Members: McKinney Austin, Steven Cramer, Sarah Grimm, Jeff Karcher, Jennifer Klippel, Lee Konrad, Jeff Korab, Dan Langer, Nancy Lynch, Jocelyn Milner, Scott Owczarek, Amanda Reese, Bob Turner, Mark Walters

Attendees: McKinney Austin, Steven Cramer, Sarah Grimm**, Jeff Karcher**, **Jennifer Klippel**, **Lee Konrad, Jeff Korab**, Nancy Lynch, **Jocelyn Milner, Scott Owczarek, Amanda Reese, Bob Turner**, **Britt Baker**

Data Governance Council Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 27, 2020
8:30 – 10:00 a.m.

1. **Welcome**

2. **Review/Approve Minutes from 9/22/2020**
   a. Approved

3. **Update on Pronoun Collection Discussion**
   a. Scott had a discussion with DoIT and other stakeholders around functionality around tool called NameCoach. Name coach for 2 purposes:
      i. Pronoun identification
      ii. Name pronunciation including preferred name pronunciation
   b. Faculty, staff, and students would use tool to indicate pronouns and name/preferred name.
   c. Advantages is that it can be integrated with Canvas and other learning tools in that space.
   d. DoIT User Services is receiving pressure to turn on preferred name/pronouns in Zoom. Iss is that we have no current strategy on pronouns and are scrambling to develop that policy for campus. Looking to create long term plan. How do we make sure we have right educational sources around pronouns and how do we communicate out that to campus?
   e. Interop won't give us the capabilities that Namecoah does in context where pronouns/names are shared. Namecoach allows everyone to specify where these things are shared.
   f. From a data gov perspective, it makes sense to make decisions about this space, but we also have to address the pressure.

4. **Updates on Ongoing Data Policy Work**
   a. McK displayed a table of a list (institutional data policy Implementation Work for Data Governance Council Discussion) showing list item and status.
   b. Questions?
      i. None.

5. **Data System Custodian Identification**
   a. McKinney brought up the document for the agenda item, "Data System Custodian Role Identification Proposal."
   b. What you're seeing here is the current state. This covers a lot but not everything. I suggest we ask stewards to identify a custodian for each of those major systems. That's the proposal. Is there any feedback?
      i. Jocelyn: Looks fine but what if there are issues?
         1. Mck: The responsibility is on the steward according to the policy.
      ii. Bob: How does steward populate the custodian list?
         1. Mck: If this is approved I'll go to the stewards and work with them to name custodians.
         2. Bob: Having a list like this exposed to the public could be a security issue. This could make these people vulnerable to issues. We should consider putting this list behind netid so it's not publicly available.

3. Mck: we don't have to expose all the parts. We don't need to expose everything but we need to maintain a record.
4. Scott: Can there be multiple custodians for specific data systems. McK- there can be where we have segmented out the system. For the most part, we should have one contact for each system, even though multiple people may worok on that system.
   a. Scott: There's further delineation that could occur for custodians. McK: That's fine we'll work on that. As long as they can be segmented and bounded that's fine.
      i. Jeff Korab – could the same hold true for tools in the learning management system?
         1. McK-yes this sort of forces that issue.
         2. Scott-are we allowed to update the list of major systems? I'd suggest adding Dars?
            a. Yes the stewards will need to review what their systems are and we will update that.
            b. McK-given the suggestions and caveats, does the council support this first round of identifying the data system costodians? If so add a +1 in the chat.
               i. The council supported this.

6. **Divisional Data Management Representative Identification**
   a. Another role to look at. See document (Divisional Data Management Representative Identification Proposal).
   b. McKinney has a list of all divisions. Not necessary to have a rep identified for each and every division at the outset, especially because all are covered by Stewards. Some schools and colleges we could identify as needing this role.
      i. How do we go about naming?
      ii. McK listed the colleges and schools as he understood them with a column next to it for the DDMR.

Divisional Data Management Representatives will be named for schools/colleges initially. Additional Divisional Data Management Representatives may be named as the need arises. Deans/Directors will be asked to make appointments.

Division	DDMR
A07 College of Agricultural & Life Sciences (CALS)	
A12 Wisconsin School of Business	
A17 School of Education	
A19 College of Engineering	
A27 School of Human Ecology	
A40 Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies	
A45 Law School	
A48 College of Letters & Science (L&S)	
A53 School of Medicine and Public Health (SMPH)	
A54 School of Nursing	
A56 School of Pharmacy	
A87 School of Veterinary Medicine	
A34 Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education (OVCRGE)	
A47 Division of Extension	
A93 Division of Continuing Studies	

      iii.
      iv. Lee Konrad – suggested adding the Libraries to the list. McK- Lee you're anticipating the next step in the work. Maybe a caveat is if we don't have a domain for libraries, we add them as a division?

