

Data Stewardship Committee: Minutes of February 22, 2016

In attendance:

Mark Coldren (HR), Mychal Ostuni (GEMS), Greg Olsen (Data Analytics), David Love (SEAS), Brian O'Connor (CAS), Rachel Link (OIA), Kelly Hayes McAlonie (CPG), Beth Corry (Business Services), Michele Sedor (OIA), Mark Molnar (OIA), Corey Hill (Student Accounts), Thomas Okon (Business Services), Jose Aviles (Admissions), John Gottardy (Financial Aid), Laurie Barnum (RP), Craig Abbey (OIA), Gary Pacer (EAS).

Meeting called to order at 4 p.m. by Gary Pacer. Gary reviewed the agenda for today's meeting, which is shown below:

- Data Cookbook Implementation: update from Michele Sedor
- BI Task Force visit with Oracle/Ciber Insight: campus visit from representatives this week
- Review/Approval of terms from:
 - Human Resources
 - Entity Hierarchy
 - Space

Michele provided an update on the Data Cookbook implementation process. The implementation team has met several times with various data consultants. The implementation will begin with enrollment data. Michele and Craig will be reaching out to the individuals in functional groups soon to set up training on Data Cookbook. Michele stated that they do request a commitment after the implementation is complete for those attending the training, as those individuals will be taking the lead in the process in their respective areas. Classes should be scheduled by the end of March. The Data Cookbook consultants have also connected Michele and Craig with other universities using the product so that they can learn more about implementation.

Craig added some clarification about attendees: the invite will go out to the stewards in each area and provide the opportunity for those in functional areas to tell the implementation team who from each area should attend. These individuals selected for training should be the subject matter experts in their respective areas – the ones who enter the data. The goal is to complete the configuration process for Data Cookbook in three to six months. We can expect to see some data in the product by the end of March. Craig next spoke about technical definitions, such as the SQL needed to obtain a specific count, including what fields in a particular Info Source table should be used, as an example of information that could be housed in Data Cookbook.

Gary spoke next about Business Intelligence (BI). In fall 2015, the Data Governance Council charged a task force to study and make recommendations for the establishment of a UB business intelligence

strategy. This strategy was to take into account central and local reporting needs and was intended to integrate with data governance efforts. Oracle/Ciber consultants have been identified as external consultants that could provide this structure and recommendations. The visit later this week will involve interviews with key stakeholders like the Data Governance Council, CFO, CIO, and others. The consultants will see our landscape – what we use, like SIRI, Info Source, Access, and Tableau – and will get a better sense of where we are and where we might go in the future.

The objective and scope of the business intelligence request is to develop a 3-5 year strategic roadmap and business case for the improved efficiency and effectiveness of business intelligence, and to address both tactical issues and support future growth. Craig mentioned that there is no “standard” way of implementing a BI strategy. Gary stated in the higher education user’s group on EduCause, questions about BI strategy arise, but the consensus that no standards seem to exist. Craig mentioned that at UB, we have a lot of good information but no great organization of it. How do we think about organizing this? Should it be centralized or federated? Currently, we have a combination of these approaches. What do units need that central offices do not? More discussion on these topics will be forthcoming.

The meeting next moved to the data definition review and approval process, starting with Human Resources. Gary reviewed the process to arrive at deliverables that commenced prior to Mark Coldren’s arrival. The working group met weekly and came up with the definitions.

Mark C. next spoke about the definitions. The Board of Trustees definitions provided a baseline for most of the definitions. One area of note in the faculty definitions is Law’s use of “Visiting” titles to designate tenure track faculty members differs from other units’ use of this. The core definitions are correct, but additional cleanup could be done.

Now that the first round of definitions are complete, the group will work on instructional FTW with TA’s – we have three kinds of student employees currently (TA/GA, work study, and student assistances) and need to understand the differences in these groups. Additionally, volunteers need to be understood: it seems that this role has come about as a way to provide access. Adjuncts are another problematic group: SUNY asks us to provide their salary range, which goes from \$900 to \$60,000. The typical rate, however, is \$3,500 for a three credit course. Mark feels that the team did a good job on the initial definitions, and plans to expand the group to address the additional terms soon.

Mark spoke about the new Department of Labor’s Fair Labor Standards Act rule to reclassify certain positions, meaning that workers who are classified as exempt managers or professionals who make less than \$50, 440 annually would instead become non-exempt and limited to either 40 hours per week or be required to earn overtime. This will go into effect probably by the end of 2016 and could impact up to 450 employees at UB. We have a number of professional staff, post docs, and admissions staff who could be impacted by this change.

Gary reviewed the spreadsheet and matrix for faculty that was created. A motion to approve was provided by Brian and the definitions were approved by the committee.

Mark M. next reviewed the entity hierarchy terms. These were reviewed by Mark himself. He went through the literature to come up with more formal definitions, and included legacy terms, combined with current business terms. These definitions do not cover Entity_O: this is used for resource planning purposes, and can change. Approximately 60 definitions were created. If approved, these definitions can be then used to define data models and think of some standardized reports that could show organizational structure and areas of use. Previously, Mark had created an organizational chart showing what entities reported to others, and could re-create this if desired.

Craig stated that entity hierarchy is the glue that holds the institution together. Mark compared to the DNA that is in every system here at UB. Kelly moved to approve the terms, and the definitions were approved by the committee.

Space definitions were next discussed. Kelly stated the currently, UB uses the SUNY-mandated state standards. This year, SUNY is adopting the FICM standards, which are directed at post-secondary institutions. The definitions are standardized, but as SUNY works through adapting these standards, the definitions may be further customized, and we would conform to this. Examples could be additional information about how spaces are utilized. Craig asked if we will be translating old data into these new standards. We need to think about ways to fuse the data between old and new standards. Kelly stated that every year, Dave Barnas works with facilities management planning staff to update assignment listings. Once this year's work on this is done, we will transition to the new system – this will be in November 2016 through January 2017. Laurie mentioned that Dave had said that UB tracks more information than the new standards track: how will we do this with the new standards? Kelly said that the level of customization in FICM will allow us to report at whatever level is needed. If the information is covered in FICM, he can report at that level, but if more information is needed, we can add levels to the standards. Craig stated that we can accept the FICM standards, but we should add UB or SUNY specific definitions as they are created. These examples show the need to rework or adjust definitions as time goes by, and that the process will not be a static one. Craig suggested that group meet with Dave to get more information as the process continues.

Tom moved that the group accept the space definitions, and the definitions were accepted by the committee.

Next Meeting: March 21, 2016 at 4 p.m. in CAPEN 567. Topics will include financial definitions and a possible look at the Data Cookbook implementation.

Meet adjourned at 4:46 p.m.