Members: Lisa Johnston, Sarah Grimm, Jeff Karcher, Lee Konrad, Jeff Korab, Anne Bilder, Allison La Tarte, Scott Owczarek, Jeffrey Savoy, Catharine DeRubeis, Margaret Tennessen, John Zumbrunnen, David Honma, James Yonker, Andrew Johnson, Jack Talaska

Attendees: Lisa Johnston, Allison La Tarte, Anne Bilder, Catharine DeRubeis, Dan Voeks, David Honma, Jack Talaska, James Yonker, Jeff Karcher, Jeff Korab, Jeffrey Savoy, John Zumbrunnen, Lee Konrad, Michael Ippolito, Phill Hull, Sarah Gramm, Shannon Larson, Tom Jordan, Scott Owczarek, Britt Baker, Katie Block

Data Governance Council Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, September 27, 2022
8:30-10 a.m.

1. **Updates**
   a. Tom Jordan (chair of Core Person Operational group and Data Integration Standard Group)
      i. Core Person Operational Group is working on the problem of core person data management across domains.
      ii. Data Integration Standard Group is working on guidelines across systems.

2. **Cybersecurity information and logging-event management presentation (Jeff Savoy, Mike Ippolito, Allen Monnete, Shannon Larson)**
   a. Jeff Savoy and team presented on their security event logging expansion project, including options for expansion, comparison to big ten schools, and next steps (slides available in the DGC Box folder).
      i. For greater efficiency, cybersecurity, base operational, and extended operational events will flow into central event management.
      ii. Using elastic search on-prem but looking into cloud solutions. Enterprise way of handling events.
      iii. Currently, no formal governance. Requests are made on a case-by-case basis.

3. **Responding to institutional data access requests from UW-Madison researchers**
   a. How do we handle requests for institutional data for research purposes? May have long-term sharing requirements. Would like to discuss as a group how guidance might look.
      i. Examples from the Registrar's Office (Phil Hull)
         1. Difficulties for both stewards and researchers making the requests. Researchers go down unproductive paths.
         2. Legal aspects. Researchers often granted exemption from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight, but when a request reaches a steward, the steward may have to educate researchers on limitations to data access. Disconnect between IRB and data stewards. Should be able to bridge gap better to maintain privacy of student records.
      ii. Examples from the Learning Analytics space (Dan Voeks)
         1. Suggestion is to charter a working group to build guiding principles for use of institutional data and research.
         2. No clarity in the institutional data policy about what constitutes an appropriate university business purpose. Research-for-publication cases are being dealt with in an ad hoc way. Frustration on the part of researchers due to lack of clarity. Need to come up with a consistent way to handle these requests.
      iii. Example from the 2021 Student Campus Climate Survey (Jay Yonker)
         1. Complicated because the survey is conducted and sponsored by the university. Went through the IRB process and received an exemption. Went to the registrar's office to get data needed for the survey. No party involved has access to all types of information.
      iv. Discussion. Suggestions for moving forward?

1. Form a working group to consider guidelines. Look at policies at other institutions.
2. Allison La Tarte: Why would UW-Madison researchers' requests be considered differently from other institutions' researchers?
   a. Phil Hull: Other institutions' researchers come to RO instead of making open records requests. Would like to have this done in a more defined process on the front end.
3. David Honma: The example of HIPAA. Shouldn't there be something similar for student data? Would be giving researchers more information up front about obstacles to obtaining data access.
4. Lisa will bring a draft of the group proposal to the council at a future meeting.

4. **Gender X (Scott Owczarek, Will Lipske)**
   a. UW-System has provided ability of applicants to have gender of X as a value. Bringing to DGC for awareness and see how other admitting offices across campus are handling. Ideas about next steps?
      i. Now that this is an accepted value, what are the downstream impacts on the student information system, various applications, reporting, data warehouse systems across campus?
      ii. Who should consume, how should it be updated, etc.?
      iii. Is there a way to better document, create definitions?
         1. How to coordinate with the HR system?
   b. Tom Jordan: The Core Person Operational Group can facilitate conversations around this.
   c. Scott Owczarek: With all the admitting offices, the joint admission working group would be another good place to have conversations to help the core person group fill in certain aspects.

5. **Last Name in Use (Tom Jordan)**
   a. Previously we limited the campus community with being able to choose a different last name from their legal one. Creates problems for those who are known better professionally by a different last name. Looking to pursue an option like the one we have for first name in use. Has been reviewed/supported by the Core Person Operational Group.
   b. Will report back to the Data Governance Council after we have more implementation information.