

WE MAY USE A POLL DURING THE MEETING TODAY.
TO ACCESS THE POLL, PLEASE OPEN A BROWSER WINDOW TO [POLLEV.COM/KAHUINA](https://pollev.com/KAHUINA)



CSTE NSSP Regional Data Sharing Workshop

Follow-up Call | West Regional

Follow-up Call| West Regional Workshop

Agenda

Objectives:

1. describe progress made by each project team
2. describe a timeline for continuation of work
3. advance their projects with CSTE support

Start :00



Attendance and agenda



In-person Meeting Review

:15



Mini-Project Charter Review

--*Process for SyS Data Sharing- Teresa Jue*

--*Data Quality for Data Sharing- Sara Chronister*

--*DUA Template – Kathy Turner*

--*Model Dashboard – Amanda Morse*

--*California – Haydee Dabritz*

:50



Additional Resource Needs

In-person Workshop Review

Day 1: Realize the value

2-part, guided data sharing activity for enhancing surveillance practice to address the opioid crisis using BioSense Platform tools and participant expertise

Realize value

1. Evaluate classifiers
2. Make surveillance products
3. Explore application/use

Appreciate value

1. The value is ____
2. With more we could ____
3. Readiness and solutions
4. Mini-project planning

Post-Workshop

Follow-up virtual meeting to support advancement of collaborative mini-projects

Day 2: Appreciate the value


Dialogue and brainstorming to imagine what could be, and make plans for getting to greater data sharing benefits

Workshop Feedback


+ Pluses

Effectiveness

Fostering Collaboration
among Peer Network



Examining and sharing
best practices



Participants generally agreed or strongly agreed that the workshop included:

- Appropriate agenda and objectives
- Useful and relevant content and discussions

Participants generally agreed or strongly agreed that:

- The workshop was well-organized
- Discussions were encouraged during the workshop

Most Valuable Aspects

"Meeting syndromic users from other jurisdictions face to face and being able to talk about similarities and differences in how we collect and use our data."

"...identifying what steps needed to be taken to facilitate data sharing, and then actually beginning those projects at the workshop "


"Establishing a safe space to discuss long-standing barriers to data sharing."

"Being able come together and see that the data sharing process doesn't have to be so ...complicated and that it can be a benefit for every party collaborating..."


Manage Time

Participants conveyed the importance of more time for completing deliverables and having detailed discussions

"Workshop length was appropriate."



"There was adequate time for discussion."



"One of the biggest challenges was having such a broad range of ESSENCE skills and understanding that we couldn't get very far into the technical details of how to share data and the implications of sharing data."

Refine Activities

Feedback included suggestions to further increase value of workshop activities



Identify jurisdictional knowledge and participation in BioSense prior to the workshop



Provide clear activity instructions and set expectations for groups



More time for hands-on activities and determining approaches to data sharing obstacles



Shorten sticky note activities



More opportunities for networking and in-depth data sharing discussions between jurisdictions



Increase CDC participation and small-group facilitation

Mini-Project Charters

Review, Progress, Next Steps

Charter Review Process for Sharing

Charter Review

- To determine a procedure for shared data handling including the request and closing processes, stakeholder engagements, and communication pathways.

Deliverables

- Create a basic workflow and further define each process for each sharing request
- Create a standardized form for data sharing requests including:
 1. How the data will be used
 2. Data description and other details related to data governance
 3. Format for sharing (dashboard and aggregation details, other data visualization options, etc.)
 4. Timelines
 5. Data suppression including interstate considerations
- Communication pathways and contact lists for stakeholder engagement

Changes Made


Next Steps

Project Members

Name	Agency
Greg Budney	Denver
Eunice Santos	UT
Mitch DeValliere	NV
Teresa Jue	AZ
Kirk Bol	CO
Melinda Thomas	CDC

Charter Review Process for Sharing

Assumptions: DUA is in place at the start of this workflow



Charter Review Data Quality for Sharing

Charter Review

- To provide jurisdictions a standardized workflow for understanding data quality and data considerations across jurisdictions leading up to data sharing.

Deliverables

1. Question guide for jurisdictions to follow to share information about their data
2. Evaluation of question guide

Changes Made

Next Steps

Project Members

Name	Agency
Sara Chronister	AZ
Krystal Collier	AZ
Levi Schlosser	ND
Michael Sheppard	CDC
Loren Rodgers	CDC
Sebastian Romano	CDC

Charter Review DUA Template

Charter Review

- To develop a model data use agreement for sharing between jurisdictions and associated resources

Deliverables

1. FAQ and instructions
2. Template with annotation
3. Inventory of data use agreement execution and status
4. Recommended stakeholder communication plan
5. Recommended governance of DUAs

Changes Made

Next Steps

Project Members

Name	Agency
Jessica White	Maricopa
Keaton Hughes	NM
Kate Goodin	Maricopa
Kathy Turner	ID
Mandy Nakamura	HI
Derek Vale	HI
Lori Zigich	NM
Rasha Elnimeiry	ND
Nick Hill	SD

Charter Review Model Dashboard

Charter Review

To develop a template dashboard to be implemented with various types of interjurisdictional outcomes

Deliverables

Template dashboard(s) by facility and/or patient location

1. Example queries included
2. Example alerts included
3. Multiple widget types (bar charts, time series, maps, etc)
4. Stratifications by site
5. Demographics (age/sex/race/ethnicity)

Changes Made

Next Steps

Project Members

Name	Agency
Amanda Morse	WA
Kelli Cogswell	OR
Rob Laing	OR
Kevin Wickersham	WA
Carson Telford	UT
Dametreea Carr	Pinal

Charter Review California

Charter Review

- Increase number of CA counties reporting in BioSense
- Improve communication LHJs to state
- Ensure proper DUAs are in place county-to-county and county-to-state
- Engage counties who have their own SyS (San Diego, Santa Clara, L.A., Solano)

Deliverables

1. DUAs – if needed
2. Identify CDPH champion(s)
3. Define CDPH role
4. Define reporting region (learn from other states, e.g., TX Dept of State Hlth Svcs)
Landscape analysis of BioSense county onboarding status (not started, planning, new onboard, experienced onboard, own system)
5. Contact list for counties for syndromic surveillance (regional contact for LHJs without ED)
6. Situational awareness map of all hospitals

Project Members

Name	Agency
Natalie Demeter	CDPH
Wendy Hetherington	Riverside
Rick Lopez	Riverside
Karen Pfister	San Mateo
Debbie Van Olst	San Mateo
Karman Tam	Sacramento
Haydee Dabritz	Yolo
Tamara Hennessy	CDPH

Charter Review California

Progress

Mapped and prepared list of California LHJs on BioSense.

Participated in CA BioSense User Group call 7/26/2019.

Next Steps

Awaiting outcome of contact with Dr. Michael Samuel at CDPH (assigned at CA BioSense User Group to Rachel, San Mateo County).

Planning to send list of hospitals for each CA county to the PI contact at each LHJ to determine which hospital systems participate.

Project Members

Name	Agency
Natalie Demeter	CDPH
Wendy Hetherington	Riverside
Rick Lopez	Riverside
Karen Pfister	San Mateo
Debbie Van Olst	San Mateo
Karman Tam	Sacramento
Haydee Dabritz	Yolo
Tamara Hennessy	CDPH



Mahalo

Contact

Hayleigh McCall, CSTE

hmccall@cste.org