

***Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global)  
Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG)***

Washington, DC

*March 16, 2006*

## Meeting Summary

### Background, Purpose, and Introductions

The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), and the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative's (Global) Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG or Working Group) convened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. on March 16, 2006, in Washington, DC. Mr. Robert Boehmer, Esquire, GPIQWG chair, and Ms. Jeanette Plante, Esquire, GPIQWG vice chair, led the meeting in the furtherance of and alignment with the GPIQWG's *Vision and Mission Statements*.

The Working Group convened for the purpose of educating the membership body, via guest presenters, on the topics of information quality (IQ), the prominent issues surrounding IQ, and the resources currently available that may be relevant to justice information sharing. The speakers' expertise was also requested to assist the group in defining the scope of the problem as it pertains to possible Global activities and recommendations and to help the group in formulating their next steps for developing justice-related information quality resources.

### Attendees

The following individuals were in attendance:

**Mr. Robert P. Boehmer, Chair**  
*Institute for Public Safety Partnerships  
University of Illinois at Chicago  
Chicago, Illinois*

**Ms. Jeanette Plante, Vice Chair**  
*Office of Records Management Policy  
Justice Management Division  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Washington, DC*

**Mr. Francis (Paco) Aumand**  
*Division of Criminal Justice Services  
Vermont Department of Public Safety  
Waterbury, Vermont*

**Ms. Cindy Southworth**  
*National Safety and Strategic Technology Project  
National Network to End Domestic Violence Fund  
Washington, DC*

**Mr. David K. Byers**  
*Administrative Office of the Courts  
Arizona Supreme Court  
Phoenix, Arizona*

**Ms. Martha W. Stekete**  
*Independent Consultant  
Chicago, Illinois*

**Mr. Alan Carlson**

*The Justice Management Institute  
Kensington, California*

**Mr. Cabell C. Cropper**

*National Criminal Justice Association  
Washington, DC*

**Mr. Larry English**

*INFORMATION IMPACT International, Inc.  
Brentwood, Tennessee*

**Mr. Owen M. Greenspan**

*Law and Policy Program  
SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice  
Information and Statistics  
Clifton Park, New York*

**Ms. Barbara Hurst**

*Rhode Island Office of the Public Defender  
Providence, Rhode Island*

**Ms. Rhonda M. Jones**

*Office of Science and Technology  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Washington, DC*

**Ms. Erin Kenneally**

*San Diego Supercomputer Center  
La Jolla, California*

**Ms. Susan A. Laniewski**

*Justice and Public Safety  
Bull Services  
Billerica, Massachusetts*

**Ms. Erin S. Lee**

*Homeland Security Technology Policy Studies  
Center for Best Practices  
National Governors Association  
Washington, DC*

**Mr. Thomas MacLellan**

*Social, Economic, and Workforce Programs  
Division  
National Governors Association  
Washington, DC*

**Ms. Ada Pecos Melton**

*American Indian Development Associates  
Indian Pueblo Cultural Center  
Albuquerque, New Mexico*

**Mr. Richard Wang, Ph.D.**

*MIT Information Quality (MITIQ) Program  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)  
Cambridge, Massachusetts*

**Mr. Carl A. Wicklund**

*American Probation and Parole Association  
Lexington, Kentucky*

**DOJ/OJP Officials****Mr. Hyuk Byun**

*Communications and Information Technology  
National Institute of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Washington, DC*

**Mr. William A. Ford**

*Information Led Policing  
National Institute of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Washington, DC*

**Mr. Christopher Traver**

*Bureau of Justice Assistance  
Office of Justice Programs  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Washington, DC*

**Observers****Mr. Wil Nagel**

*Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority  
Chicago, Illinois*

**Ms. Brittany White**

*Bureau of Justice Assistance  
Office of Justice Programs  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Washington, DC*

**Ms. Martha Williams**

*Bureau of Justice Assistance  
Office of Justice Programs  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Washington, DC*

**Staff****Ms. Christina Abernathy**

*Institute for Intergovernmental Research  
Tallahassee, Florida*

**Mr. Gerard Ramker, Ph.D.**  
*National Criminal History Improvement  
Program  
Bureau of Justice Statistics  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Washington, DC*

**Ms. Terri Pate**  
*Institute for Intergovernmental Research  
Tallahassee, Florida*

**Ms. Donna Rinehart**  
*Institute for Intergovernmental Research  
Tallahassee, Florida*

The following presenters, notable professionals in the information/data quality field, were introduced by Mr. Boehmer:

**Mr. Larry English**  
**President and Principal**  
**INFORMATION IMPACT International, Inc.**

**Dr. Richard Wang**  
**Director**  
**Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Information Quality (MITIQ) Program**

Following the morning presentations, the group held a working lunch to facilitate questions and discussion with the guest speakers and to begin scoping primary issues in information quality.

