

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, Jeff Karcher, Jennifer Klippel, Lee Konrad, Jeff Korab, Mark Walters, Sarah Grimm, Amanda Reese, Susie Maloney, Dan Langer, Dan Purcell, Kristine Sunda, Britt Baker

Data Governance Council Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, November 24, 2020

8:30 – 10:00 a.m.

1. Framework for Reviewing Ancillary Systems (Kristine Sunda, IT Strategy for ATP)

- a. Kristine Sunda presented the phases of the ATP Framework and previewed the Data Governance Council's role in ATP's data strategy.

2. Welcome

- a. The council agreed with McKinney Austin's suggestion to move the monthly meetings from Webex to Microsoft Teams.
- b. The council's next meeting is December 22, which is near the holidays. McKinney asked members to let him know if they can't attend so that he can determine if they will have a quorum.
- c. The Data Governance Council's email list will be converting at some point from a WiscList to a G-group. The emails may look slightly different in terms of formatting and the address will change.

3. Review/Approve Minutes from 10/27/2020

- a. Approved

4. Updates on Ongoing Data Policy Work

- a. DGC work
 - i. McKinney provided the status and updates for each Institutional Data Policy Implementation task in detail.
 - ii. At today's meeting, the council will determine how to grant/deny document exceptions.
- b. Subcommittees
 - i. McKinney: We have two subcommittees that are currently in progress:
 1. Institutional Data Policy Subcommittee (IDPS) is working on the authorization standard for protected data. The group has completed a first draft and it is in the commenting period. We will soon be ready to get some feedback from stakeholders and experts outside the group. We're not too far off from bringing this before the DGC for action.
 2. Documentation Standard Subcommittee (DSS) has had three meetings and is not yet into drafting. There are two deliverables:
 - a. Report back to DGC on how scoping the standard will work.
 - b. The standard itself, which is a ways off.

5. Data Policy Exceptions Process

- a. The group looked at the agenda document for "Institutional Data Policy Exception Process Discussion."
- b. How do we want requests to be submitted (form, email) and where should submission information be presented or accessed?
 - i. Sara Grimm suggested a form for standardization.
 1. McKinney: This would be softer form that would elicit a process and conversation about the issue. Not sure what this is going to look like. This might be for people who think they need

an exception, but they really don't. The benefit of doing a form is standardization, but the drawback is that we'll get people who don't need an exception. We can include the link to the form in the standards and procedures to have a direct connection to the exception process.

2. McKinney: I'd propose that we make the form available where the policy is by providing a link, but not really advertise it in the general area where we have forms and contacts. Anyone object?

- i. The group agreed to go with this approach.

- c. What should be included in the documentation (requester, reason, scope timeframe, plan for future compliance, request date, approval/denial action, action date)?
 - i. Does anyone disagree with the documentation items?
 1. Sarah: Extension to request, if it keeps getting pushed out. Also, a field for resolved when the issue gets closed.
 - a. Lee Konrad: And a field to explain why the extension was needed.
- d. Where should the documentation reside and who should have access to it? Should there be a regular report to the Data Governance Council?
 - i. McKinney: I'd propose that DGC have access to the documentation. Or, ODMAS could keep the data and provide a report to the DGC. It should be locked down but still transparent to the DGC.
 1. The group agreed with ODMAS being the keeper of the documents and reporting to DGC.
- e. When should the Data Governance Council be consulted, and what does the consultation entail?
 - i. McKinney: For exceptions that fall within one or two domains, having the steward consultation is enough, but for broader exception requests that span more than two stewards, we would bring those before the DGC before deciding. Thoughts?
 1. Group agreed with the approach that issues involving more than two domains requires the Data Governance council to be consulted.

6. Data Issue Management Procedure Implementation

- a. McKinney presented the Data Issue Submission Form on the ODMAS website. The form requires NetID sign-in and pulls basic information about the submitter automatically. It captures what's required within the procedure itself.
- b. McKinney: After the form is submitted, the rest of the process will be manually documented by ODMAS and others. One way to document is with Jira, but we need to do some work with configuration. Until we get more experience, we'll document manually and decide what the best approach is. We'll eventually want to automate more. If anyone thinks of anything, reach out to me and we'll try to address whatever issues you catch.

7. Next Steps

- a. At the next meeting, the council will work on ironing out domains.
- b. McKinney will send out materials a little sooner than usual.
- c. Please let McKinney know if you can't make it the December 22 meeting.