Data Stewardship Committee: Minutes of April 20, 2015

In attendance: Beth Corry (Financial Services), Greg Olsen (Data Analytics), David Love (SEAS), Rachel Link (OIA), Gary Pacer (EAS), Craig Abbey (OIA), Chris Connor (GEMS), Tim Okon (UBS), Mark Molnar (OIA), Brian O'Connor (CAS), John Gottardy (Financial Aid), Laurie Barnum (Resource Planning).

Meeting called to order at 4:03 by Gary Pacer.

A teleconference from EAB (Education Advisory Board) on Data Governance Excellence is scheduled for May 7th. This teleconference focuses on developing data governance initiatives, which is the first in a series from EAB. Gary will see if he can get a conference room so that interested committee members can attend. Brice Bible is working with EAB, and data governance and analytics are a theme in the CIO's office.

Gary and Craig attended a Data Governance Council meeting on April 2 to show the DGC progress on the deliverables and provide updates on the DSC's activities. There was an April deadline for preliminary reports, definitions, and inventories, and a June deadline for recommendations for a permanent structure. Gary stated that the members of the DGC feel the processes are worthwhile and needed, and that buy-in is not an issue – the members support this work. Gary shared additional observations from the meeting:

- Policies, Practices, and Definitions are not always aligned
- There is recognition that efforts in data governance need to be ongoing and sustainable
- The pace of effort devoted to data governance is metered by availability and access across a number of competing initiatives
- The DSC is valuable for discussing cross-system issues (e.g. names in HUB or HR data)
- Many institutions are devoting resources to data governance initiatives. Many have been at it for years.

Goals for year one as presented to the DGC were outlined, with assigned responsibilities, target completion dates, and current status.

Goal 1: Approving the initial scope of institutional data (student records, financial aid, admissions, human resources, finances, research, space, publication/citation, and organizational structure), was assigned to the data governance executive council, with a target completion of October 2014, and has been completed.

Goal 2: Formalizing initial organizational structure (approving initial definitions for data trustees and stewards; formalized DGC and DSC), was assigned to the DGC with a target completion of November 2014, and has been completed.

Goal 3: Research data management in higher education (review documentation, conference calls with other universities, identify best practices, and recommend changes to UB structure) was assigned to the DSC with a target completion of February 2015. This goal is in progress. Research has been completed and recommendations are being drafted.

Goal 4: Identify and inventory key institutional data elements, was assigned to the DSC and DGC, with target completion of January 2015, and currently in progress. HR and Enrollment teams are active. Space, Financial Aid, and Student Accounts teams are being formed. Organizational Structure and Publication/Citation portions are ready for the final write-up.

Goal 5: Build inventory of definitions, assigned to the DSC Working Teams. This goal had a target completion of April 2015 and is currently in progress. Materials are posted to the DSC website, and a repository is needed.

Goal 6: Prepare report and recommendations for permanent data management structure, assigned to the DGC and DSC. This goal is to be completed by June 15. Working Team 1 is working on this and will bring drafts to the larger DSC group for buy-in and feedback.

Craig outlines the topics for recommendations that will be contained in the report. The report will cover the following general areas:

- Roles and Responsibilities
    - Data Trustees
    - Data Stewards
    - Data Managers
    - Users
- Data Stewardship Committee Membership
    - Membership
    - Rotation, term appointments
- Data Classification, Access Levels and Security
    - Classify data sensitivity rating scheme
    - Role of Information Security Officer
    - Who has access to which data
    - Single logon, process for changing credentials
- Sustainability of Data Governance Efforts
    - Assign responsibility to person/office
    - Short-term ramp-up?
    - Long-term staffing needs and structure
- Data Definitions
    - Data Types: Official, Strategic, Operational
    - Repository for meta data
    - How to update?
    - How to ensure common usage?

