AFFINITY GROUP / AG-CAO

Technology, data, and quality executives

Make information usable and improvement collaborative across systems and professional roles.

Stacy Peacock and Brandy Tofel

Participants described duplicate entry, limited integration, inconsistent definitions, and delays in data access. The operational burden sits with staff and providers, while the consequences affect reporting, service coordination, and the ability to act on a problem.

The group connected AI and technology governance with the people using the systems and the meaning of the data. Data literacy, mentoring, and cross-functional relationships were important alongside technical tools. A shared directory and state comparisons were discussed as ways to make peer knowledge more accessible.

Quality improvement was framed as an opportunity for learning and earlier action. Participants wanted to distinguish proactive improvement from a purely punitive response to findings, with a clearer path from information to a practical change.

Put the learning to work

- Choose one high-burden data journey and identify duplicate entry, disputed definitions, and delayed access.
- Agree on one measure's definition, owner, use, and limits before comparing results.
- Pair a quality lead with an operational and technical colleague to test one improvement and review what users experienced.

Questions for your team

Can two teams use the same measure and reach the same interpretation? Does our review process help people improve the work?

Proposed CY2027 connection

April LX; separate CY2027 CQO and CIO/CTO tracks with shared cases and checkpoints. CAO participants can select the track that fits their responsibilities.

Source and coverage: Automatic transcript of the combined CAO/CIO/CQO affinity discussion. The separate CQO and CIO/CTO tracks are a proposed 2027 structure.