

# Oregon DATA Project

## Technical Training

### Component 2: Building a Culture of Data Quality

#### Activity 4:

## Data Steward Responsibilities

### Purpose

- Quality data does not happen by accident. It is the result of purposeful actions and oversight supervision by a Data Steward or a Data Quality Oversight Committee. The self-assessment completed in Component 2 Activity 3 allows a district to identify areas that may need additional oversight. Adding these areas to the recommended list of responsibilities from the national model, the Data Quality Oversight Committee can begin assigning specific district personnel to each responsibility. Using the self-assessment as an annual assessment tool and by implementing the purposeful oversight and activities covered in the responsibility grid, the district will be well on its way to building a culture of data quality, a culture in which data is valued and used to achieve goals and one that understands and respects the effort it takes to generate quality data.

### Participants

- Presenter: Data Quality Oversight Committee leader
- Audience: Data Quality Oversight Committee (DQOC)

### Session Description

- Using the self-assessment summary reports created in the previous activity, the DQOC will spend time identifying areas in which the district/school need to improve.
- Using the anonymous self-assessment, the DQOC can expand improvement areas or add additional responsibilities to the master list.
- The Data Steward Responsibilities list will become a master work plan for specific people within the organization.
- Total time for this session: 60 minutes

### Objectives

- Review the self-assessment summary report from Component 2 Activity 3.
- Review the anonymous self-assessment comments.
- Identify areas for focusing improvement efforts.
- Assign data steward responsibilities to specific district personnel.



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

## Presenter Preparation

- Review the self-assessment summary and the anonymous self-assessment comments from the previous activity.
- Please read the “Learnings from the Pilot” section for comments about how to react to the ratings.
- Review the “Data Steward Responsibilities” grid.

## Presentation Strategy

- Using the self-assessment summary reports created in the previous activity, the DQOC will spend time identifying areas in which the district/school need to improve. Areas which had a consensus rating of 3 (“usually happens”) or 4 (“always happens”) are areas that a district will want to maintain existing efforts. Areas with a consensus rating of 2 (Happens but not the norm) are areas in which good practices exist but not applied throughout the system. A district may be able to improve the rating from a 2 to a 3 with minimal efforts by improving the use of good practices across the district. Areas rated as 1 (Doesn’t Happen) may take action or efforts that are totally new for the district. This may take significant effort or resources.
- Look at the areas that received a score of 1 or 2 and then make a decision as to if this may or may not be an area worth focusing improvement efforts. (See “Learnings from the Pilot” section.) Areas with a score of 3 or 4 should be maintained. (30 minutes for this analysis discussion)
- Use the “Who’s Got Whoville’s Data?” PowerPoint presentation to shift to a discussion about Data Steward responsibilities. As you quickly bring each slide’s text to the full screen, use the presenter notes to provide a connection between the slide and the Quality Data Culture Concept Map. (5 minutes)
  - Pages 1-5 helped us identify the importance and the large amount of data that we collect. This is the bottom right bubble: Importance of a Quality Data Culture.
  - Pages 6,7 will be discussed in a later activity that will focus on State Collections.
  - Pages 8-10 address the upper right bubble: Factors Affecting a Quality Data Culture.
  - Page 11 clearly asks, “Who is the Data Steward charged with oversight?” This is the bottom left bubble of “Roles.” This becomes the job of the Data Quality Oversight Committee and the question is, “What activities or responsibilities need to be accomplished to provide good oversight?”
- Hand out the Data Steward/Coordinator Responsibilities Assignments grid. These areas come from the national model the Oregon DATA Project is working from. The DQOC should add additional responsibilities from the anonymous assessment comments and from the identified improvement areas from the self-assessment summary report. (10 minutes)
- Hand out the Role description sheets from the national model for generating ideas as to personnel in the district that may be assigned the responsibilities on the grid. (2 minutes)
  - In some cases the staff responsible column may contain a single person, and in other situations it may contain multiple people.



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

- The completed grid, with the additional identified areas of improvement efforts, becomes the beginning of a work plan for the district to build the culture of data quality. (13 minutes)

**Note: Unless otherwise noted, the resources listed below are available at [www.oregondataproject.org](http://www.oregondataproject.org)**

## Resources

- Self Assessment and Anonymous Assessment comments from previous activity
- *Who's Got Whoville's Data?*\_(PowerPoint presentation)
- Quality Data Culture Concept Map (PDF document)
- Quality Data: Role Descriptions (PDF document)
- Data Steward/Coordinator Responsibility Assignments (Word document)

## Learnings from the Pilot

- Each pilot district self-assessment summary had areas rated 1 (“does not happen”) or 2 (“happens but not the norm”). In some cases, the district looked at a “best practice” which was rated 1 and decided not to put forth efforts to change. As an example, a district rated itself a 1 for the best practice of “Standards and guidelines are posted in areas where data entry occurs.” The district felt that the posting of standards and guidelines for all areas of data would be a large notebook that would not be easily used by the people entering the data. The district decided that its open communication network that allowed people with data standard questions to access answers through a quick call to the help desk or on-line documentation was sufficient and working well. Bottom line, don’t let the numerical rating necessarily dictate district improvement efforts.
- In each district, the anonymous comments really added depth to the self-assessment ratings. Many items were identified by multiple comments and made it fairly simple to identify possible areas for improvement efforts. Each Data Quality Oversight Committee was able to identify three or four areas that they felt they could positively impact in the near future.
- In assigning responsibilities, each of the pilot districts identified individuals as well as groups/committees. Some of the individuals identified were expected to be totally responsible to meet the activity/responsibility while some were expected to create a team to meet the activity/responsibility.



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