The meeting included a group review and discussion of a draft of the *Information Quality in Justice Information Sharing Fact Sheet*. Using the knowledge gained from the guest presentations, the group would then make revisions to the draft fact sheet.

Ms. Plante commended the Working Group on their work and the success of their last product, the *Privacy Policy Development Guide*, and referenced her presentation at the SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics Symposium, held that week, regarding sharing agreements between entities involved in information sharing. Ms. Plante emphasized how much the guide helps in providing substance for the agreements.

Mr. Boehmer gave an overview of the meeting agenda and key discussion points. Refer to Attachment A, Global Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG) Agenda, for a complete agenda for this meeting.

### **Speaker Presentation:**

**Mr. Larry English, INFORMATION IMPACT International, Inc.**

Invited speaker, Mr. Larry English, gave a comprehensive presentation on information quality, accompanied by PowerPoint and overhead projector visuals, according to the following outline and highlighted discussion points:

#### **Presentation Outline**

- **Applying Quality Principles to Information:**
  - Privacy—a fundamental expectation people have and a component of IQ.

- A brief history of information quality.
- **Assessing Information Quality:**
  - Primary issues in IQ.
- **Improving Information Process Quality:**
  - IQ—a product of our processes; it is produced.
- **Implementing an Information Quality Improvement Environment:**
  - The role of the policymaker in IQ.
  - Policymakers need to have education and agencies must organize themselves in order for the 14 points of IQ to work/apply.

Mr. English detailed fourteen points of total IQ management, defined the characteristics of IQ, and outlined the fundamental principles of IQ. Mr. English emphasized a cultural shift throughout the organization and listed IQ improvement techniques to assist with this process. The following is a list of notable points made by Mr. English:

- **An agency needs to define IQ** and share the definition among the agency employees to ensure a comprehensive understanding and culture shift agency-wide.
- **Distinction between data quality and IQ**—Data is the representation of a fact, while IQ is the meaning derived from a fact.
- **IQ is a fundamental paradigm shift** for how we do things today; a way of conceiving things—a pattern or model for how we see the world. This is our framework for solving problems.
- **IQ is not data cleansing, rather process improvement.** By eliminating the cost of data cleansing as a result of the improvement of the process, there is a financial savings gained that can be justified for use in funding the next IQ initiatives.
- **IQ must be presented in an intuitive and nonbiased way.** Creating, updating, and retrieval are all a part of the data production process (presentation of the information).
- **Funding IQ by:**
  1. Improving process.
  2. Reducing information scrap and rework.

A large component of information technology budgets is for scrap and rework. Whereas, if the IQ process is defined, adopted as a culture, comprehensively trained and implemented, and managers are made accountable, the cost of scrap and rework is reduced—thus more funding can then go towards funding the improvement of the process. If you have to do a data cleansing, do it once and only once, but also utilize the private data sets for comparison and auto-correction. One major problem is how much productivity is lost because

we deal with bad data (for scrap and rework). This is a huge issue in any department.

- Mr. English referenced a cost/benefit demonstration in his book entitled *Improving Data Warehouse and Business Information Quality*, page 199. Statistics are displayed there that may be useful in showing the impact of bad IQ and the risks associated with it.
- **Training** must be provided for both managers and staff (producers). Upward education is also needed. Every time a new leader is elected or appointed, have a system in place for upward education.
- **Culture:** An agency has to create a culture consistent with a shared mission and implemented through stewardship agreements/contracts across organizational boundaries, based on an understanding of the mutual information requirements. The agency should provide IQ training as well as reciprocal benefits/incentives and feedback and hold managers accountable for IQ (e.g., write it in their job description).
- **Meta data** is data and symbols that describe other data.
- **User is not a good term.** It doesn't define roles enough, whereas the following terms may be more useful: knowledge worker (who retrieves or applies information), information consumers (federal agencies use this term), or business partners.

