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## Workstream 2 - Resources

### Purpose of this report

1. The purpose of this report is to discuss and get agreement on the proposed resource areas and next steps.

### Context/rationale

1. Knowledge is patchy in the state sector about the practicalities of collecting and publishing quality disability data.
2. We need to address this patchy knowledge through disability data resources for the state sector. These resources need to be easy to find and relevant to the needs of officials in an Aotearoa / New Zealand context.
3. In some cases, the information the state sector needs already exists (for example with the Washington Group question sets) but is not easy to find and/or relevant for an Aotearoa / New Zealand context.

### Suggested areas for resources

1. Below are the proposed general areas we need resources in. In addition, a draft one-page summary document has already been completed.
   1. **Administrative data**

General principles and advice for collecting disability data in administrative datasets. This may have to be high-level general advice because there is a lot of variation in the way agencies collect and store administrative data (as well as in the purpose of that data).

* 1. **Enduring Questions**

Explaining what the Enduring Questions are, how they were developed, and how agencies can use them to guide data collection.

* 1. **Adult question sets**

How to use and choose between the three Washington Group adult sets; enhanced, extended, and the Short Set.

* 1. **Children and young people question sets**

How to use and choose between the Washington Group’s Child Functioning Question Set and Statistics New Zealand’s shortened version.

This could also look at when the adult question sets might be useful for collecting data on disabled young people (and what the limitations are).

* 1. **Choosing the right disability data tools**

This would be aimed at reducing confusion and the misuse of tools, such as the Washington Group’s question sets. There may be some overlap with the above two resources.

This could cover the difference between population-level statistics and individual-level data for support/service delivery and planning purposes (and what data collection tools are best suited to each level).

This could also cover how disability prevalence data should be collected (and the limitations of the shorter question sets in this regard).

* 1. **Demographic analysis in disability data**

This could cover when and how to disaggregate or standardise by ethnicity, gender, age, and sexuality.

This could include highlighting where these demographics may distort the results (such as with the General Social Survey and the acceptance of diversity data).

* 1. **Accessible/inclusive survey methodology, collection, and the publishing of results (including for online surveys).**

Covering how to ensure everyone can take part in a survey and access the results.

### Next steps

1. The Disability Data and Evidence Working Group discusses and agrees on the proposed resource areas (with changes, if needed).
2. Members of the Disability Data and Evidence Working Group, co-opting others as needed, work on individual resource areas to develop the raw content.
3. The Office for Disability Issues and Statistics New Zealand decide where the resources will be published and where the resourcing for designing will come from.

**END**