MINUTES – FINAL
Health Information Technology Standards Advisory Committee (HITSAC)
Thursday, July 19, 2012

Commonwealth Enterprise Solutions Center
11751 Meadowville Lane
Chester, VA 23836
Multipurpose Room 1222

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present:

Dr. Marshall Ruffin, Chairman
Dr. Sallie Cook
Dr. Jim Harrison
Rich Pollack (Afternoon)

Members Absent:

John Quinn

Others Present:

Bannister, Lynn, VITA
Barnes, Kim, VDH
Barnes, Rich, VITA
Colvin, Ashley, VITA
Condrey, Debbie, VDH
Dixit, Prashant, VITA
Edwards, Kelly, VITA
Epley, Brian, North Highland
Farnsworth, Mike, DMV
Gedamu, Teddy, MEDfx
Grubbs, Dr. Joseph, VITA
Laugerbaum, Carl, Advantus Strategies
McCleaf, Sandy, CHA-ConnectVirginia HIE
Mix, Dave, DMAS
Murphy, Julie, VDH
Reed, Larry, DMAS
Weir, Sean, VITA
White, Michelle, CHA-ConnectVirginia HIE
Whyte, Chris, Vectre
Wirth, Mike, OS-HHR

Call to Order:

Chairman Marshall Ruffin called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. in the VITA Multipurpose Room 1222 at the Commonwealth Enterprise Solutions Center in Chester, VA. Chairman Ruffin welcomed HITSAC Members, staff and attendees.

OLD BUSINESS

Approval of Minutes from the March 15, 2012, HITSAC Meeting

Chairman Ruffin called the item to approve the minutes from the March 15, 2012, meeting and asked HITSAC Members if they had changes or corrections. Seeing none, Chairman Ruffin called for a motion to approve the minutes. A motion was made by Dr. Harrison with a second by Dr. Cook. The motion passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Status Reports

Commonwealth Data Governance

Dr. Joseph Grubbs, Commonwealth Data Governance (CDG) Service Lead and HITSAC Administrator, gave the status report for the CDG team. Highlights of the team's accomplishments included adoption by the Secretary of Technology of the Enterprise Information Architecture (EIA) amendments to the Commonwealth's Enterprise Architecture (EA) Policy; development of the EIA Scorecard, which will serve as a data collection instrument to support the update for the Commonwealth Data Strategy; completion of the Auditor of Public Accounts (APA) audit of enterprise data standards and VITA's corrective action plan; and preliminary planning for the report required pursuant to Item 427 of the 2012 Appropriation Act. Dr. Grubbs said HITSAC would receive full presentations later in the agenda on the EIA Scorecard and the conclusion of the APA audit process.

Dr. Grubbs also said that the CDG team was coordinating with the IJIS Institute to schedule an on-site training on the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM). Chairman Ruffin asked when the training would be held. Dr. Grubbs responded that CDG was still working on the dates but the plan was for sometime in late September. Chairman Ruffin asked for Dr. Grubbs to notify him once the training had been scheduled, as several of the HITSAC members are with organizations whose staff would like to attend. Dr. Grubbs said that a broadcast notice and invitation would be sent out once the training dates had been established.

Dr. Grubbs concluded the status report by stating that the CDG team continued to provide program and project support to the eHHR and VITA MITA Programs. This included support to the Enterprise Data Management (EDM) project team, the Services Oriented Architecture (SOA) project team, the eHHR Program Management Office (PMO) on the CMS Gate Review, and the Office of the Secretary for Health and Human Resources (OS-HHR) on enterprise data-sharing agreements. Dr. Grubbs acknowledged Mike Wirth, OS-HHR, with whom he has been working closely on data-sharing strategies. Mr. Wirth addressed the HITSAC members, stating that the CDG team had made a valuable contribution to the eHHR Program and the OS-HHR in its support of enterprise data sharing. Chairman Ruffin thanked Mr. Wirth for his comments and presence at the meeting.

