



Subcommittee Report:

Other Items, Services, and Capacity Building

Kim Murnieks, Director, Ohio Office of Budget and Management
Matt Soldner, Agency Evaluation Officer, U.S. Department of Education

August 2021 (Annotated)

Background

Subcommittee Charge

- The overarching purpose of this focus area is **ensuring NSDS users—be they federal, state, local, or other authorized entities—can make the best possible use of the Service’s potential for secure and privacy-protecting evidence building, regardless of their existing analytic capacity.**
- Two remits of equal importance include making recommendations on:
 1. **Providing training, coaching, and technical support (“technical assistance”)** to NSDS users; and
 2. **Approaches to communicating** about the Service with citizens, policymakers at all levels of government, and researchers focused on the Service’s potential value proposition for each.
 - Temporally, this second remit will likely begin before the first.

Committee Discussion

Discussion Questions

- Do these activities resonate with the large committee?
- Are there “blue sky” activities that we might want to telegraph in the Year One report so that we can spur discussion and feedback?
- Are there discussion points that other subcommittees have raised that our subcommittee should consider and further develop – items that are out of your subcommittee’s scope and properly fall into our “Other Items” scope?
- As we move to writing more formal recommendations and are weighing our choices, what decision-making standards would the whole committee have us consider?
 - Value proposition of a given recommendation to key stakeholders?
 - Resource availability to implement recommendation as we understand it today, versus what might be possible in the future?
 - Centrality of recommendation to “north star” of the NSDS?
 - Other factors?

Technical Assistance

Proposed Recommendation Structure

Activities to Fully Define (the “What”)	Other Considerations (the “Who” and “How”)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Completing administrative processes required to gain access to linkable administrative data▪ Ingesting those data into the NSDS architecture▪ Analyzing linked or linkable data in secure, privacy-preserving ways▪ Privacy protection, including how to analyze the risk associated with releasing de-identified confidential data	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Core staff with the appropriate skill set that are sufficiently resourced to provide technical assistance for use of the Service<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ “Data concierge”, has a comprehensive but necessarily constrained understanding of available data and how it might be fit for various research purpose; works with agency-based experts▪ What is the most effective way for that staff and NSDS users to gain access to:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• agency-based experts with insight into specific datasets and systems (e.g., FSRDC “institutional partners”)• expertise in the latest analytic methodologies• legal and technical expertise in privacy

Observations

- This necessarily implies roles for NSDS staff as well as agency staff
- Technical assistance will be needed for both data providers—at all levels—and data consumers. Even experienced researchers will need training on new analytic methods and our evolving understanding of privacy and related issues.
- Training models, including those at Georgetown and via the Coleridge Initiative, exist
- There is intersection between the NSDS’ R&D roles, governance roles, and its training roles

Communications

Proposed Recommendation Structure

Activities to Fully Define (the “What”)	Other Considerations (the “Who” and “How”)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Identifying internal and external stakeholders who we need to communicate with (“audience identification”)▪ Clarifying our communication goals for each audience<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ <i>Each group.</i> Promoting the value proposition of an NSDS▪ <i>Data providers.</i> Data quality at all levels, starting at collection, and the need for convergence on standards that make linking easier.▪ <i>Evidence-building partners.</i> Agency evidence-building needs, such as issues identified in Learning Agendas▪ <i>Transparency.</i> About what data are being linked, by whom, for what purpose, and what’s being learned.▪ <i>Research community.</i> Implications of having more and more useful data increasing available on privacy and privacy budgets▪ Creating the actual communications▪ Identifying appropriate communication channels, intermediaries, and influencers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Determining what needs to be communicated when in the lifecycle of the NSDS▪ Clarifying whether this is a core function/role of NSDS staff versus work that can leverage external experts in or out of government.

Observations

- We have an expanding list of project pilots—how might they serve as a “jumping off point” for communicating about the potential value of this kind of work?

Committee Discussion

Discussion Questions

- Do these activities resonate with the large committee?
- Are there “blue sky” activities that we might want to telegraph in the Year One report so that we can spur discussion and feedback?
- Are there discussion points that other subcommittees have raised that our subcommittee should consider and further develop – items that are out of your subcommittee’s scope and properly fall into our “Other Items” scope?
- As we move to writing more formal recommendations and are weighing our choices, what decision-making standards would the whole committee have us consider?
 - Value proposition of a given recommendation to key stakeholders?
 - Resource availability to implement recommendation as we understand it today, versus what might be possible in the future?
 - Centrality of recommendation to “north star” of the NSDS?
 - Other factors?