

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, September 22, 2020

8:30 – 10:00 a.m.

1. **Welcome**
2. **Review/Approve Minutes from 8/25/2020**
 - a. Approved
3. **Institutional Data Policy Communications Update**
 - a. McKinney Austin presented the institutional data policy to the ITCCC group.
 - b. An in-progress webpage with FAQs is on the ODMAS website.
4. **Data Documentation Standard Subcommittee Charge (Discussion and Vote)**
 - a. The council viewed the minor edits to the subcommittee charge, including named membership at the end.
 - b. Steve Cramer asked if the charge should give guidance on what the subcommittee should document.
 - i. McKinney: We can ask the group to come back with a summary of the scope they plan on working on. It will take years to get a complete list of what documentation is needed. I want to make a list of minimum documents and pick off ones that are doable.
 - ii. The council agreed that McKinney can add to the charge that the subcommittee will present to the DGC when it has established the scope so the DGC can correct course if needed.
 1. In charge section where standard is, McKinney will include the challenge and approach, and add a sentence about reporting out on that.
 - a. The group voted to allow McKinney to make the edits directly without a further email vote to approve the changes to the subcommittee charge document.
5. **Institutional Data Policy Implementation Work (Discussion and Planning)**
 - a. McKinney brought up the document for the agenda item, Document (5a – IDP Implementation Work to DGC), and highlighted that he would like to prioritize and sequence the implementation work, including what needs action by DGC and which statements require standards and procedures.
 - i. McKinney: This policy is a chance to rethink and recalibrate our domains. We can identify the domains as we scale out the policy, so we have coverage of the entire institution. I think we need to add to our current list of domains and discuss whether our current domains are at the right level of granularity and segmentation. There is significant work to do on this. Thoughts?
 1. Jocelyn Milner: The subcommittee approach seems to be working well as opposed to having the whole council.
 - a. McKinney: It's going to be hard to execute the work that needs to be done without domains established and data trustees. The advantage of a subgroup is that there is more flexibility in the scheduling. The subgroup will figure out what the data domains are and how to parse out coverage that is workable. Would anyone be interested in participating in a subgroup of this council?
 - i. Amanda, Jeff, Sarah volunteered to participate in the subgroup.
 1. McKinney: We'll pull together a subgroup and will contact the volunteers online, and the volunteers will discuss and make

recommendations to the council. You can email me if you want to add or remove your name to the list.

- b. McKinney: The policy is not specific about how the roles are filled. We should be able to address rows 2-4 ahead of January 1. Let me know if you have thoughts and I'll make sure we have room on the agenda for the next three meetings or so to address these.
- c. McKinney: I broke out the second table because as we got the policy approved with the addition of an implementation statement. I want to figure out which parts of the policy need a standard or procedure before we can expect people to comply. I went through the twelve policy statements and identified for myself which seemed to require standards/procedures and the status. We are currently working on three of them. I also identified that #6 (data quality), #8 (data systems), and #9 (data integrations) all need standards or procedures. The other policy statements stood on their own. I'd like to get consensus from the council so that as we get questions about this, we can tell people they can wait for the standard/procedure to be compliant (or not).
 - i. The group agreed via chat.

6. Pronoun Data Collection Discussion (Scott O)

- a. Scott Owczarek: We learned from the preferred name implementation that without a clear campus policy about updates, who gets access, how do we think about this as policy before implementing this as a policy. We are struggling with this because there is a huge interest from the community and therefore a lot of pressure to implement quickly. Can this council help to develop this policy so we can have a sound technological implementation? Preferred name is not usable across multiple systems, right now, and we don't want to run into that with the pronoun collection.
- b. McKinney: What timeframe are you looking at?
 - i. Steve: The assumption is that we will implement this for the spring.
 - ii. McKinney: The policy process is long. I wonder if we can use institutional data policy with procedures and standards to put formal guidelines on this, or if you want to use guidelines like we used with learning analytics. We probably need to put a group together and charge them out of this council in order to move that quickly.
 - 1. Steve: The meeting about the NameCoach license is tomorrow, so I suggest allowing that meeting to occur and let them report back to this group. DoIT AT wants to develop the policy first and then implement the tech solution.
 - a. Scott will connect with McKinney after tomorrow's meeting.