



MINUTES
Enterprise Data Coordinating Committee
12/9/2016

Initial meeting of the combined Steering Committee, Functional Subcommittee, and Regulatory Operations Subcommittee of the Enterprise Data Governance Committee

Attending: Chris Derickson (Chair), Susan Kellogg, Lynn Williford, Vicki Bradley, Phyllis Petree, Rich Arnold, Scott Jackson, Fran Dykstra, Rick Root, Lee Bollinger, Kevin Lanning, Nicholas Graham, Micki Jernigan, Kim Stahl

Not Present: Andy Johns, Mel Jones, Patricia Oliver

DISCUSSION:

Welcome from the Chair and Introductions

Chair asked for introductions. Discussion of purpose of this committee, following on previous Institutional Data Coordinating Committee with revised charter.

Role of the Committee, and of each subcommittee

○ *Steering Committee*

Primary focus on Policy for data governance.

○ *Functional Subcommittee*

Identifying the ways that Policies will impact day-to-day work of the University. Proposing Standards and Procedures to enact Policy.

○ *Regulatory Operations Subcommittee*

Identifying and addressing compliance issues in the area of data governance. Proposing Standards and Procedures to enact Policy.

Any subcommittee may propose policies for the Steering Committee to consider. Chair described differentiation of Policy, Standard, and Procedure.

Chair reinforced that this is a new approach to data governance for the University, and that each subcommittee may adjust as they gather more experience.

S. Kellogg introduced the ITS Policy process, and described how the committee will relate to the normal review and approval processes for data-related Policies. These processes include public comment periods. Emphasis will be placed on transparency and consensus-building, avoiding unintended consequences.

Discussion took place of the scope of “data governance” for this committee, and need to coordinate work with other campus groups addressing data management.

Committee Charter

The Committee discussed key points of the charter, the charge, and purpose of establishing Policies, Standards, and Procedures for Enterprise data. Discussion of the roles and responsibilities for decisionmaking. Examples were given of current “Data Steward” models on campus, use of delegation, and difficulties when subsets of data require independent use or sets of data have multiple “owners” or “Stewards.” Committee discussed the need to look at other models in use elsewhere.

Discussion of Committee logistics including two-year rotating membership. “Fresh eyes/voices are important.” Chair made request for additional key voices which may not be represented on the committee, while recalling the need for a flexible appropriately-sized committee. Note was made that a Finance representative would join the committee when appointed.

Defining “Enterprise” Data (scope of “Institutional” Data Governance versus “Enterprise” Data Governance)

Short discussion of the need to look at information that the University generates and holds in order to run and do the business of the University as a first priority.

S. Kellogg clarified that the Committee members are expected to represent diverse interests beyond their own areas. However, the ITS Policy process involves notification and feedback opportunities. The Committee would bring in people as needed in order to avoid unintended consequences.

The committee may engage in various projects, such as an inventory of systems by data classification, or a Data Dictionary, that such projects are not the primary work of the committee. The Committee will authorize project teams as needed and Committee members will participate as their resources allow.

Committee discussed the issue of addressing only a subset of University data and creating gaps in governance, or including larger sets or all University data and creating compliance issues through lack of granularity. More discussion needed.

Discuss needed roles around data (Data Steward, others)

S. Kellogg requested that the committee review the current role definitions as provided in the Institutional Data Governance Policy (Data Steward, Data Custodian). Discussion of current roles in the Institutional Data Governance Policy: Data Steward, Data Custodian. It was observed that these processes are very “person-driven” rather than “role driven.”

Discussion of other roles possibly missing from the current model.

Committee noted the need for formal and documented delegations of authority.

Discussion of how to handle joint owners of the same data.

Suggestion offered that the Committee identified the duties and group those into roles (action item for next meetings. S. Kellogg, K. Stahl. List functions).

Alternate/coordinating suggestion: Using existing examples in the University, identify functions to create list for later grouping into roles.

Committee discussed the need to differentiate a “role,” from a “Duty” or a “Responsibility.” Use for a “QC role” or a “Data User” roles? Should Policy require that each area have a “Data quality control officer” or should it instead make data quality a required function but leave role generation up to the responsible area/Steward? Regardless, when corrections are made to a record, governance is required. Data integrity is within the auspices of this committee.

Committee discussed how standards of data entry are established.

Committee agreed that as the structure is established, responsibilities within roles may fluctuate. First, identification of responsibilities must occur in order to begin to differentiate roles.

Next items for future meetings

- Data Governance Policy – needed modifications
- Assignment and training for data governance roles (Steward, etc...)

Committee agreed that next steps would include a meeting of the Steering Committee in December, followed by January and February meetings of the full committee to continue discussion of roles and responsibilities.

Adjourned.