Chairman Ruffin asked whether any of the CDG team's workstreams were delayed or behind schedule. Dr. Grubbs responded that only the update to the Commonwealth Data Strategy could be considered delayed. The main hold-up had been the need to set aside work on the EIA Scorecard and the Data Strategy to address the APA audit and the preliminary planning for the Item 427 report. However, Dr. Grubbs said that the delay actually had benefitted the team, giving more time to refine the EIA Scorecard. Dr. Grubbs added that the schedule was an internally imposed schedule, so the delay would not have significant down-stream impacts.

eHHR Program

Mr. David Mix, Program Director for eHHR from the Department of Medical Assistance services (DMAS) provided a status report on the eHHR Program. He began by commenting on how much progress had been made in the eHHR Program since the last HITSAC meeting.

Mr. Mix then briefed HITSAC on the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling on the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act ("Affordable Care Act"). Mr. Mix said the Court upheld the Affordable Care Act's individual mandate but made the Medicaid expansion provisions optional for the states. Mr. Mix added that the Court's ruling did not impact eligibility modernization or funding for the health information technology projects.

Mr. Mix turned to the eHHR Program Management Office (PMO) accomplishments: ongoing meetings of the eHHR Program Oversight Committee (POC), achieving full PMO staffing and functionality (Mr. Mix recognized Mr. Wirth and Mr. Larry Reed, PMO Manager), developing the Organizational Change Management plan, preparing for the first CMS Gate Review, scheduled for August 6, 2012, preparing for the Eligibility Modernization contractor (procurement in process), and completing the HHR business requirements document, the Program milestone document, the Program charter and all Program operational plans.

Mr. Mix reported that the Data Sharing Working Group was continuing its work on the Enhanced Memorandum of Understanding (E-MOU), which built from the Nationwide Health Information Network (NwHIN) Data Use and Reciprocal Support Agreement (DURSA). He said the initial target would be the eHHR partner community but the plan involves expanding to onboard other partners in the future.

Mr. Mix said that the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), the Federal sponsor of the eHHR Program, had approved the funding increase requested for the technical infrastructure projects at VITA and the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). The eHHR PMO had received conditional approval from CMS for the Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) Enhanced funding for the Eligibility and Enrollment systems but that funding requests for the Health IT healthcare-specific service and interface projects remained problematic. Mr. Mix then gave an overview of the funded projects, partially funded projects and funding challenges for the health information exchange (HIE)-related interface projects.

Chairman Ruffin asked if other states were experiencing these challenges. Mr. Mix said that most were in the same position as the Commonwealth. Mr. Mix said the only states able to move ahead are those that had existing agreements with payers on a cost-allocation model. He added that Virginia's statewide HIE (ConnectVirginia) may be able to help fund – if Medicaid and other payers become subscribers – but that would be at least two years in the future.

Mr. Mix concluded his presentation by announcing that the user-acceptance testing for the Provider Incentive Program had been completed and the Program "soft" launch was scheduled for July 23, 2012, with communication to the providers following in August 2012. Chairman Ruffin asked for clarification on the program's purpose. Mr. Mix said that the program offered incentives to providers to upgrade and/or implement electronic medical record systems.

Chairman Ruffin opened the floor to questions from HITSAC members and the public. Seeing none, the Chairman said he would like to see a note documenting where other states were on the funding challenges. Mr. Mix reiterated that most of the states were in the same position as Virginia; the only states able to move ahead were those with existing agreements with providers on the cost-allocation scheme. These agreements and methodology gave Medicaid a model to contribute funding. Chairman Ruffin requested an update on the issue at the next HITSAC meeting.

Health Information Exchange Program

Kim Barnes of the Virginia Department of Health (VDH) gave the status report on the ConnectVirginia HIE. Before she began, Chairman Ruffin acknowledged for the record the impressive shoes being worn by Ms. Barnes. (Note: Ms. Barnes came adorned with a stylish pair of high-heels with a design reminiscent of the classic Converse Chuck Taylor All Star basketball shoes.)

Ms. Barnes proceeded by stating that the ConnectVirginia HIE was moving forward on schedule. The HIE supported interoperability via two mechanisms: ConnectVirginia DIRECT and ConnectVirginia EXCHANGE. DIRECT features a secure point-to-point email service; EXCHANGE offers a query and retrieve functionality.

Ms. Barnes said that DIRECT has been expanded to include organizations, and the organization capability may be used to support Commonwealth Agency participation. EXCHANGE will be kicked-off with Inova Health System as the first node. Inova will be onboarded in September 2012, Ms. Barnes said, congratulating the Chairman who serves as the Inova's Chief Technology Officer. Chairman Ruffin said Inova was committed to being the first node on the HIE.

