



Minutes  
Enterprise Data Coordinating Committee  
5/16/2017

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

Attending: Susan Kellogg, Kim Stahl, Nicholas Graham, Mel Jones, Scott Jackson, Vicki Bradley, Lee Bollinger, Molly O'Keefe, Rick Root, Kevin Lanning, Dwayne Pinkney, Lynn Williford, Allison Legge, Fran Dykstra

Not Attending: Micki Jernigan, Rich Arnold, Andy Johns, Patricia Oliver, Phyllis Petree

Minutes:

- Welcome, announcements, approval of minutes

Minutes approved

- Next Steps for EDCC and subcommittees

Committee discussed topics for subcommittee discussion:

- How to evaluate what types of things a data steward (or other role) needs to evaluate and what is "just a technical decision." Determining what the Data Stewards would be best suited to evaluate. How to build nuances in Committee documents in such a way that balance between "out of control" numbers of required approvals and appropriate oversight. Example: obtaining a new router (that much or all data passes through). Should that type of determination lie with the technical data roles? What is realistic? Other examples given of data being approved for one use and transferred, but then repurposed. Should that trigger re-review by the original Data Steward?
- Methods of managing MOUs through their lifecycle. When data stewards sign an MOU to allow data use but prohibiting re-use, the MOU needs to be available for future incumbents of those data steward roles to stay aware of the agreement. When new uses/scenarios come up years later the data stewards can be aware of what was agreed to.

But balancing the need to document with the need for nimbleness as an organization. Finding efficient methods for managing these agreements. Consider a Sharepoint site. Three-party or two-party agreement between responsible data-steward, party using the data, and perhaps ITS specifying what data sharing is allowed.

- Creation of a common form for data requests. Comprehensive, covering access, data retention, re-use, and other considerations.
- When we have MOU/agreements regarding data use, determine who is responsible for making sure people adhere to those agreements. Where does the responsibility lie?
- Training for all data management roles. Training of data management roles, getting training out there. Online 10-slide training in Sakai or something more or different. Discuss getting feedback and how to develop a solid program to train data stewards.
- At what point will we be ready to train data stewards? What will we need to have in place (procedures, etc?) to be ready? Let's determine what the minimum is and make those a priority.
- Data-sharing audit, discuss what that might entail. How could a Trustee find all current data sharing agreements in use?
- Discuss maintaining data integrity when non-canonical source is updated. Synchronization with canonical source? Restrictions on non-canonical uses? Warning on the system to ensure users are aware that they may be dealing with data that isn't authoritative. Preference to update canonical source by policy?
- Prioritization of approvals. Ex. Seeking Data Steward/Trustee approval for use of Student data prior to IRB approval process.
- Awareness communications for general University community to improve understanding of the role of data stewards and responsibility to consult them.
- Collaboration with Research Data Stewardship group as they developing review processes involving privacy and security and risk evaluation for the use of data in that context. Overlap in processes?
- Determining which other University groups are involved in data stewardship right now?
- Data Dictionary update.
- Data Quality initiative.
- Explore possible value in a Chief Data Officer role.

- Role of this committee: reviewing specific agreements? Would there be value in the committee making recommendations to perhaps give guidance to data stewards?
- Next Steps for Data Governance Policy/Standard, committee checkpoints

In the Policy review process, material feedback should go to the committee. May be sent via email or call when large changes are needed. Final draft should be reviewed by the Committee before going to the Policy Review Committee (PRC). Steering Committee members will plan to be at the PRC if discussed there to answer questions and demonstrate support.

- Review of Information Classification Standard

Committee endorsed review without change to the Information Classification Standard. The Committee also discussed the importance of increasing use of the Classification in other contexts (security controls, reference, guidance documents, etc.) to improve visibility and gain benefits.

- New Business

For next meeting, members will submit use-cases for the Committee to walk through to consider how the Policy and Standard apply. This may facilitate creating guidance to determine what types of decisions should be handled through a business or technical data management role.