

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, 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, December 22, 2020

8:30 – 9:30 a.m.

1. Welcome

2. Review/Approve Minutes from 11/24/2020

- a. Approved

3. Updates on Ongoing Data Policy Work

- a. The Institutional Data Policy Subcommittee (IDPS) that worked on the Institutional Data Policy and on the Data Issue Management Procedure are close to wrapping up on their final deliverable, which is a recommended authorization standard. A draft authorization standard is out for review to some subject matter expert experts and stakeholders external to the group. There may be an additional round of feedback after this one.
- b. The Documentation Standard Subcommittee (DSS) is working on their initial deliverable regarding the scope.
- c. The Data Stewards are reviewing their major systems over the coming weeks and will be naming their data system custodians. That work is ongoing.
- d. Our data issue management form will go live on January 1 to match the procedure effective date. The exception request form will also go live on January 1.

4. Data Domain Recommendations

- a. The data domain subgroup – Amanda Reese, Jeff Korab, Sarah Grimm, and McKinney Austin – spent about two months working on the recommendations. Would like to have the DGC look at the document and voice any concerns today.
 - i. Recommendation 4 – Trustee for Data Outside of Designated Domains
 1. The subgroup dealt with the question of whether domains should be designated for all the institutional data at UW-Madison.
 - a. The recommendation is to add domains as needed/appropriate. The Chief Data Officer (CDO) will work on issues that fall outside currently defined domains in consultation with the DGC. As we have more issues in an area, we can determine when to carve out a new domain and designate an appropriate trustee.
 2. Group approved this recommendation with the added comments.
 - ii. Recommendation 2 – New Domains
 1. Comprises the five domains that the subgroup recommends be added to the list now and two that could be added in the future. Questions?
 - a. Scott Owczarek: Has the CRM come up in your discussions? As they're rolling out enterprise Salesforce, it might be good to prioritize CRM for planning purposes.
 - i. McKinney: The recommendation of the person domain is related to that. The CRM, as a system, is going to cross domains.
 - ii. Scott: The identity management implementation for Salesforce might be different from the rest of the implementation of Salesforce.

- iii. McKinney: We'll have to watch how that develops. We may have an organization domain like the person domain. I can't see CRM being its own domain because it will cross a lot of domains.
 - 2. Person domain
 - a. This is different from what we have now because it's cross-functional. We have person data in both the enrollment management and human resources domains. We can have the same people represented in both of those domains with inconsistent information.
 - b. Catharine DeRubeis: Would this be tied to all the affiliations people have? How do we separate and prioritize affiliations?
 - i. McKinney: This is linked to interoperability and identity management. We want to master the data in a central hub and make the information consumable across the institution in all the domains. If a person makes a change in one central place, the change will be consistent as it goes downstream.
 - c. Scott: How will this work operationally? How do you shift from employee to student, etc.?
 - i. McKinney: We need to define and scope our domains so we know the boundaries. This council will have a two-way conversation with trustees on this topic. We will define additional domains before acting on them. It will take a while to see if this works well operationally.
 - d. Trustee for person data
 - i. Jocelyn Milner: How does this work at some of our peer institutions?
 - 1. McKinney: We are leading in this area, so there aren't examples to follow.
 - e. McKinney: There's a lot to think about and discuss, so we'll table this one. I can get more information and pick this one back up next time.
 - 3. The group discussed the potential domains of Facilities, Legal and Compliance, Library, and Medical Affairs.
 - a. The council approved the four domains in a vote.
- iii. Recommendations 1 and 3 will be picked up at next DGC meeting. McKinney will ask for concerns via email.

5. Use Guidelines for Preferred names/pronouns

- a. Scott: The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs have approved collecting student pronouns via the Canvas learning management system.
 - i. The plan around the Canvas implementation is that it will be introduced for Spring 2021.
 - ii. Unfortunately, Canvas can't pull out the data and allow us to port it to other environments.
 - iii. NameCoach is the other software we're working on. We can't implement NameCoach immediately, but it would work in other environments like Salesforce.
 - iv. Questions?
 - 1. Lee Konrad: Do you expect NameCoach to be implemented for the fall semester?
 - a. Scott: Depends on how testing goes. NameCoach will be for all campus users, not just students.
- v. Scott: Please provide feedback on the use guidelines documents by January 5.