

Committee Members in Attendance

- Jennifer Butts
- Jorge "Yuri" Csapo
- Brian Horsman
- Scott Maize
- Cheryl Mosier
- Virge "T.O." Owens
- Dan Rohner
- Phillip Romig III
- Jenifer Ross-Amato
- John Sullivan
- Mike Wilcox

Jeffco Staff in Attendance

- Mary Beth Bazzanella
- Carol Eaton
- Jeremy Felker
- Matt Flores
- Craig Hess
- Curtis Lee
- Brett Miller
- Chris Paschke
- Hope Corrales
- Jef Fujita
- Betty Standley
- Fran Williamson

I. Call to Order

- a. The meeting was called to order at 4:40 p.m. by Brett Miller, chief information officer.

II. Introduction and Background

- a. Brett Miller started the meeting indicating highlights of what was discussed with the Board would be distributed to the committee. He indicated tonight's meeting is the last of the year and we will look to start up again in late August mid-September. We will look for support from the committee members on how to build future agendas and we will also ask the Board for some additional members from the community and hopefully more educators. Mr. Miller then turned the meeting over to Curtis Lee and Kent Micho to discuss their Data Governance work.

III. Certify DQ Scorecard Background

- a. Curtis Lee, Executive Director Data Quality Ed Tech, explained to the committee what Certify is and how it is used with the Data Quality Score Card. It was stated the importance of how data certification needs to be timely, relevant and actionable. With this score card users are able to fix errors efficiently.
 - i. A committee member asked what would an error include?
 - Could have to do with demographics (i.e. date, middle name, state ID, race/ethnicity)
 - Regulatory related where everything looks fine you just can't have certain things together
 - Date related (i.e. an enrollment date entered later than a withdrawal date)
 - A lot end up being logic errors
 - b. Mr. Lee went on to talk about Data Stewardship and how this group of five to ten people work together across different departments to co-develop a business glossary which will build capacity with this scorecard.
 - i. A committee member asked how long the scorecard has been in place?
 - Scorecard has been in place 2 ½ years and we have 6 score cards in place
 - We have steady growth, but we want to be smart about building more scorecards
 - ii. Another committee member asked if Hermes was our data warehouse?
 - Hermes is the brokerage the data message between different applications

IV. Case Study: Sped Data Quality Improvement

- a. Kent Micho, Director Process Improvement, continued the discussion around the collaborative work between IT and Special Ed. He indicated it is important to celebrate the success that we have accomplished and to help others with creativity and opportunities. This helps others identify additional opportunities for the district. We measure value on three dimensions: financial, efficiency, outcome. Financial benefit of data quality has been a huge win for Special Ed and the district. Because of the improved quality of the Special Ed data, the district has realized ~\$1M in increased revenue YOY and is expecting to realize an additional est \$1M YOY in additional funding over the next two years. The following were implemented to help with this:
 - i. Encore was replaced with Enrich
 - ii. Remapped document imaging
 - iii. Decommissioned a data base for the Child Find program and merged the data into Enrich
 - iv. Simplified the process
 - v. Developed additional training
 - vi. Certify implemented
- b. Major results for Special Ed include:
 - i. Increased funding
 - ii. Streamlined data capture for state reports
 - iii. Improved data quality and confidence in the data
 - iv. Increased staff accountability
 - v. Decreased repetitive work allowing focus on higher value-add work
- c. Next steps for the district include identifying and realizing additional opportunities. Initial target areas include:
 - i. Medicaid
 - ii. Career Tech Ed
 - iii. Transportation
 - iv. Dual Enrollment
 - v. Immunizations
- d. A committee member asked how long Enrich has been implemented with the Certify scorecard in place to clean up the data quality? And who is getting the error reports to fix the data?
 - i. It's been in place just slightly over a year
 - ii. Person in Special Ed who is accountable for the students would most likely be the one who will be fixing the data. We are sensitive to do things in stages and ensure that teachers are not responsible for taking on additional work.
- e. Certify helps with adherence to state policy
- f. A committee member asked does Certify allow you to push remediation down to the lower level users?
 - i. Can and should are two different issues depending on the situation. If we can extract the data, we can analyze it anyway we need to.
 - ii. Along with data submissions rules we also have audit requirements around the data collected.

V. Summary

- a. Brett Miller summarized by saying our transparency work we will be growing out over the summer and we welcome feedback around what topics committee members would like to hear about. This is important work and we want to continue to make this meaningful for all involved.

VI. Closing

- a. The meeting adjourned at 5:47 pm.