### **Working Group Discussion**

The following list contains comments and discussions raised by the Working Group:

- **Top-Down vs. Bottom-Up Approach:** Discussion amongst the working group ensued regarding this top-down vs. bottom-up approach, with the following comments:
  - IQ should be applied at the lowest level (e.g., the police officer who enters the information into the system).
  - Top executives must be educated and empowered in order to implement IQ.
  - The problem we experience is multiple pieces of information from multiple sources and an issue of trust in that data. "How do you build the trust that IQ will occur? There is not an ownership of the combined data."
  - The first source of information may have a tendency to overstate or enter incorrect information (gathering wrong information), when not familiar with how the information will or may be used. How do you deal with those things? What are the incentives?
- **Private Sector Database Sources:** We are dealing with the problem of fake identifications and fake social security numbers. We're moving mass amounts of data and centralizing them. We found, however, that when we compared the social security numbers to private sector databases, we could

automatically correct the discrepancies. There are ways to partner with private sector entities to auto-correct these entries, but one problem is that there isn't a financial incentive to fund IQ endeavors.

- **Evolutionary Data:** A common problem is evolutionary data (for example, using the name John Doe until a fingerprint match is found and identification is made). You need details around the information, such as where did the information come from, what agency supplied the information, and on what date was it established? **Information evolves as it moves.** Very often information is combined in a data warehouse . . . yet, the name under which it is booked (often an incorrect name) may yield no results when searching the data warehouse with the booking name.
- **Context:** Regarding the context of the data (who is giving it, when was it presented?)—is it information that is sufficient to evaluate the usefulness of the information, not simply its sender's meaning?
- **Metadata:** The term metadata, is it becoming more used in defining data? While in the justice arena, an example of metadata is, "I got this information from an informant who is not reliable," this is not metadata. The issue is that everything about a piece of data is not metadata. **We need a new paradigm for what metadata actually is.** What caveats do we need to pass along with the data and yet comply with and include considerations for privacy?
- **Training:** The training and consensus building of trust developed within agencies, especially for the officer on the beat who is entering data into the computer in the squad car, is key to success.
- **Size of Data Fields and Standards:** A lot of work needs to be done in the enterprise-wide development and implementation of standards. A big problem is that data fields, the NAME field for example, are not consistent. A name field for one agency may be five fields, while at another, a name field may be one.
- **Duplication:** A lot of emphasis is on avoiding duplication. Per Mr. English, you have to have a single record for each occurrence.

### Speaker Presentation:

#### Mr. Richard Wang, Ph.D., Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), MIT Information Quality (MITIQ) Program

Invited speaker, Mr. Richard Wang, Ph.D., announced an upcoming information quality event, the Eleventh International Conference on Information Quality (<http://www.iqconference.org/>), to be held November 10–12, 2006, at MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Dr. Wang followed the announcement with a presentation, accompanied by PowerPoint visuals, according to the following discussion points:

#### Presentation Outline

- **Why Data Quality?**
  - Data quality (DQ) foundation.

- Typical data quality issues.
- **An MIT Perspective.**
  - Definition of data quality (conventional versus new research view) beyond "accuracy."
  - DQ dimensions (DQ is multidimensional).
  - Organizational DQ assessment.
  - Managing information as a product (product versus byproduct).
  - DQ Assessment Framework.
  - Proven MIT Total DQ Management (TDQM) Research Results.
  - Measure: Data integrity analysis.
- **Open Discussion**

Dr. Wang gave an in-depth definition and overview of data quality (DQ) and stated that it goes beyond accuracy and is multidimensional. Dr. Wang implied that each broad category of DQ (or "IQ") has related subdimensions. Dr. Wang described four principles on how to manage information as a product (with a life cycle) and identified the roles and tasks associated with each principle. The following is a list of notable points made by Dr. Wang:

- **Budgeting for IQ:** It's hard to demonstrate an immediate return on investment for IQ. How does data quality improve our mission? It's an ongoing issue. If it's not in the budget, people don't invest the time into focusing on IQ. Until you can encourage senior management to include it as a line item in the budget, you cannot spend the time needed to ensure IQ. How do you encourage management to do this?
- **Make People Care:** Develop an IQ policy (Put a stake in the ground!) stating "We care about information quality," and get management to approve the mission/statement.
- **Incremental Goals:** IQ is not a 90-day "fix." Create a correct expectation by doing a small component within a 90-day type of project. Develop smaller incremental goals. IQ must be treated as a journey.
- **Measure/Feedback:** You want people to provide feedback, suggestions, and solutions. Measure data integrity but also evaluate people's perceptions.
- **Information Product Map:** Map the route of one data element at a time, then you will find if there is a breakdown. Research has shown, however, that generally where IQ goes from good to bad is when it either leaves or at the beginning (entrance/exit) . . . **The point/source of transfer is the biggest area where IQ/DQ breaks down.**

### **Working Group Discussion**

The following list contains comments and discussion points raised by the Working Group:

- **Appropriateness and Access:**
  - Where does appropriateness fit in to the multidimensions?
  - Highly purposed specific data, such as a victim's address, though accurate and timely, does not, by itself, indicate appropriate access.
  - This is a level-of-access question (access rights); it highlights the relevance of accessibility.
  - Disposition of data is a separate and critical process in the IQ organizational process. What I have learned is that disposition dates must be established up front; otherwise, you lose track of it at the end.
  - Access, universally, is not necessarily appropriate. When other information is passed on or tagged to it, such as a restraining order placed on an individual, the implication raises a bias and that particular bias is transmitted, though it may be irrelevant or inappropriate. That's not an issue of access. When you attach information, you are inviting an "inappropriate inference."
  - You are collecting information that may not be relevant, though accurate, like a convict's religion. When is it relevant, and when should it be accessible?
  - Is it appropriate for an officer to make a comprehensive/complete record of all the information available? Is it relevant at that time, and if not, when will it become relevant?
  - You need to communicate with all three types of stakeholders—the data collector, the data custodian (data storage and maintenance), and the data consumer (data utilization). You need to be able to communicate horizontally regarding the data processing roles. Though you've got to strike a balance between privacy and IQ, you have to have a mechanism for ensuring IQ.
- **Issues of Bad IQ:** Bad IQ not only results in customers/partners losing trust but also in wasted money spent on mail, resources, recovery, and corrections.
- **Ownership of Data:** How to overcome "it's not our problem, it's your problem."
- **Factors/Incentives:** What are the factors/incentives for entering the correct information?

- **Corrections/Clarifications:** When do you go back and correct or clarify information? When do you make the choice to send the data back and to recheck the data?
- **Metadata:** Everything is not metadata. We need a new paradigm for what metadata actually is. Guidelines or standards are needed on what metadata (caveats about the data) we pass along including privacy considerations.
- **Training:** Training and consensus building of trust among agencies, especially down to the officer on the beat who is entering data into the squad car laptop, is key to IQ for the justice community.
- **Awareness:** How are we going to raise the awareness of IQ to a level of importance to avoid the "so what" response?
- **Internal/External IQ:** As they address enterprise as a company, we have to look at IQ, both in enterprise/company mode and in a sharing environment. There is internal IQ and IQ of what is shared.
- **Layers of Knowledge:** The concept of layers of IQ; we tend to think of it as an individual piece of data in a database, but what we have is the quality as it is transferred and the quality in relation to how it is gathered.
- **Stakeholders:**
  - We are currently experiencing a phenomenon in the tribal juvenile justice system where people who are entering and collecting information are not including certain pieces of information subjectively. An example regarding juveniles is that the parent's name may be missing or, in other cases, the spouse's name. One problem with the criminal history improvement program is that the corporate knowledge or local familiarity of situations may not be known to outsiders. This situation addresses stakeholders who have different cultures, departments, agencies, etc. Completeness is a real issue.
  - We should also be concerned about people who buy the information to use (i.e., for background checks) and consider them as stakeholders or just one of the data consumers.
- **Legal Framework/Business Management Model:**
  - The concept of utility of the information by the end user or consumer is not captured. A legal framework can be built with the criminal history record information regulations dealing with record accuracy, completeness, reporting requirements that need to be included, and federally disseminated guidelines like the paperwork reduction act.
  - All information sharing is business process reengineering, but what we aren't addressing is the lack of a management model for how you collaborate on these sharing systems to be sure you include all these business rules. We don't have a business management model. This goes across the board to all information sharing partners.

- **Technical Versus Policy Issues:**
  - How many IQ issues are technical issues versus policy issues? We have a comfort level with policy issues but not so much with technical issues. Let's separate those out in the future.
  - Are we talking about creating standards for policy or technical perspectives? Try to keep in mind public oversight of the criminal justice system. IQ is really about dependability and being able to defend the data in the justice process. If we find that a certain policy results in generating errors, the public trust declines.
- **Accountability and Incentives:**
  - The two things we can boil this down to are accountability and incentives—the pain and pleasure principle.
  - We do a great job of claiming ownership of the data, but we need to do a better job of accountability and creating incentives for entering correct information. What are the incentives? How do we properly motivate the people that are in the positions where we want to implement it? This is about control, accountability for the data in the justice system, and the need to establish assurances.
- **Assessment:** Regarding assessment, how much of an assessment do we provide on how much IQ has been an issue or detriment for the information and people that are affected. It would be interesting to assess the current problem in an information sharing environment.
- **Is there an IQ problem?**
  - Is there a problem with information quality? Is there an agreement that there actually is a problem? It's missing. We need to state the problem(s).
  - There are several different levels of problems.
  - We need to lay it out empirically. What are the problems?
  - As long as you believe there is a problem but you don't measure, there is resistance. If you measure and present your results, it motivates action.
  - Measurement for our communities is not as straightforward, it will be more difficult.
- **Global JXDM and Quality Metadata:**
  - The Global Justice XML Data Model (Global JXDM) endeavor applies to data quality.
  - Is there discussion about developing quality metadata to add to the Global JXDM? They would need to be informed from this type of group as to what that means.