Ms. Barnes added that the Commonwealth of Virginia node was scheduled to be onboarded in April 2013. She said that ConnectVirginia and its solutions provider, MEDfx, already had been working with the eHHR project teams to ensure alignment in anticipation of onboarding the Commonwealth node.

Chairman Ruffin congratulated Ms. Barnes and the HIE team on their progress. Ms. Barnes acknowledged the work being done by the Community Health Alliance (CHA), VDH's contractor for the ConnectVirginia HIE.

Chairman Ruffin opened the floor for questions from HITSAC and the public. Seeing none, Chairman Ruffin closed the HIE update item.

VITA MITA Program

Mr. Rich Barnes, VITA/MITA Program Manager, gave a status report on the VITA/MITA Program. Mr. Barnes began by highlighting the accomplishments since the March HITSAC meeting. Under the Enterprise Data Management (EDM) project, the accomplishments included approval on Scope of Work (SOW) #2 with Triad/IBM for implementation, approval of the detailed project plan, ongoing configuration and tuning of the IBM Initiate platform, and continuing development of a data stewardship plan with IBM and the eHHR PMO.

For the Services Oriented Architecture (SOA) Project, Mr. Barnes noted the accomplishments: approval of SOW #2 with Triad/IBM for implementation, approval of the detailed project plan, approval of the VITA Architectural Review (VAR) for the development, test and production environments, on-time delivery of the logical partition (LPAR) architecture/environments for the Commonwealth Authentication Service (CAS), and the transition to an acting Program Manager. On the last item, Mr. Barnes noted that Lynne Jeffries, the VITA MITA Program Manager, is out on maternity leave and he was serving as the acting Program Manager.

Mr. Barnes said that a final set of accomplishments relate to VITA's internal project management requirements. He said that when the VITA MITA Program was originally chartered, VITA's Project Management Division (PMD) staff did so based on the scope and details known at the time. Now, with more information available, the VITA MITA Program had initiated a formal change-request process to update the Program's schedule and budget baselines with PMD.

Chairman Ruffin asked if the change request would have any budget or schedule impacts. Mr. Barnes said it would not since, as Mr. Mix reported, CMS had approved the request for increased funding. The only other impact related to the official project status being tracked by VITA/PMD, which since the formal project schedule update had not yet been approved the Program was still being reported in a "yellow" or guarded status. Mr. Barnes said the Program should in fact be considered in a "green" or on-schedule status, although ongoing challenges would warrant a "guarded-green."

Mr. Barnes wrapped up his status report by identifying upcoming tasks and targets for EDM, SOA and the MITA Program: for EDM, continuing to work on installation and configuration of Initiate for EDM, for SOA standing up the LPAR environments, and for the Program office completing the change request, developing a cost model/service plan, and recruiting project staff.

Chairman Ruffin acknowledged the excellent progress being made across the various programs and projects. He said this progress should continue to be a source of pride for the Commonwealth, something to be recognized by the Federal government and other states. Mr. Barnes concurred adding that the Commonwealth is on the leading edge. Chairman Ruffin asked whether the Commonwealth would be documenting its accomplishments in publications. Mr. Wirth, OS-HHR, asked to be heard by HITSAC, and the Chairman called him to the podium.

Mr. Wirth said that Secretary Hazel had prepared a report on the eHHR Program for the Stewards of Change national conference, documenting the efforts of the Commonwealth. In the report, the Secretary showed how Virginia's approach had been more methodical and holistic, compared to other states, and that this approach was beginning to show its returns, as demonstrated by the substantial progress. Chairman Ruffin concurred with Mr. Wirth's comments and asked for a copy of the Secretary's report. Dr. Grubbs referenced the recognition given by the APA for the eHHR Program.

Presentations

Note: Due to the technical nature of the Electronic Authentication and Identity Management presentations, viewers are recommended to access the full presentations on the VITA Web site at:

http://vita.virginia.gov/ITAC/default.aspx?id=6442470067

Electronic Authentication and Identity Management

Chairman Ruffin called for Mr. Mike Farnsworth from DMV to give a presentation on Electronic Authentication and Identity Management. Dr. Grubbs also requested that the Chairman recognize Mr. Teddy Gedamu from MEDfx who would be co-presenting with Mr. Farnsworth. Chairman Ruffin welcomed the presenters.