- Training
  - Town Hall
  - Training on topical areas: Student, Finance, Research, HR, etc.
- Data Quality Reporting Process
  - Alignment of Business Processes to Data Systems
  - How to report and handle issues?
  - Data quality scorecards
  - RTS – DCheck (OIA)
- Data Warehousing & Business Intelligence
  - DW & BI Strategic Plan
  - Official, Strategic & Operational Reporting
  - Reporting Structure
  - Interaction with Data Governance

The Data Trustees want a process in place for data definition approval, and for creating official university definitions. Working Team 1 will work on identifying a process for this, likely with a flow chart or other diagram, and will also look into processes for communicating official approved definitions to the campus community. The DGC also asked if consideration should be given to projects that are high impact and currently important to the university, like enrollment, over projects that are less urgent or important.

A follow-up meeting with the DGC is currently scheduled for early June. David asked if anything has been added to the charge. The answer so far is no, that the DGC is respectful of the committee members' other commitments, but more tasks may be assigned after the final report is reviewed.

Craig recently attended the AAU Data Exchange (AAUDE) annual meeting and shared his findings from conversations with other representatives at the meeting. The consensus was that the data governance process has been beneficial for other institutions in order to establish the flow of communications and information sharing. Other institutions also struggle with operationalizing definitions and getting them into practice as well.

Working team presentations were next. Working Team 1 will be working on roles, responsibilities, and drafting recommendations. These draft recommendations will be provided to the DSC as a whole for review. Suggestions have been made to bring the Information Security Officer into the process and to look at current university security processes and documentation, with the idea being to provide some common guidelines for the future.

Mark presented Working Team 2's report as Kara could not attend. The group is making good progress and is currently working on enrollment definitions. A matrix to show operational, strategic, and official definitions is being developed that will show similarities and differences between the categories. Team members have contributed suggestions toward degree definitions, which will be reviewed at the next meeting.

Gary presented Working Team 3's report since Sue could not attend. Gary and Craig presented the HR matrix, along with the strategic/operational/official Venn diagram at the DGC meeting. The team is in

the process of finalizing the matrix. The next definitions the team will cover are staff, employee, and student employee. The most recent matrix has definitions of terms, how the definitions are obtained, and source. This grid is way to capture key definitional attributes. Gary identified a potential way to capture data definitions by using an online subscription service called Data Cookbook. The team is meeting weekly and is getting close to finalizing the faculty definitions.

John Gottardy presented information on the Financial Aid group's efforts. They are currently pulling apart the reports they do for external constituencies to look at commonalities, ambiguous definitions, and to see what needs clarification. Fund codes in Info Source are problematic. It is hard to identify institutional versus federal versus state funds. Changes were made during the transition from legacy to HUB and the group is attempting a crosswalk to allow for recoding. John asked Gary for information about how Blackboard Analytics feeds data into tables – he would like to see where data comes from to identify the source. Gary stated a mapping sheet does exist and he will share this with the team.

Mark is working with Tom Wendt on the research data team. Tom will review operational definitions, while Mark reviews official definitions, and then the two will work together to create university definitions. Their first meeting will be this week. Mark also spoke about the business systems transformation and how this creates changes in the entity hierarchy system. Since this is so deeply ingrained in our systems at UB, in order to preserve integrity of the system, Mark is getting word out about changes. He is working on ways for data for new systems to be placed in to the old ENT_* tables to allow continued use of these tables within Info Source. If this is done correctly, users will not notice any change in functionality.

Mark and Craig met with Shirley Walker for Student Accounts definitions. They will next meet with Cory Walker. Since Student Accounts data feeds into strategic tuition revenue data, these definitions will be important. John pointed out that much of the Student Accounts data overlaps with Financial Aid, and Craig suggested including John in future meetings so that all can work together.

Craig stated that a meeting with Kelly Hayes-McAlonie for definitions on Space is upcoming, and will report back to the DSC at the next meeting about progress.

Next meeting: May 11 at 4p.m. in Capen 567. Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.