## **Facilitated Discussion: "Prominent Issues in Information Quality"**

The Working Group held a brainstorming session to list prominent issues and problems in IQ, particularly in the justice community.

- Coordinating collaboration models between agencies.
- Governance—How you manage how to get there by working through existing governance.
- Institutionalizing IQ goals.
- Stewardship/cultural shift—A willingness to work for the good of the enterprise versus the individual (altruism).
- Education—A part of the solution might be to create educational packets/models for different levels of the organization. (Reference Mr. English's book, Chapter 6, which identifies the differences in audiences for training.)
- IQ problems occur at the point at which data is collected (the input of the information).
- IQ problems occur at the point of transfer of the information.
- Accountability and responsibility—Analyze accountability at multiple levels within organizations.
- Political constraints/pressures—Lack of enforcement of National Crime Information Center (NCIC) compliance.
- Top leadership (elected) and senior management turnover.
- Different issues for tribal (e.g., oral tradition versus written data). Need tribal-specific materials.
- Disposition of the record—Disposition is either destruction or transfer of the record. Should there be a disposition schedule?
- Perpetuity of the data (maximum thresholds for records)—At some point we reach a point of diminishing returns if we can't let someone erase the past. Instead we almost define someone as a criminal forever if we never let them get rid of the record of a past criminal conviction. Regarding relevance - it is how you interpret the information.
- Money drivers for private data users (influence of private sector partners).
- Exporting/selling—Consumers buying information products (propagation).
- Auditing the quality—There is a need to monitor the level of IQ. If you have measurable characteristics/dimensions, then you can audit and measure, to a certain degree, the accuracy and completeness of the information. Need to identify auditing processes.

At the next meeting the group will review the problems and issues listed, narrow them down to what the group plans to address, and then begin forming suggestions regarding solutions and resources.

**Document Review:**  
***Information Quality in Justice Information Sharing Fact Sheet***

Based on the information presented that morning, Mr. Boehmer and Ms. Plante led a facilitated discussion, with feedback and assistance provided by the guest presenters. The Working Group discussed new ideas on how to approach the drafted fact sheet, entitled *Information Quality in Justice Information Sharing Fact Sheet*.

**Key Points Made**

- **Getting the Reader's Attention:**
  - Based on the presentation information we've just heard from our information quality specialists, we may need to rethink the fact sheet. We want to develop a starting product that says IQ is important without giving everything to everyone in that one piece. The fact sheet doesn't give the whole picture we need it to give.
  - We need to show why IQ is important up front. This has an impact how? We should cite statistics (hypothetical example: "Sixty percent of the cops on the street don't have enough information."). This fact sheet should make the case more straightforward.
  - We need to put the stake in the ground claiming that IQ is important.
  - The fact sheet is moving in the right direction, but it needs more attention getting material. Perhaps, instead of "What is IQ?", it should say something like, "Can you guarantee your information is reliable?" It is not clear that the vast majority of people we deal with could define IQ. We need to get them understanding it from the same point of view.
  - People will be looking at it as what's in it for me?
  - This is a quick-to-read one pager; something you can hand to the next lower level. It should state clearly what the nature of the problem is and what you can do about it. Sensationalism can turn off people. You have to go from the anecdote to the concept.
  - We need to state why IQ is important; state the benefits of good IQ (e.g., enables staff to make better decisions), followed by a definition of IQ; and then state what it's going to do for them. Then we list the products that are coming next.
- **Target Audience:**
  - We might want to mimic what the fusion center folks did; a handout on why fusion centers are important and then a fact sheet, etc. Products

were then designed for different audiences. We might want to address the fact sheet to each target audience.