Mr. Farnsworth started his presentation by commending the efforts of HITSAC and the eHHR Program in making the Commonwealth Authentication Service (CAS) possible. He noted the positive attention being given to the Commonwealth in other states and Federal agencies.

Mr. Farnsworth then talked about the primary business drivers, such as the Federal funding for health IT under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act ("Recovery Act") and incentives programs enabling providers to adopt or upgrade electronic medical record systems. These, combined with an increased reliance on Web-based business transactions, require secure mechanisms for electronic authentication and identity management.

For the Commonwealth, CMS auditors found that 16% of the Medicaid eligibility records were in an "error" state. This reinforced the need for the Commonwealth to develop a more effective means for ensuring identity of the individuals applying online for benefits. The current communication between Agencies responsible for eligibility determination does not feature a fully automated means of authenticating a citizen's identity.

Mr. Farnsworth said CAS has been tasked for implementing an enterprise, electronic authentication service capable of achieving a National Institute for Standards and Technology (NIST) Level 1 through Level 3 authentication and credentialing. He referenced NIST Special Publication (SP) 800-63-1, which is in the electronic HITSAC agenda packet, then walked the HITSAC members through the NIST levels of authentication.

CAS will offer four (4) primary services: identity proofing, identity credential, multi-factor ("strong") authentication and identity binding. Mr. Farnsworth described each of these services and how they will

function within CAS. He also discussed the integration of CAS with EDM and the architecture being stood up under the VITA MITA shared services (MITA) platform. Mr. Farnsworth concluded the presentation by identifying the key lessons learned in the economic, political and technical domains; identifying CAS relationships with other nationwide initiatives; and listing the "takeaways" that will inform future efforts.

Chairman Ruffin complemented Mr. Farnsworth on the clarity of the presentation, particularly given the technical nature of the content.

Dr. Harrison asked about curation and error correction with the "golden record" approach. Mr. Farnsworth said this continues to be an open question with CAS and the IBM technical team. The determination has been made, though, that if an identity cannot be established then CAS will not bind the identity.

Chairman Ruffin again thanked Mr. Farnsworth then welcomed Mr. Gedamu from MEDfx, a solutions provider to the ConnectVirginia HIE.

Mr. Gedamu began his presentation by outlining the ConnectVirginia HIE and its DIRECT massaging services. He then went into the business requirements to support the HIE services with electronic authentication and identity management. Mr. Gedamu noted the alignment with CAS around NIST Level 1 through Level 3 authentication. He described ConnectVirginia's compliance with the NIST SP 800-63-1 guidance in four primary areas: registration, identity proofing, issuing tokens and authentication.

To provide additional detail on the technical approach, Mr. Gedamu introduced Mr. Colin Fletcher of MEDfx's technical team who joined the meeting via conference call. Mr. Fletcher provided a detailed explanation of the technical approach being taken by MEDfx for ConnectVirginia. The technical approach involves implementation of the Security Assertion Mark-up Language (SAML) and the Open Authentication Standard (OAUTH). Mr. Fletcher described the functional specifications of SAML and OAUTH.

Mr. Gedamu concluded the presentation by walking HITSAC members through the two-factor authentication process being implemented for ConnectVirginia. Chairman Ruffin thanked Mr. Gedamu for the presentation and the clear description of the authentication process.

Dr. Harrison asked about the DIRECT Messaging service and the authentication into the service via SMS messaging. He questioned about what happened when a provider loses his/her mobile phone. Mr. Gedamu and Mr. Fletcher both responded, stating the phone is used as a "soft" token and a registered device. In the case of a lost phone, the provider would need to call into ConnectVirginia/MEDfx to register a new device. The provider does not have the credential authority to register a new device.

Dr. Cook asked about the multi-step process implemented by DIRECT and any plans to replace this process with something more efficient. She said she found the process to be cumbersome. Mr. Gedamu said the multi-step authentication process is by design, a means of adding extra levels of security.

