and not just our E-KIDS So we spent some time exploring perhaps utilizing existing databases, but those were more operational in nature. And we really couldn't at the time anyway reconcile kind of our research needs with the existing databases that were more operational in nature. Plus, being at the department of health, we have the vital records department, birth and death

registries. We wanted to be able to utilize that data for matching purpose, and data recognition, as well as using it for denominator data for population type data. Advantages would be consistent data, being able to pull -- being able to hard code reports and being able to have data, once it's in there, to be able to use it in many different ways over a period of time.

I'll turn that over to the other speakers now.

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: Thank you very much. Alejandra, would you like to elaborate on your system, an ECIDS, SLDS, centralized, federated, hybrid, why one model over the other and what are the benefits for you in your state for that model?

>> ALEJANDRO REBOLLEDO: Absolutely. Like Steven said, we were a race to the top state, but it has taken us that long to come up with the model we have right now. Our ECIDS model is considered -- we would consider it a hybrid. We have some centralized data that is housed within here, the children youth and family department which houses child care, pre-K and home visiting data, all the workforce data, and all that information is housed here. However, in the other agencies we have the part D program and we have the public education pre-K program as well as the 619 information. What we're doing right now is all that information is being fed into the centralized warehouse to provide the information and do all the matching of the data. However, we have external information that we couldn't have a centralized process because, of course, we, one, don't have enough oversight in those programs and those programs deciding to participate are more in the volunteer type approach, and that is our head start data. We're still negotiating some of those partnerships to bring that data into the warehouse.

So for us bringing the information from different databases and agencies was critical. Do we have the ability to do both, have automatic fed into the warehouse but also on request data set that would allow us to have a more complete picture of our state information. And at the same time ensuring that there is not duplication of data that is being collect the.

The other part is that each one of the databases that are currently working within each one of those agencies is -- has a different purpose. Some of them are used for billing, some are used for accountability, and some of them are used for assessment. Because each one had a different function and had a different setup, it was important for us to continue allowing those data systems to exist. Making mechanisms to make sure that that communication is taking place within the warehouse.

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: All right. Thank you. That's interesting and helpful. So we've got two new questions from the chat from Brittany in New Hampshire. So the first is asking about your experience with state legislation on privacy where it may be more restrictive than the federal legislation. If oh so, what steps did you take in order to move forward with data integration?

Each of you can share what the status is with state legislation or rules around privacy and what you did as a result of it.

>> ALEJANDRO REBOLLEDO: This is Alejandra. I can share a little bit about how we are protecting the identity of our families. We do have some state regulation, props not as strict as the ones you have, but we actually send to the warehouse our information using the unique ID. I think you mentioned the unique ID being the critical point because that is actually how we deidentify data. We have memorandums of understanding within each agency that is sending the data sets ensuring that we do comply with our HIPAA and FERPA, depending on the program. We are actually bound by both. And we rely on those that were used to ensure that our information is safeguarded and the privacy of our families is actually protected.

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: Great. So a linking ID or a research ID. That's helpful.

>> HOWARD MORRISON: This is Howard here in Texas. Oh.

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: Go ahead, Howard.

>> HOWARD MORRISON: I was just going to say that we implement a similar unique ID process as well. In every other state agency or other government agency we have a memorandum of understanding of data sharing agreement that would be reviewed by our security officers to make sure we're aligned with HIPAA and privacy issues and also ensuring that we have data governance to kind of review the collection on data being collected and how it's being used to ensure that there is that additional discussion that happens around the data collection and the data use of the data.

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: Thank you, Howard. Do you -- go ahead, please.

>> STEVE MATHERLY: Go ahead, Bill. It sounds like you have a follow-up question for Howard. Go ahead.

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: I was going to say. Howard, in Texas, do you have anything beyond FERPA, HIPAA, any unique state legislation around privacy that you have to address?

>> HOWARD MORRISON: Not explicitly that I'm aware of. There are some local issues, but I think we're just mostly liking at those FERPA and HIPAA guidelines and then ensuring that we do our due diligence with our state agencies to ensure we mitigate any concerns. I think over time I think there's less concern than maybe we had at our state agency more than five or ten years ago.

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: Okay. Good. Thank you.

>> STEVE MATHERLY: In Utah we indeed do have privacy laws specific to our state, but they have not impeded our progress. They speak to the State Education Agency or SEA being transparent so parents have an opportunity to know how data is being shared along with national federal laws, we also have state laws that protect -- they are really mainly focused on

vendor products that end up in the classrooms in making sure that software products and hardware products, your tablets and various learning software are not capturing PII from students and using that data inappropriately. Mainly what our state laws speak to, if anything, we have had state laws over the last few years that have done a tremendous effort to facilitate the development of our SLDS as well as our EKIDS.

