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Some Context: CREC Mission

- Workforce Development
- State Data Sharing Initiative
- Economic Development
- Policy Analysis
- Program Evaluation
5B’s: Making the Case for Data Sharing

- Better Data
- Better Access
- Better Analysis
- Better Decisions
- Better Outcomes
State Data Sharing Initiative (SDS)

Mission:

*Improve public program outcomes by enabling evidence-based policy-making through greater sharing of administrative records for rigorous analysis and evaluation purposes.*

Goals:

1. Raise awareness of the value of administrative records.
2. Deepen understanding of laws that protect administrative data.
3. Build upon existing data governance and management process models.
4. Foster collaboration between state leaders and agencies to improve access to microdata.
1. **Research** – Data, laws, regulations, policies, & practices:
   - Studies
   - Presentations

2. **Technical Assistance** – Case examples and resources:
   - 5 state-specific efforts
   - Data sharing tools/website
SDS Research Objectives

Better Data.
Assess the value of administrative microdata for policy analysis and program evaluation.

Better Access.
Analyze legal and policy approaches states use to protect and govern access to administrative data.

1. What data is available?
2. What questions can the data help answer?
3. What are the benefits and limitations of using this data?

1. What do state confidentiality laws and regulations say?
2. What data sharing policies/practices do states follow?
Value of Administrative Records

UI Microdata
• Employment
• Wages
• Occupation (LA, AK)

Corporate Tax Microdata
• State taxable income
• Value of tax credits claimed
• Jobs created (attributable)

1. Are there any recognizable trends in employment, wages, or credits claimed?
2. Which companies or workers may be at risk?
3. Are tax credits creating new jobs and/or generating new economic activity?
4. Are new jobs “quality” jobs?
Key Findings: 2015 Corp. Tax Form Comparison

- Company Background Information: 25%
- General Tax Information: 54%
- Tax Credit Information: 18%
- Reported Economic Impact Information: 3%
Key Findings: 2015 Corp. Tax Form Comparison

Most Frequently Collected Data Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation-Relevant Data Elements</th>
<th>Number of Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEIN</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate tax owed</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State taxable income</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sales in dollars, state vs. everywhere</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined value of all tax credits claimed</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings: Corp. Tax Form Comparison

Tax Forms Containing Most Evaluation-Relevant Data Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Number of Evaluation-Relevant Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using Microdata: Benefits & Challenges

Benefits
• Relatively comprehensive
• Longitudinal analysis capability
• Reduced burden on companies
• Significant cost savings for government

Challenges
• Legal and regulatory restrictions/interpretations
• Process management limitations
• Technical difficulties
• Data sharing climate/cultural differences

Better Analysis.
Analyzing Laws & Regulations

Objective

• Compare legal approaches applied by states to protect data and permit access.

Methodology

1. Apply Data Confidentiality Framework
2. Extract Relevant Language
3. Assign Specificity Rating

Data Confidentiality Framework

1. Definition
2. Authority
3. Purposes
4. Parties
5. Elements
6. Content Requirements
7. Safeguards
9. Penalties

### Key Findings: Laws & Regulations Analysis

#### CT Laws & Regulations Specificity Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Confidentiality Questions</th>
<th>Detailed Explanation</th>
<th>Broad Mention</th>
<th>Not Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Definition</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Authority</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Purposes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parties</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Elements</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. Agreement Type</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Safeguards</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Payment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Penalties</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### UI Laws & Regulations Specificity Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Confidentiality Questions</th>
<th>Detailed Explanation</th>
<th>Broad Mention</th>
<th>Not Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Definition</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Authority</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Purposes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parties</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Elements</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Contents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Safeguards</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Payment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Penalties</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**39 Laws & Regulations**

**35 Laws & Regulations**
Advancing Data Sharing

- Educate state leaders on the value of administrative records and data sharing.
- Revisit antiquated state data confidentiality laws and regulations.
- Deepen agency-level understanding that protecting and sharing data are not mutually exclusive.
- Help streamline data sharing policies and processes across state agencies.
Next Steps

Technical Assistance
• 5 multi-agency state initiatives
• Case example dissemination

Data Sharing Tools
• Tax Data Comparison Tool
• Confidentiality Laws & Regulations Database
• Data Sharing Toolkit
State Data Sharing Initiative
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Information Sharing Between State Agencies

Administration of the Oklahoma Quality Jobs Program
The Department administers the Quality Jobs Program and accepts applications into the program.

The Department requires the most recent four quarterly employment reports filed with the Employment Security Commission to be attached to the application.

To be approved, the Department verifies that all companies are in good standing with:
- Secretary of State,
- Tax Commission, and

Contracts signed between the Department and an approved company are forwarded to the Tax Commission.
The Commission plays a role in the administration of the Quality Jobs Program by providing employment and payroll data to:

- Department of Commerce to verify information supplied through the Quality Jobs application process and
- Tax Commission to verify information supplied through the payment claims process.
All claims for the payment of benefits under the Quality Jobs Program are submitted to the Tax Commission.

The Tax Commission accesses Employment Security Commission directly to obtain:

- Individual wage data, and
- Employer report data.

Tax Commission verifies, prior to payment, that the company has complied with its Commerce Department contract by:

- Meeting its baseline number of employees,
- Using the correct benefit rate on the claim form as reflected in its contract,
- Meeting its annual payroll threshold, and
- Is still under their maximum total benefit available?

Upon verification of claim, the Tax Commission pays the benefit to the company.
3 Keys to Data Exchange

1. MOU between Department of Commerce and Tax Commission.

2. Limited waiver of confidentiality as part of program application.