- IQ management is important as a decision maker. If I see management in the title, I have to pay attention to it. So putting management in the title will enhance the focus to improving the "management" of IQ.
- Some of the issues we are discussing will not resonate with the tribal communities. Could we create a separate piece just for them and their unique issues? They have to sift through these things to find applicability to them. We want to make sure information that is given to the tribes is relevant to them. This ought to be the group to put a product like that together. There is a strong need to develop tribal-specific materials, principles, and products.
- Give people a message that they can customize. For example, list five arguments and suggest the reader apply the one that fits for their agency or audience. We also have to realize that people don't really know they need to care about IQ, so they will ask why are we telling them about IQ?
- The reader needs to know where their state fits in or ranks (e.g., state-by-state ranking on IQ).
- IQ could be just a jurisdiction issue rather than a statewide issue.
- A keeping up with the Jones kind of thing. Also, let's not just focus on justice records but also on school records, health records, etc., and talk about it in general.
- **Case Studies and Examples:**
  - Is there an available case study that could be used for convincing people and the first responder community, such as a case study where the principles learned from these presentations have been applied to the law enforcement/first responder community?
  - How do you get people interested? Why not use an attention getter. Give examples as reasons we have to respond with better IQ.
  - We have to put a face to the problem. If you want to talk to high-level people, use cover stories or case studies as examples.
  - We need to add information about colleagues that are doing this.
  - We need to have recognition for the work already done out there, leverage these as starting points.
  - If you go and ask people, they will have good stories to share. Maybe you should send out a request for stories?
  - Regarding the tribal juvenile criminal record history program example, they did an analysis on parent information. The results showed that a

disproportionate number of youth appeared to come from single parent households simply because one of the parents weren't listed. To correct the errors, they turned to census records. This could be used as an example of incomplete information.

- **Remove Blame—Focus on the Information:** Don't state that, for example, the police information was bad or the court record was bad, instead say that the information is bad (no particular blame).
- **Focus on GPIQWG's Mission:** The face of the IQ problem is such a massive undertaking that we cannot do it all. Let's keep in mind the GPIQWG's mission, which involves the adoption of privacy and information quality policies and the preservation of the integrity and quality of information.
- **Make Positive Change and Show Benefits:**
  - You must reinforce the importance of actively improving processes and, in doing that, address making positive change. There ought to be something an agency administrator can see in the fact sheet that is important to them. How does this affect/help us?
  - We don't want to just show the risks of bad IQ, but we also need to show the benefits of good IQ.
  - List what outcomes an agency can expect if improvement is achieved. For example, what would it look like five years from now if we succeed?
- **IQ is a Journey:** We need to emphasize that IQ is a journey, not an end product. Analogy: "You never stop taking a bath."
- **Provide Direction:**
  - We need some specific directive and include the directive in the title. If the audience is high level (the potential champion), what is it we want them to do? Are we trying to get them to take additional action? Or are we just educating them? An example we could give them is to make it part of their strategic plan.
  - We need to provide tools for implementing.
  - You have to provide direction (e.g., What does it look like when we solve these problems?), otherwise you will simply cause frustration.
- **Funding:**
  - We need to go beyond just a list of tasks and answer the question "How am I going to fund it?" We have to define, even at a high level, what the outcomes will be and identify how to fund IQ.
  - The fact sheet should achieve both form and function. Is there a problem and how do you define it? List incentives. We have to show the potential costs of not having quality data.

- **Accountability:** Global was created to deal with shared information systems. Participating in a shared system creates different expectations. We need to show who is responsible for what and how.
- **Measure:**
  - We've found in our research at MIT that IQ has two evaluative components to it: measurable facts and subjective judgments or perceptions.
  - You can't measure accuracy electronically.
  - Directions to the policymaker are: Make it a priority (communication is included here), assign someone to care about it, and determine how to measure IQ (the bulleted list of dimensions may be our starting point for "what" they need to measure). Then we list resources that are out there and indicate that Global will be developing more.
  - The important thing to note about metrics is "Are these things you can actually measure?" Also, a fundamental problem is that departments or agencies think "our data is okay," but it's "their data" that isn't reliable. When it crosses organizational boundaries, this problem occurs. Some of the things are opinion and perspectives, while others are measurable. Administrators will react if you make them care about IQ.
- **Literature Resources:**
  - We might want to list Mr. English's book as a follow-up to this fact sheet (as a resource since the content describes the processes that pertain to IQ management).
  - We need to point to resources both within and outside government.
  - Let's point them to a short list of reading (e.g., our presenter's articles).
- **List of IQ Dimensions:**

The group reviewed Dr. Wang's list of IQ Dimensions (slideshow, page 12) to determine which dimensions they would like to highlight.

  - Should we put the dimensions into real-world justice community context?
  - Is this list meant to be illustrative of IQ's multidimensional nature, or is it just instructive? Is it illustrative, or does it go beyond that to show the complexity of IQ's multidimensional nature?
  - In our work, IQ dimensions are becoming more and more instructive, each dimension builds a foundation. The list of dimensions is more a set of vocabulary in which the people who are dealing with IQ will come to use sooner or later. While illustrative is good, putting IQ dimensions into a real world context would be more instructive, especially at the higher level. CEOs and administrators want to care

about the "confidence in data." When they use information, they want to feel they are confident in the data.