I also see a question about the initial steps where states started. It's very much what was described earlier in bringing together the stakeholders, developing questions mutual questions everyone wants answers to and then doing a data inventory to the very -- we started with some very basic data elements here in Utah, just enough to be able to match identities amongst the various service providers, as well as some enrollment and exit dates. Now we're building toward additional data such as attendance, encounter data, race/ethnicity data, things of that nature. But our first phase was just enough to be able to match and be able to show distinct count of children and which programs they were enrolled in and in what order or sequence.

Yeah, the steps -- as well as taking that data inventory, fortunately my predecessor Clay Murphy was very familiar with CEDS and was spoken about earlier, we have a data dictionary. We've done alignment with their tools.

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: Thank you. Colleen is greatly. We've done a lot of work with her, EDS things. It is a good valuable tool for doing that particular work.

With that -- that's really looking to address Brittany's second question, talking about steps you can take at the beginning stage of data integration. So, Howard, Alejandra, any further advice for Brittany on that?

>> ALEJANDRO REBOLLEDO: Yes. I think what I would add one thing that we did early on and I think somebody spoke about that is during the inventory of the data systems you want to integrate in the capacity of those data systems to integrate what kind of data elements have been collected and why. And then a lot of discussion then to start agreeing upon which data elements you want to integrate, because not everything, as I spoke before, not everything can be integrated because it serves different purposes but agreeing on certain data elements that you want to collect what comes very closely with that are the kind of questions you want to answer and what the purpose of your ECIDS is going to be. Is it going to be for policy decision making, prioritizing funding, is it for gap analysis? Is it going to be for moving your system forward, tracking children's progress, making program modifications? There is some definite ideas that came about on what we wanted to respond based on our stakeholders and our community needs. And from there we had to review a few questions. We're going to be very ambitious. Just know that you have to take one bite at a time and be very patient and very cordial and very understanding that

what purpose this ECIDS is going to serve because you're working
with the cross-agency, cross-system. In early childhood we say
we're very territorial. When it comes to our data we're even
more territorial because we're very protective of our data and
rightly so.

        Again, I guess the first -- if you want to do a step by
step. Or, the first step is do an inventory so you know who's
collecting what and what data systems are existing in your
state.

        >> BILL HUENNEKENS: Great. Thank you. So with that,
let's turn -- we've talked a lot about the beginning, how we
take care of privacy security type things. Let's turn to output
of the system, so a question for the panelists, does your system
have reporting mechanism or interface to allow stakeholders in
the public to access data to create their own reports? Do they
have reports for the stakeholders and public to use?

        >> STEVE MATHERLY: This is Steve from Utah. I can answer
that question. I wanted to add to Brittany and what Alejandra
said, when you're doing that inventory, you also have to
discover how that data is regulated. We often speak of FERPA or
HIPAA. Actually it's nice when your data is covered by FERPA or
HIPAA, because then you have a road map. You have a template,
and you have some of the tangibles that you can go to to learn
about the exceptions and how to handle that data. Actually
what's a bit more challenging is when the data is not clearly
regulated by a specific body, then you really do have to do your
research. You have to work with the funders as in the case with
the department of health, we have WIC and home visiting as well
as ages and stages questionnaire, developmental health program.
We also work with help me grow. All those are wonderful sources
of data but they don't fit squarely under FERPA or HIPAA. In
those instances you have to do your research and work with your
federal funders and your state legal team and probably even make
sure that you get parental consent during the enrollment
process.

        With regards to reports and such, our EKIDS, as I
mentioned is housed at the Utah department of health, we have a
data governance body. We have four hard coded I won't call them
canned because they're very dynamic reports. You can adjust
time frames. You can get these reports down to a zip code,
granular level. They're dynamic in that sense. They produce a
distinct count of children served by the various early care
programs that are participating in our ECIDS. Who's serving
them? A distinct count or which program is serving them and
cross-over data. Since our ECIDS are new right now, those
reports are protect the. Our data policy committee comprised of
the data sources can approve stakeholders to view those reports.
By joining our ECIDS as part of our data governance, the ECIDS
data sources, they all have access to those reports.

        In a parallel fashion we're also building another data

product or tool. That will be public-facing. That has
population data, poverty data, risk factors, at birth data, as
well as some of our EKIDS data that's been aggregated at a
county or state-wide level. Our data sources are more
comfortable with presenting that data at that level to the
public. At some point when all of our data is loaded and
validated and our data sources feel confident with what we have,
then we may make our standard reports also available to the
public, but we're going at the pace that our data source is most
comfortable with.

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: Great. Thank you. Others on
availability of data?

>> HOWARD MORRISON: Yeah. This is Howard -- Howard here
from Texas. So we have kind of two sets. We have some reports
that are available to the internal users that are submitting the
data. Most of those are along the lines of data quality check,
but we also allow them to look at some of their prekindergarten
progress monitoring scores and benchmarks and seeing their
growth from beginning of year to end of year.

