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, Rob Cramer

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

Data Governance Council Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, March 23, 2021
8:30 – 10:00 a.m.

1. **Welcome**
   a. Rob Cramer has joined the council as a new member.

2. **Review/Approve Minutes from 2/23/2021**
   a. Approved

3. **Data Governance Program Updates**
   a. McKinney Austin: To review, the comprehensive Data Institutional Policy is live as of January 1, 2021. In support of that policy, we had identified six standards and procedures.
      i. The Data Issue Management Procedure: Went live along with the policy and is now complete.
      ii. Data Access and Authorization Standard: Completed at our last meeting and will go into effect at start of the next fiscal year).
      iii. Data Documentation Standard: The group continues to work on it and the group delivered the scope at our last meeting. Continues with the drafting of the standard.
      iv. The remaining three – Data Quality Standard, Data Systems Planning Standard, and Data Integration Standard – we expect to start working on late this spring or early this summer.
   b. Stewards are working on their annual refresh of their major systems and systems classifications. UW-System policy requires stewards identify the systems where their data resides and to revisit them. Pretty far along, but not quite complete.

4. **Data Classification Issues**
   a. As McKinney said, the data stewards have been asked to identify and revisit their data systems, and Bob is the data steward for cybersecurity data.
      i. Bob Turner: What we need to do is have a way to classify the data that is under our stewardship (along with associated data trustee). Am looking to the council to have a conversation about creating a classification guide.
      ii. I'm asking the council for assistance with classification of some data issues in order to put the right security controls on them (see the data classification document in this meeting's Box folder).
   b. McKinney pointed out the classification rationales on https://data.wisc.edu/data-governance/data-stewards/.
   c. McKinney: When we started with the stewards, we asked them for how they write up a rationale specific to their domain, but there are two domains that haven't submitted them yet. I'd propose getting to 100% compliance on having rationales for each domain. Can work with each group to get all the domains in compliance.
   d. Amanda Reese: From my perspective, one of the areas we struggle with is having people understand the classification of their data. We could use resources to help people recognize when their data is identifiable. We could provide more resources to help people make decisions about what category their data fits in. For example, in the HIPAA space, we leverage a group of privacy coordinators in providing that type of support to their end users.

e. McKinney: Based on the discussion, I'd propose we work on the remaining two to reach 100% compliance, then share with Bob's group to get the standpoint of security and go from there. There would be an opportunity for comments and revisions to add detail.

   i. Bob: "Step Zero" is our tool for identifying the data and we would be happy to give anyone tutorials on how to use it.

f. McKinney: As a document from 2010, the Data Classification Policy predates our data governance program, which excludes academic research data.

   i. There are a few options we can discuss because we do have the UW-System's 3-tier scheme.

      1. Not have our own policy and live under the UW-System's scheme.
      2. Use our current 4-tier scheme.
      3. Choose the middle road of revisiting our classifications and make tweaks to the definitions or the number of them. I have no proposal on how exactly how to address this.

   ii. Do we want this to live in IT policy or do we want it in data policy?

      1. If we want it to be in data policy, it is broader than the data governance program's scope, but I think we could still have the policy live in data. It would still be executed by the provost and the vice chancellor for finance and administration, who would have that authority over the broader scope.

   iii. Bob: I second the idea of creating a new policy that is based on the old UW-Madison and UW-System policies but gets more into the idea of classifying the data in detail. We need to address research data because it isn't addressed at the System level, and we make sure that there are procedures to go with our policy.

      1. McKinney: If we think the policy should be redeveloped this way in the data space, then I think we'd want to charge a group to draft the policy and bring it back to the council. If that's the direction we want to go, I can work with Bob and others to work to frame out what that group would look like and what the charge would be. Alternative suggestions?

         a. Amanda Reese and Lee Konrad were interested in being involved in this group. Anyone else should email McKinney and let him know.

5. **Domain Definition and Profile Discussion**

   a. McKinney: We have a need to clearly define our domains. They are named but their scopes are not specifically written out. The next step is to have the domain definitions come through the DGC for review and discussion. I suggest having these definitions in domain profiles along with other basic information on https://data.wisc.edu/data-governance/data-stewards/.

      i. I created a template as something for us to react to and discuss (available in the meeting's Box folder). I'll provide a quick run-through of the components and we can talk about what the components you think should be added. The other document is a template courtesy of Steve Cramer from the Teaching and Learning domain. I included that as an example.

         1. Steven Cramer: This is tough to get right the first time. Until we get more experience, we might have to go with something to get started. Clear distinction in domains is very difficult and might have to be worked though as a council over time. On data usage, there are different priorities and missions that can compete.

            a. McKinney: I agree and am trying to get this template out as that starting point. There will have to be feedback as we go, and we can adapt as needed. And yes, getting the right level of specificity is difficult, as is the conflict in the boundaries of the data.

         2. Scott Owczarek: My question builds off the point Steve made about the gray area between domains. Person data/student data and the profile data/student data. Trying to build these buckets will be difficult.

    a. McKinney: We do have a Person Domain Working Group set up and they are starting to deal with these questions. No clearly defined timeline, but hopefully they will come back this spring/summer with a recommendation or report. Getting one done will provide an example we can share and give us an idea of how to tackle the different domains. Do we agree that merging this template and Steve's example is a good starting point?

        i. Group agreed with this option.

6. **Data Issue Management Report**
   a. McKinney displayed the current month's report to the council. It is also available in the group's Box folder.
   b. Only had one issue was raised over the last month in (human resources data domain issue). The report will take better shape as a variety of issues come in. Is now resolved.

7. **Next Steps**
   a. The next DGC meeting is April 27, 2021.