

Oregon DATA Project

Technical Training

Component 2: Building a Culture of Data Quality

Activity 3: District and School Analysis

Purpose

- The four components of data quality form a framework to understanding and recognizing the factors that affect a culture of data quality. Analyzing each of the impacting factors within a district can help identify areas of strength and areas that may need additional support. One of the responsibilities of the Data Quality Oversight Committee is to monitor the components of, and factors that affect, quality data.

Participants

- Presenter: Data Quality Oversight Committee leader
- Audience: Data Quality Oversight Committee

Session Description

- The DQOC will complete a school and district analysis of the factors affecting quality data compared to best practices as identified in the Forum Guide to Building a Culture of Quality Data (pp.7-16) which is available under Resources.
- Total time for this session: 60 minutes.

Objectives

- Understand the four components of quality data
- Identify the six factors that affect quality data
- Complete a school and district analysis

Presenter Preparation

- Download the “Helping Achieve Data Quality” document listed under Resources. Make sufficient copies for the DQOC. Send the material to the DQOC in advance of the meeting for this activity so the members can read the two articles before they arrive. The document contains a cover sheet that provides instructions to the reader.
- Download the “Quality Data Self-Assessment” document listed under Resources. Make sufficient copies for the DQOC.
- Have copies of the Data Summary created at the end of Component 2 Activity 2 for the DQOC members.



A project of the Oregon Department of Education,
with support from the EESC

Presentation Strategy

- Hand out copies of the Data Summary document created at the last activity (Component 2 Activity 2). While reviewing the document, comment on the large amount of data being collected and used to make decisions. The importance of data accuracy is easy to see. Use this as a springboard back to the Quality Data Culture Concept Map.
- The four components of quality data are listed in the upper left quadrant of the Concept Map. The presenter should clarify each of the four concepts for the DQOC.
 - Accuracy: Given the many users who make multiple decisions based upon the collected data, accuracy is paramount. Incorrect data will seldom lead to good decisions.
 - Utility: This is the usefulness of the data being collected. If the data is not useful, then energy spent in collecting it is wasted energy. The district should be certain that the data that is being collected is being used to inform decisions. The district should also be certain that the data that is needed for decisionmaking is being collected.
 - Timeliness: Collected data forms the basis of summary reports, which provide analysis and meaning to the data. Providing such reports should be done in a timely manner. Reports that are delayed may provide meaningful data but may be too late to act upon.
 - Security: Much of the data being collected is of a confidential nature and steps need to be taken to ensure adherence to confidentiality laws such as FERPA, HIPAA, etc. This component also addresses computer security, passwords, and data recovery plans.
- Next, move to the upper right corner of the Concept Map and talk through the six factors that can impact data quality. Comment that the articles that were handed out in advance of the meeting described what might be considered “best practices” in each factor area. Explain that this activity will include doing a self-assessment from a school and from a district perspective of current practices.
- Self-Assessment Strategy
 - If the DQOC contains eight or more people, split the group into two. One group will do the School survey and the other will do the District survey. If the DQOC is smaller than eight, the group will do both surveys which may affect the overall time commitment for this activity.
 - In splitting the DQOC into two groups, try to ensure that each group has representation from both school level and district level. This will add to the interaction and discussion during the activity.
 - Process: With the self-assessment document you will be using the following scale for either a school perspective or a district perspective:
 1. This doesn't happen here.
 2. This happens but it would typically not be the norm.
 3. This usually happens.
 4. This always happens.

- If your position has many others like it within the district (i.e., a building secretary) try to consider how all of the other people in your position would rate the statement.
- A single survey is provided each group. One member of the group reads the first statement. Then like “Paper, Rock , Scissors”, the group members tap the desk three times and on the third, expose the number of fingers for their rating. The group is after a consensus score. If everyone has the same number, that is the consensus score. If the responses are different the high score/low score respondents share their rational for the score. This dialog is important and builds common understanding. Expect to find a difference in responses between building level and district level personnel.
- Each group has 30 minutes to complete the appropriate survey.
- When each group has completed the survey, hand out individual blank surveys (both school and district) to all participants except the “reporter.” The facilitator will only need a blank copy of the other survey and will keep the one just completed. The reporter from one group will read out the consensus scores for each item. The other participants will record the scores on their blank forms. (2-3 minutes max per group).
- The group facilitator should record the scores on an overhead or projected copy of the survey.
- Once all of the scores are recorded, have the participants comment on things that might have been a surprise for them or that they feel positive about. Keep it positive!
- Now we are going to look at the items that we ranked low. Some of these things may not happen but within our organization do not cause a negative impact. Some of these things may not happen, and cause negative impact on our data quality. The first is okay, the second needs to be addressed. Today’s activity points to some of the areas we should look at closer – the things that negatively impact our data quality.
- Before we actually make a master list of the areas with negative impact, we want to solicit things that you are concerned about or know that others are concerned about. Perhaps there is something that didn’t come up in today’s survey or perhaps there is something you are concerned about but because others in your group were not, the group score didn’t reflect your concern. This input will be gathered through an anonymous survey handed out now but returned later.
- The group facilitator will compile the results for the next activity.
- The group facilitator will take the two surveys and complete the Summary page of the survey document. This is done by computing the average score for each of the six categories of the survey and entering it on the summary page. Finish the summary by computing the overall average score for both the School and District assessments. A sample is available in Resources.
- Hand out a copy of “Best Practices for Data Entry” as additional information for the DQOC.



A project of the Oregon Department of Education,
with support from the EESC

- Once you have received the anonymous self-assessment surveys, compile all of the input into a single document, which will be used in the next activity. A sample is available in Resources.

Note: Unless otherwise noted, the resources listed below are available at www.oregondatapoint.org

Resources

- Helping Achieve Data Quality (PDF document)
- Quality Data Self-Assessment (PDF document)
- Anonymous Self-Assessment Input (PDF document)
- Template: Self Assessment Summary (Word document)
- Sample: Self Assessment results and summary page (PDF document)
- Sample: Anonymous Self-Assessment Summary (PDF document)
- Best Practices for Data Entry (PDF document)
- Session Evaluation (PDF document)

Learnings from the Pilot

- The “paper, rock, scissors” strategy was very effective in getting people to share an opinion without being impacted by the others. Many times we saw 1’s and 4’s within the group. This caused laughter and more importantly a discussion of why people responded the way they did. Sometimes this was caused by a misunderstanding or lack of information on how things actually worked within the district. The groups always came to a consensus and the activity evaluation forms consistently commented on the interactive discussions as being a positive.
- The group facilitator will need to monitor each group and keep them on task. This activity lends itself to a great deal of sidebar or extended discussion regarding the statements read.
- When the summary report was completed, the overall averages were very close comparing the School and District assessments. We noted that some sub-categories showed larger discrepancies (>0.7), which may be an indication of an area worth additional discussion.
- Offering people an opportunity to provide input on specific negative situations within the district in each of the six impact areas provided a rich source of information about what is really happening (or not happening) within the district. Compiling the information into a single document highlights duplicate ideas and will be used in creating a district roadmap for improvement. In each pilot, we believe we got information because of anonymity that we would not have otherwise received.

administrative support
technology
school improvement
special needs



A project of the Oregon Department of Education,
with support from the EESC