Dr. Harrison commented on the impact of poor cell-phone coverage within medical facilities; the use of SMS messaging as part of the authentication process becomes impeded by cell-phone coverage issues preventing a provider from receiving the SMS text message with the one-time password. Mr. Gedamu said that providers may change their preferences to have the one-time passwords sent to both cell phones and email. Dr. Harrison said this would be even more cumbersome, requiring providers to have to exit the electronic medical record to access their email system. Some email systems may not be accessible at hospital work stations.

Mr. Gedamu said that ConnectVirginia has noted the issues of provider access and have attempted to address them through organization entities and delegate users.

Ms. Barnes said that many electronic health record vendors are including DIRECT-enabled functionality in their new releases. She cited EPIC as an example. Chairman Ruffin noted the importance of this issue and closed the agenda item.

Chairman Ruffin recessed the meeting for lunch at 12:35 p.m.

Chairman Ruffin called the meeting back to order at 1:30 p.m.

Legislative Affairs Update

Chairman Ruffin called on Ashley Colvin, VITA Legal and Legislative Affairs, to provide his brief to HITSAC on current legislative affairs issues. Mr. Colvin said he would focus his briefing on the APA's recent review of the progress on enterprise data standards. However, Mr. Colvin noted that VITA had developed a response strategy that combined the required Corrective Action Plan with the planning requirements pursuant to Item 427 of the 2012 Appropriation Act. He said VITA was coordinating the corrective action plan with the Item 427 reports, as well as with VITA's overall data governance efforts.

Mr. Colvin reported that the APA's review assessed the status of data standards implementation as required by the 2008 Budget ("the Act"). Language in the Act required the development of standards for major financial and information collection processes. Mr. Colvin said that changes in institutional and Agency structures, as well as staff turnover, resulted in delays on the required data standards. He said the APA review has given VITA an opportunity to refocus its efforts.

Mr. Colvin continued by noting that a major challenge being faced by VITA related to the legislative intent and definition of a "data standard." He said the Act did not define the term, nor does existing statute offer a clear understanding. The APA interprets the Act to mean standardization of data at rest and the use of standardized data. He said the APA frequently cites the vendor tables maintained by DGS: Data standards would first define whether IBM is abbreviated as IBM or spelled out in full. Next, other Agencies must standardize the data in their systems to comply with the standard.

Mr. Colvin continued by offering a brief statutory and legislative background on the issue of data standardization. He said that as far back as 1988, the Commonwealth's Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) called for key demographic data to be standardized. The business reason for data standards was straightforward, he said, quoting from the JLARC Report: "Multiple State human services agencies may maintain records on some individuals. Efforts to coordinate case management could be achieved if data from various automated systems could be merged. In order to achieve these data interfaces, [uniform] labeling conventions are needed."

Mr. Colvin acknowledged that the business need still exists today, but its coordination has become more complicated. He cited numerous barriers to interagency data sharing embedded in Federal regulations and the Code of Virginia. Mr. Colvin said enabling data sharing supported by data-exchange standards would achieve the business objectives in a more cost-effective and institutionally feasible way than attempting to modify data at rest in legacy systems or in commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) solutions. Also, Web services and other mechanisms for information exchange have become available, in many cases removing the need for Agencies to store data. These services and data are available to Agency subscribers to call to from their applications.

Turning to institutional and governance-related challenges, Mr. Colvin said the process established in the Act for developing data standards has not been as successful as originally hoped by the General Assembly. The first factor impacting progress on data standards was that the process required coordination among Agencies from

four separate Secretariats. He said this organizational challenge pointed to a larger governance concern: the difficulty overseeing a process that spans the enterprise.

Mr. Colvin then shifted to the nine specific recommendations made by the APA in its audit report. The first group included recommendations that the Secretary of Technology should direct VITA to prioritize adoption of data standards. Mr. Colvin said these recommendations consisted of the preparation of a detailed schedule with deadlines for the completion of data standards, a related recommendation regarding the Information Architecture, and a staffing plan that shows the number of resources necessary [for VITA] to assume leadership for data standards.

The APA also recommended that VITA evaluate whether existing standardized data should be adopted as a data standard, Mr. Colvin continued. He said the APA appears to recognize that the new Cardinal Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) solution has implicitly developed data standards by virtue of the way it stores data. So the APA recommends that VITA review Cardinal's data standards for each of the seven business areas and evaluate whether the Commonwealth should adopt them as the enterprise data standard.