Then we also have external reports that are available to
the public. Those are more canned, crystal PDF downloadable
reports that are available at the state, district, and campus
level. Those are looking at prekindergarten assessment
information, prekindergarten enrollment, race, ethnicity,
student population information. Then we have additional
kindergarten program and readiness report. We have a little bit
of both. Some that are internal to the users and then those
that are canned, external reports that are downloadable for each
school district and in the state of Texas. Also there's data
downloads that are also available and are aggregated at the
regional level as well for our regional education service
centers.

The data tends to be helpful for either research
institution, early childhood organizations that are supporting
programs within their community without having to do maybe a
specific data request or public information request as that data
is readily available to them. This, of course, is masked so
they wouldn't have any student level information but they do
have this canned report.

Then we're also working toward more dynamic reports with
the new project that we have where we're lending the public
prekindergarten, kindergarten data with our child care quality
rating system with the Texas Workforce Commission. That will be
more of a select report and data elements that they want to see
for their specific community. But that's where we're at with
our public reports for Texas.

>> ALEJANDRO REBOLLEDO: Hi --

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: Thank you, Howard.

>> ALEJANDRO REBOLLEDO: If I can add for New Mexico just
really quick. We don't have it for the public yet. However, we

are required to provide reports as part of our accountability statute that we have. So like Texas, we do PDF reports that have some of this information. We're moving right now towards having our data facilitation to be with our (?) that's interactive. We're doing geo coding so we can use those interactive maps to provide information about where our programs are and what type of services they provide in different types of the community. We're using actually -- we're going to be using that information as part of our needs assessment to do the gap analysis.

And we want to have a more dynamic process a little bit in the long term in using the Tableau so they can do canned reporting of aggregated data. We're not quite there. We're in the data collection process. We have the IBIS process set up already for doing this data utilization. Our next step is going to be the Tableau.

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: Thank you. At various stages of this work. It is good to hear that. Well, Brittany, I'm glad that you found that information to be helpful, Nikki as well. Thank you for asking the questions. That certainly makes an experience like this more valuable when we can get your direct question answered by those doing the similar work that you were planning or are engaged in right now.

With that, Steve, Howard, Alejandra, thank you very much. I appreciate you taking the time to address the assembled group and talk about your efforts with your colleagues. Your time is valuable. And we appreciate you taking the time to spend sharing the information with us today.

With that on this slide you'll see that there are a number of ECIDS resources that are available practice a number of different types of organizations. I would like to highlight one of them 1 the DaSy consist of questions more likely answered with an integrated data system. These questions are geared to early intervention and preschool education to be tweaked in any program. The data collaborative has essential questions has fundamental coordinated state data systems. The state and early childhood data systems and other useful information. A number of sources that can be linked to information. So with that, I again thank you for the time. I will turn it back over to Jim to wrap things up for us.

>> JIM LESKO: Thanks Bill, and thanks Tony for putting together the presentation and thank you extra special appreciation to Steven and Howard and Alejandra for being willing to come on and answer the questions. I know the information you shared was much appreciated by the states that were on the call and their partners and a valuable addition to the conversation.

If you do have further questions concerning integrated data systems, we encourage you to either contact your PDG B- 5TA specialist or feel free to send us an email at the email address

you see listed there. PDGB5TA@atlasresearch.US. We would love to hear your feedback and suggestions for communities of conversations in the four-part series that we completed today.

You can link directly to the web address that you see on this slide. It will take you straight to the Survey Monkey. We do take your feedback seriously. We made some adjustments as we've gone on since we started these conversations.

You'll also -- everyone that has registered for the conversation today will receive the link through the recording of this conversation, and there will also be a Survey Monkey link attached to that. So if you don't get to it today, you can always link to it when you receive the recording of the we're very much appreciative of that feedback.

I do see a question that came in. We do have a minute or two. I'm not sure whether Bill or Tony want to address this. If you don't, we can get to it. The question is the QRIS and ECIDS webinar, is it common for ECIDS to be hosted as a portal on a consumer education website?

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: Boy, Tony, I don't necessarily know. I would think not, but I --

>> TONY RUGGIERO: I'll check into that. I don't think so either, but I can look into that and get an answer.

>> BILL HUENNEKENS: Sure, Rachel. Thank you for the question and we'll get back to you directly with an answer to that.

>> Not seeing anything else in the chat box in terms of questions. Thank you all for joining the conversation today. We hope you found it to be a valuable experience. All of the recordings from the four-part series will be posted on to our website. So you'll have access to this on an archival basis. And the PowerPoints are always available.

If you do have further questions, contact your PDG B- 5 specialist. And thank you very much. -- oh. Also much thanks I must mention to my Atlas team that have been working behind the scenes to make sure this all flows very smoothly and a special shout-out to Evelyn and Sami for managing the Adobe room today. Thanks so much, everybody. Bye.

(Webinar concluded at 2:58 PM CT)

Services provided by:
    Caption First, Inc.
    P.O. Box 3066
    Monument, CO 80132
    800-825-5234
    www.captionfirst.com

                    ******

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate

communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

******