- Maybe we should identify the IQ dimensions that we don't want to include and consider what the context of this call-out box will be? Are we listing them as "these are the IQ elements" or are we referring to them as "categories to begin with?"
- Remove "value-added" because you wouldn't be collecting the information in the first place if you weren't going to use it.
- What about instead of value-added, we use another term?
- What about using currency? "Current and up-to-date" is currency (the age of the information); while "I get it at the time or before the time that I need it" is timeliness. Our business rules are the limitations, legally, in what can be gathered and can be shared. What we're trying to reinforce is the notion that your business rules are your legal requirements. Identify the legality as one of your dimensions.
- The quality aspect refers to how the information is used as an information set. How and when is information clustered in an unintended context? Is the information complete enough to do what we need to do? Is the information more than it ought to be (over-inclusive)? It's all cast in the way it is framed.
- Accurate, complete, and timely are terms that are used consistently in Global products and the Global community, so we should keep them since they are used throughout Global in the justice community.
- Add "Reasonableness" to the IQ dimensions and cite the FBI story as an example. However, I question the term reliability as a dimension. Some of this deals with source credibility, which has to deal with confidence.
- I suggest this becomes part of the business process, since you know you will collect information from those sources that are less than credible.
- What we're talking about here is information quality and not data. When we're dealing with reliability or objectivity, we're not dealing with one piece of data. Instead we're dealing with all types of information that the person is looking at. IQ is macrodata not micro.
- I suggest we use the four terms we currently have on the draft fact sheet (accuracy, completeness, timeliness, and reliability), but add objectivity as a fifth and then work with those who will be drafting this document to incorporate the characteristics and dimensions the presenters listed.

### **IQ Fact Sheet Revision Recommendations**

Ms. Plante suggested we take this draft and remove the words "Fact Sheet" and instead use the title ***Shared Vision for Justice Information Quality***. A consensus was made by the group to revise the draft fact sheet according to the following outline:

1. Identify what IQ is.
2. Identify why IQ is important (pain/pleasure principle).
3. Use real-world context/stories.
4. List the elements of IQ, its data quality dimensions and attributes.
5. Provide a to-do list for what we want the executive to do. Have a bulleted list of types of actions, such as strategic plan and leadership.
6. Short list of reading sources.
7. Last item will state that the working group is working on additional products.

#### **Suggested stories/examples to use:**

Ada Pecos Melton—Tribal juvenile criminal record history program.

David Byers—Prisoner identity swap story (regarding what they've done to improve IQ).

Alan Carlson—The Ohio guy story (regarding mixed up social security numbers).

Paco Aumond—Vermont story (Burlington police investigation of a stolen boat. The neighbor's name was listed and left in the database as a suspect, which resulted in a denial of employment at an airport because it turned up in the background check.).

#### **Direction for audience (what to do):**

1. Make it a priority within the organization, network with other professionals, and put it in the overall agency strategic plan as a goal, as well as part of the information technology plan.
2. Assign responsibility—Appoint a person as the leader who will do the performance work plans, and measure for problems such as cost and consequences (process engineer with resources to measure).
3. Communication—This will give you information for budgets/grants.

#### **The following individuals volunteered to assist in the drafting/revision process:**

- Erin Lee (will rework the first paragraph under "What Is Information Quality?")
- Tom MacLellan
- Jennie Plante
- Owen Greenspan
- Dr. Wang (volunteered to assist with the writing of the fact sheet)

**Task:** Christina Abernathy will e-mail the components to these individuals.

## **Working Group Recommendations and Next Steps: "Products Beyond the IQ Fact Sheet"**

Ms. Plante led a roundtable discussion and requested input on next steps for products/resources focusing on information quality. The following are suggested approaches, products, or resources that grew out of this discussion:

- Can we put together a **template for resolutions** that agencies can use to pass throughout their organization and others for resolving errors? This Working Group should make a proposal to the Global Executive Steering Committee (Global ESC) to do an association resolution in support of information quality and to ask the Global ESC to consider the utility of developing a resolution template for associations to use to correct erroneous information.
- At the SEARCH Symposium, an emerging topic is performance management metrics that measure progress. Should we direct or urge executives to **develop performance management methods for IQ** and can we provide tools to accomplish this?
- Consider doing **a proof of concept** to test whatever policies and guidelines this group develops and apply lessons learned. Mr. English suggested that for the next products we include not only policies, but how to accomplish these policies. Explain how to set up and create an understanding of principles, have a set of identified processes, and have sets of tools or techniques, cause and effect diagrams, control charts, etc.
- Maybe the next step is to **do some research on readily available resources**. For example:
  - JNET, CrimNet, etc. Case studies where accountability has been addressed.
  - Sources for governance models.  
**Task:** Erin Lee will bring back information to the next meeting.
  - Educational resources.  
**Task:** Mr. English has an updated version of his book that he will send us electronically.
  - Auditing/measuring resources.
  - State/federal laws on record retention.
  - Model for auditing justice information systems for information quality.
  - Dr. Wang's *Data Product Assessment Spreadsheet*.  
**Task:** Ms. Abernathy will request an electronic copy of this auditing document.

### Next Meeting Plans and Closing Remarks

Goals for the next meeting are to finalize the IQ fact sheet, to review the problems and issues the group listed and narrow them down to addressable issues, and then discuss suggestions for solutions and resources to develop.

Thomas MacLellan distributed a draft copy of NGA's Issue Brief *Protecting Privacy in Integrated Justice Systems* and asked for feedback from the Working Group. Ms. Abernathy offered to distribute the document through IIR and will send TM comments.

A request was made to have a meeting sooner than six months. Ms. Abernathy will coordinate with Ms. Plante and Mr. Boehmer on availability. Dr. Wang extended an offer to the group to host the next meeting at MIT in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Tentative meeting is being considered for the week of June 19<sup>th</sup>, 2006.

Meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.



## **Attachment A**

### **Global Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG) Agenda**

**March 16, 2006  
Washington, DC**



# Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global) Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG) Meeting



Hotel Washington  
515 15<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC  
(202) 638-5900 ♦ (800) 424-9540



United States  
Department of Justice

March 16, 2006

---

## Agenda—Page One

---

### *Capital Room*

- 8:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m. *Continental Breakfast*
- 8:30 a.m. – 8:45 a.m. Welcoming Remarks and Introductions  
*Robert Boehmer, GPIQWG Chair*  
*Jeanette Plante, GPIQWG Vice Chair*
- Anticipated Discussion Topic  
♦ *Update on Global working group activities*
- 8:45 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. Meeting Goals and Purpose  
*Robert Boehmer, GPIQWG Chair*  
*Jeanette Plante, GPIQWG Vice Chair*
- Anticipated Discussion Topics  
♦ Review of GPIQWG's privacy and information quality priorities  
♦ Agenda overview  
♦ Presentation goals: To educate the WG on information quality and the current issues and resources relevant to justice information sharing  
♦ Facilitated discussion to narrow scope of WG's next product(s)  
♦ WG recommendations
- 9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. Speaker Presentation  
*Mr. Larry English, President and Principal*  
*INFORMATION IMPACT International, Inc.*
- Prerequisite Reading  
♦ Article: *The Essentials of Information Quality Management*
- Anticipated Presentation Topics  
♦ *Information quality overview and primary issues*  
♦ *Available tools/resources, processes, and techniques*  
♦ *Recommendations*
- 10:30 a.m. – 10:45 a.m. *Break*

# Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global) Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG) Meeting



Hotel Washington  
515 15<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC  
(202) 638-5900 ♦ (800) 424-9540



United States  
Department of Justice

March 16, 2006

---

## Agenda—Page Two

---

- 10:45 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.      **Speaker Presentation**  
*Dr. Richard Wang, Director  
MIT Information Quality (MITIQ) Program  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)*
- Prerequisite Reading  
♦ Article: *Managing Your Information as a Product*
- Anticipated Presentation Topics  
♦ *Information quality overview and primary issues*  
♦ *Available tools/resources, processes, and techniques*  
♦ *Recommendations*
- 12:15 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.      **Working Lunch**  
*Mr. Larry English and Dr. Richard Wang*
- 1:00 p.m. – 2:30p.m.      **Facilitated Discussion: Information Quality**
- Anticipated Discussion Topics  
♦ *Scope the primary issues in information quality relevant to justice information sharing*  
♦ *Target audience(s)*  
♦ *Target product(s) and concept(s)*
- 2:30 p.m. – 2:45 p.m.      **Break**
- 2:45 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.      **Working Group Recommendations/Next Steps**
- 4:15 p.m. – 4:45 p.m.      **Product III: Information Quality Fact Sheet**
- Anticipated Discussion Topic  
♦ *Approval of Information Quality Fact Sheet for GAC*
- 4:45 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.      **Closing Remarks**  
*Robert Boehmer*
- 5:00 p.m.      **Adjournment**