Mr. Colvin said this recommendation closely mirrors new language in the 2012 budget, which requires VITA to perform the same task for all 45 projects listed in the Budget. Per this budgetary requirement, VITA must first determine whether to adopt the manner in which any given project stores data at rest as the enterprise data standard. Mr. Colvin said VITA must then report back on the cost to modify all current projects to store data in conformance with these new data standards.

Because this approach presupposes the use of data standards, and not data exchange standards, Mr. Colvin said VITA has an initial concern about the cost to modify about $500 million worth of existing projects. As a result, Mr. Colvin said it is VITA's goal to investigate whether data exchange standards could reasonably meet the same objective. But regardless of the approach to standardization, from a governance perspective the APA believes that VITA should assume the authority and responsibility to develop data standards and use its authority for project review to enforce Agency compliance with data standards as a condition of project approval or continuation. Mr. Colvin said these represented significant actions, which VITA will evaluate carefully to ensure that decisions which are best left to the business are not made by the technology side of the house. Otherwise, as he said, "the tail wags the dog."

Mr. Colvin said VITA has developed a corrective action plan for the APA report and simultaneously has begun working on the reports required by Item 427 of the 2012 Appropriation Act. As part of this effort, he said VITA will ask all Agencies that are actively developing projects to provide a conceptual data model. He said VITA may also require inclusion of this model with any new project submitted for approval.

Mr. Colvin concluded his presentation by noting the progress made since the APA issued its report. He said VITA's Commonwealth Data Governance staff have met with the lead Agencies for Cardinal and other enterprise projects to identify standards that may be adopted as Commonwealth standards. In addition, he said the Secretary of Technology has adopted amendments to the Enterprise Architecture Policy that establish an Enterprise Information Architecture program and maturity model within the Commonwealth's architecture policy framework. He referred HITSAC members to Dr. Grubbs of CDG for more details.

Chairman Ruffin asked Mr. Colvin about his statement regarding the business side driving the technology side for data standards, the "tail wagging the dog" statement. The Chairman agreed that the business side needs to drive the standards but asked what could be done to push the business side to recognize the value proposition of standardized data.

Mr. Colvin responded by acknowledging his agreement with the business objectives of cited by the APA – the ability to follow Commonwealth revenues from the time they are appropriated to the time they are spent – but said that the challenge comes in organizationally with trying to achieve this across Secretariats, Agencies and programs. The APA, in this environment, views VITA as having the statutory authority to move things along across the entire Commonwealth enterprise.

Mr. Pollack asked whether in the future the Commonwealth may be able to tie facilitated funding of projects to that entity's compliance with adopted standards. Agencies implementing standards get placed on a faster track for project funding over those not implementing standards. This, he said, would incentivize the embracing of standards across the enterprise. Mr. Colvin agreed but said a challenge would be on the different funding streams currently supporting projects.

Dr. Grubbs noted progress being made by the CDG team in enhancing the process model to have standards being developed by Cardinal and other projects adopted as Commonwealth standards. He said that in many cases the business side is, in fact, driving data standardization, and CDG has stepped up to support the business with managing the process to have the standards adopted by the Secretary of Technology. Dr. Grubbs also commented on the use of data-exchange standards and CDG's efforts to move the Commonwealth toward conformance with the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM).

Mr. Colvin added that HITSAC can help to support this effort by weighing in the discussion, particularly on the issue of data standards versus data-exchange standards. Chairman Ruffin clarified the desired approach and offered to support VITA. Dr. Grubbs said the desired approach would be adoption of "external" – that is, international and national standards developed and maintained by Standards Development Organizations (SDOs) – and adoption of these standards, or harmonization of Commonwealth standards with the standards. Chairman Ruffin agreed that, as demonstrated in the health IT domain, interoperability built on industry standards represents the optimal strategy.

Mr. Mix commented on the eHHR/MITA model and that, when the interfaces are stood up based on standards, the Commonwealth will be able to "plug and play" based on business needs. The most important thing, he said, is not the underlying data model; it is the ability of the service or interface to engage with the "outside world." Mr. Mix expressed his concern regarding the focus on data standards, saying the most important objective centers on aligning standardization with the service and business objectives.

