**Data Task Force Meeting: August In-Person | August 8th, 2018**

# **SUBCOMMITTEE: ANALYSIS**

# CHAIR: JUTTA ULRICH

# ATTENDEES:

[x]  Aaron Wicks [x]  Tiffany Keimig

[x]  Lise Stuart

[x]  Matt Fitzgerald

[x]  Jenae Bjelland

[x]  Jutta Ulrich

# ACTION ITEMS:

* **Add introduction to FAQ**
* **Add theory of change to the FAQ to help people buy in**
* **Add intro, big picture why, format with some examples, theory of change**
* **Separate documents for decision/ question trees with specific levels of questions for; frontline workers, case managers, leaders, boards, state, partners**

# NOTES:

* Services and outcomes are separated , and need connection and analysis
	+ Who got outcomes from services
	+ Ability to tell whole story
* Skill sets and interests matter

FAQ:

* The group agreed that the Analysis FAQ was sorely needed, but added that it would be more effective to lead off with “WY”, and not so much with “WHAT” as this would better illustrate why it all matters.
* The group agreed that it is necessary to be the leader in services and will need to connect it to the overall community. To do this, the subcommittee will look into using collective impact models/ statements and helping smaller agencies contribute.
* The Analysis Subcommittee discussed what are the key elements of a story in writing data and sharing that with other agencies in order to bring it back to their communities as:
	+ Explaining best expectations and the message
	+ Maintaining the system and partnerships
	+ Using State Plans to help guide and to share that information or source
* The group prioritized showing frontline staff how their work is applied and how they are contributing as well as ensuring program managers keep reporting back to their line staff on their contributions and maintaining continuity of data.
* The analysis subcommittee stressed the common theory of change is important to address and that they need to cross this threshold and bridge any differences on it as well as elevate awareness among the network on this issue.
	+ To do this, it is important to Opening up the CAP’s understanding of the bigger picture
* Additionally, the subcommittee agreed that there needs to be a list of questions one should be able to ask and to know the answers to; such as are things getting better or worse as this would provide greater flexibility.
	+ By also understanding who does and doesn’t come back and what the data says about that.
		- The group agreed that a question tree be developed of what types of questions can be asked for the data and what would still need to be asked to fill out the data.
* For this, there needs to be examples that resonate and that are digestible to the majority
* The group stressed that it is paramount to have, analyze, and maintain the connection between what is done and why it matters. There will be inherent resistance to data because it makes some question their beliefs and their world view, but it can be approached in a way with identification of a specific problem and to make them come to their conclusion/ breakthrough on their own.
* The Analysis Subcommittee furthered discussed how analysis needs to be done overtime to identify trends in order to help tell the story and find comparisons. This would help with talking about disparity and equity.
* The Analysis Subcommittee stressed the importance of knowing the depth of case management in telling and analyzing information and connected that success with having leadership’s buy in so that the case managers are assisted in doing their jobs.

DOCUMENT:

* The Analysis Subcommittee discussed the analysis FAQ and agreed that the following had to be added to it:
	+ An introduction, a bigger picture “why”, a format with some examples, and a theory of change.
	+ The group also agreed on a separate document of a decision tree with levels of questions for frontline, case managers, leaders, board members, states, and national partners. As well as an interface between family level and community level outcomes.
* The group also started on assessing the need for data prompt questions and data analysis prompts and would expand on this topic at a later date, as well as adding measurements into it.
	+ They expressed how therange of funding is huge and what are people assuming is a positive outcome and that they need to tell the story of what the indicators/ outcome are
* The Analysis Subcommittee asked its members if they know if there are surveys in their own areas and if they could check, gather, and report back with them.

WEBSITE:

* The subcommittee discussed the new PMG website and how it is a contractual deliverable between NASCSP and OCS off of the Annual Report. The website would be modeled off the LIHEAP website and would pull analysis and data across different states.
* The first few years of the site would focus on state data, but local agencies would be able to login and see data and trends for themselves as well. For right now, the plan is for only states to be featured because the data is powerful and there needs to be a mechanism in place to control the data so it is not taken out of context.
* Federal website requires a huge amount of approval and is slow going and is tricky because OCS is deliberate in unveiling everything as there is also a 3 year OMB Clearance Process to take into consideration. Because of this, the first reporting will not be until 2019 but there will be trend analysis later on with only minor changes to the data.
* The subcommittee also discussed the public audience of the website as being mixed to include congressional staffers, local agencies, associations, etc. and that the data and analysis must be defendable to everyone looking at it regardless of who they work for.
* Another consideration brought to the subcommittee was the Organizational Standards model and how it is interpreted and to be thoughtful of what it looks like.
* The group also discussed what the first year data would look like as being based off of state information in module 1, and looking into module 2. Integrating services and outcomes in module 3 hasn’t gotten to the level on inclusion yet as narratives would need to be sorted out.
* Additionally, the group discussed the idea of having a place where people can click that can show them what determines the funding states can get and how funds are allocated.
* The group finished discussion with needing to find out more information with blockage in demographics within HEADSTART and to choose a chart and blowout feature of the website that can look at one particular state as well module 3 and the strategy that is going into it and its relationship with the agencies

# NEXT STEPS:

The analysis subcommittee came to an agreement on what their next steps moving forward would be. The next steps discussed were;

* All next steps on FAQ
* Public website
* Treating taskforce to tear apart and Qs on what we want the website to do.
* Additionally, the subcommittee discussed the timeline going forward or the following agenda items:
	+ Life cycle data
	+ Crosswalks on LIHEAP
	+ Standard measurement tools to indicators
	+ List of standard docs for strategies
	+ Joint deliverable with Communications Subcommittee
		- Talking points or data summary

# REPORT OUT SUMMARY:

* All next steps on FAQ
	+ Subcommittee reviewed all next steps on the FAQ and determined that the document needs to be expanded for different audiences to be able to understand it, as well as an introduction paragraph linked to the theory of change needs to be added. It is also the recommendation of this subcommittee to provide more concrete examples to make the document relevant for others who may use it. It is also determined by this subcommittee that we need to establish questions trees with a data focus for all levels; such as those on the frontline, case managers, leaders, board members, the state, and national partners.
* The subcommittee reviewed the dashboard for the website and it is the recommendation to use the analysis subcommittee and larger Task Force to use it as a focus group to provide feedback for proposed dashboards and their changes moving forward; such as what is relevant, useful, and what can be taken out of context/ used against us.
* There was a recommendation for the analysis and communications subcommittees to coordinate efforts to create talking points on relevance of CSBG considering this current political climate and upcoming elections, so any new members of Congress can be informed. These points would be driven by what national partners have determined necessary and what NCAF has determined would meet their needs.
* The subcommittee reviewed its upcoming deliverables and agreed that these are still relevant and that the timeline that was assigned to them still makes sense. These include:
	+ Life cycle data
	+ Crosswalks on LIHEAP
	+ Standard measurement tools to indicators
	+ List of standard docs for strategies
* There was a request of the subcommittee in this meeting for members to go back to their own areas and organizations and ask for any analysis tools that may be shared for review of the taskforce.