1. Lee-I see both sides of that. As long as it belongs in one of the two. A domain would be even better.
   v. Jennifer-Is there a rep for A98? Financial positions. (CHECK RECORDING around 27-28).
      1. Jennifer-Online undergrad on A86 might be an issue also. That's the other thing that might be an issue, but it's probably too early to put this on the list.
   vi. Joc-There are more divisions that have data domains associated with them. There may be others to add. International division.

Divisional Data Management Representatives will be named for schools/colleges initially. Additional Divisional Data Management Representatives may be named as the need arises. Deans/Directors will be asked to make appointments.

Division	DDMR
A07 College of Agricultural & Life Sciences (CALS)	
A12 Wisconsin School of Business	
A17 School of Education	
A19 College of Engineering	
A27 School of Human Ecology	
A40 Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies	
A45 Law School	
A48 College of Letters & Science (L&S)	
A53 School of Medicine and Public Health (SMPH)	
A54 School of Nursing	
A56 School of Pharmacy	
A87 School of Veterinary Medicine	
A34 Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education (OVCRGE)	
A47 Division of Extension	
A93 Division of Continuing Studies	
International Division	

   vii.
      1. McK- I think what I'm trying to identify here as first wave that are divisions not covered by domains. That's why we have Continuing Studies and the Graduate school
      2. Joc- these are all the schools that have deans. I think Student Life is in the category as well.
      3. Mck- if we don't structure domains to cover these, we'll add them to the list.
      4. Joc-another one would be the division of the arts. But I think you've got it now with the rest of the deans.
   viii. Jennifer Klippel – Is FP&M going to be on this list? McK-it's been really siloed, but they are on track to get added in to the doc and have a steward, etc. Wide areas of campus could make good use of the data.
   ix. McK-the second part of this is where we identify these people. I have an idea on this but I'm not committed to it: We have risk executives for every division, so my thought was to ask these people to name someone. They appear to always be the deans or directors. Is that the right approach or is there another approach to this? Similar to the work we did awhile back with the trustees. Very challenging.
      1. Jeff Korab-as long as they can name someone I think that's a good approach.
      2. McK- it shouldn't be the dean or director. Should be someone with some nexus to data systems.
      3. mcK- not hearing other thoughts. Starting with these divisions (adding as needed) and asking divisional leadership to name somone to the DDMR. Does the council support this?
         a. The council agreed via chat.

7. **Institutional Data Released for Non-Institutional Use**

a. This particular issue has been raised a few times in different areas. The policy doesn't speak to this explicitly ad there is ambiguity since there are questions. When we ship our data off somewhere, we lose control over it. Does the policy apply to released data? (See recording around 40 minutes)

Institutional Data Released for Non-Institutional Use

<u>Issue</u>

There have been several requests for clarification of ambiguity around policy application in the case where institutional data has been released (with appropriate authorization) for a non-institutional use.

<u>Examples</u>

1. Release of student record data to the National Student Clearinghouse
2. Release of water sample data to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
3. Release of institutional data to researchers for academic research

<u>Discussion</u>

- Does the instance of the released data cease to be institutional data upon authorized release for non-institutional purposes?
- Is institutional control over the released instance of institutional data dictated by data use agreements rather than by the Institutional Data Policy?

b.
c. The national student clearing house is a place we ship data to, and people can subscribe to their service. We hand over our data and no longer have control over it.
d. McK-we can have data use agreements and contracts like that to maintain control.
e. Scott- is this for where we don't have contractual agreements AND we've handed over the data?
   i. McK-The question is, does the the policy apply to data that has been handed over, period.
      1. The second example about water samples, for example. Can we require the DNR to observe our data policy after they have our data?
f. Joc- 47-49.
g. Scott – there are instances where we get public records requests that we provide institutional data and then we have no control over the data.
h. McK- there are multiple issues with this and we need some guidance about how we go about this. Institutaionl data for research pruposes – what the protocols are.
i. Bob- might depend on release and mechanism they are given.
j. McK- trying to validate that IR, once it's released, it's out of our hands.
   i. 54:30-Joc-some open records situtations suggest that it would be helpful to have
k. Jeff Korab-is there any data use agreement out there already that we can make use of?
   i. Mck- we haven't done the work on this yet or getten to it yet.
l. Joc- we participated in
m. Mck_ sounds like we're on the same page but need to refine how to articulate it. We can revisit this. Any parting thoughts? None