Enterprise Information Architecture (EIA) Scorecard

Chairman Ruffin called on Dr. Grubbs to give the presentation on the EIA Scorecard. Dr. Grubbs began by establishing the purpose of the EIA Scorecard and how it will be used to support the update to the Commonwealth Data Strategy. Dr. Grubbs stressed that the EIA Scorecard will not be used in a punitive manner. Rather, data gathered via the EIA Scorecard will establish the "current state" of EIA across the Commonwealth and inform outreach, planning and program activities to achieve the desired "future state" of EIA.

Dr. Grubbs discussed the organization of the EIA Scorecard, with the first set of measures focusing on Agency viewpoints on EIA, generally. Each subsequent section concentrates on one of the four EIA program areas: data governance, data standardization, data-asset management and data-sharing. Dr. Grubbs said the coded values for the measures would be used to generate an overall EIA score for the Agency. He confirmed that the unit of analysis would be the Agency.

Chairman Ruffin and Dr. Harrison raised questions regarding the disparity between the measures in terms of the coded values and scale ranges. Dr. Harrison also asked about the use of a four-point versus a five-point Likert-type scale.

Dr. Grubbs responded that the scale ranges were designed based on the concepts being measured and the response-type for each item. He said the most important consideration was whether there was validity and reliability within each measure – that is, on how the items captured the range of meanings for the measure – rather than on the inter-measure consistency. Dr. Grubbs explained that the scales for each measure should not be compared to the other scales; instead, the values and ranges should be confirmed to be appropriate for the concept being measured.

On the issue of a four-point versus five-point Likert-type scale, Dr. Grubbs said that each had its use in survey methodology but often it is important to remove a mid-range response category (in a five-point scale). This pushes the responded "off the fence" and requires a response on either end of the scale.

Dr. Cook said she recognized this approach; however, she added that in some instances a "Not Applicable" response option should be included, in the event that none of the other responses applied. Dr. Grubbs agreed and said this option would be added, as appropriate.

Dr. Cook also asked about how the results will be published and how often it will be updated. In terms of updating, Dr. Grubbs said the instrument would be implemented, at a minimum, every two years. Dr. Grubbs said the results would be published using a dashboard of EIA Scorecard indicators. He hopes the results would be used as a resource.

Chairman Ruffin asked about how the future users of the results may be engaged to help refine the instrument and measures. Dr. Grubbs agreed, saying he will continue to refine the instrument based on future implementations. Chairman Ruffin also asked about the limited sample of respondents. He encouraged CDG to implement the survey to a larger group within the Agency. Dr. Grubbs agreed and said he would broaden the target sample of respondents.

Chairman Ruffin returned to the issue of the scale ranges, questioning the impact on the absolute score. Mr. Pollack joined the question. Dr. Grubbs clarified the question and said he would go back through the instrument to make sure that the scale ranges have the required validity and reliability. He also reinforced the need for within-measure, rather than inter-measure, validity and reliability – that is, on how the items captured the range of meanings for the measure.

Dr. Cook said the results from the EIA Scorecard will need to be accompanied by a companion report, analyzing and highlighting the key findings. Dr. Grubbs agreed and said that EIA Scorecard will be tested in a focus-group setting before the full implementation. This will help to refine the instrument and measures. Dr. Grubbs also said the EIA Scorecard results and report would be used to inform EIA planning, outreach, training, engagement with Agencies and EIA program activities.

Dr. Harrison provided comments and recommended changes on several of the measures and items in the EIA Scorecard. Dr. Grubbs noted the changes and said he would revise the instrument, as recommended. Chairman Ruffin said he would share the instrument with his research team at Inova and ask for their input. Dr. Grubbs welcomed this and asked the other HITSAC members to continue to share feedback.

Mr. Pollack asked if the EIA Scorecard will be implemented with a companion glossary to help ensure consistent understanding on key terms among the respondents. Dr. Grubbs said that a glossary would be provided and that help buttons with definitions would be included in the user interface. He added that the test

implementation with the focus group would help to identify which terms in the instrument may require further explanation.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Ruffin called for public comment. Seeing none, Chairman Ruffin closed the public comment period.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Ruffin opened the meeting for any final comments from the HITSAC committee. Seeing none, Chairman Ruffin called for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Pollack and with a second from Dr. Harrison. The motion to adjourn passed unanimously.