

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, Lee Konrad, Jeff Korab, Nancy Lynch, Jocelyn Milner, Amanda Reese, Bob Turner, Catharine DeRubeis, Tom Jordan, Britt Baker

Data Governance Council Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, January 26, 2021

8:30 – 10:00 a.m.

1. **Welcome**

2. **Review/Approve Minutes from 12/22/2020**

- a. Approved

3. **Person Domain, Continued**

- a. McKinney shared slides that stated where the domains subgroup left off and what a workgroup might look like.

- i. One option is to set up small group work with representation to handle details before standing up the Person Domain (other option is to stand the Person Domain up immediately). Thoughts?

1. Jocelyn: Even with all the questions, it seems like there's value in having the workgroup to help lay the groundwork.

2. Catharine: I would like to serve on this workgroup. I have a lot of questions in this area.

- a. McKinney: Preference for workgroup vs standing up Person domain now?

- i. Catharine: Workgroup before standing up the domain would be helpful.

Would be challenging to know where the boundaries are if it was stood up immediately.

3. Tom: Progress over the next couple of months is important to set arc for the work. Decisions made on the interop project will come in advance of formal policy from campus around Person Domain. Important for workgroup to understand who needs to be involved in decisions/tactical alignments to make sure we're in alignment with direction of campus. Will help CRM initiative and Interoperability initiative make some of the decisions they need to make.

- ii. McKinney: We would try to get the group established in the next week or two. Anybody in opposition?

1. No

- iii. McKinney: Not suggesting we formally charge an ad hoc subcommittee. We'll just get some people together to do the work and Tom and McKinney will come back with a report for DGC.

4. **Data Domain Recommendations, Continued**

- a. The group continued discussion of "Recommendation for UW-Madison Institutional Data Domains" document prepared by McKinney, Sarah Grimm, Jeff Korab, and Amanda Reese.

- b. At the last DGC meeting:

- i. The group approved Recommendation 4 with some additional language.

- ii. We also talked through Recommendation 2 and approved four bullets (deferring on Person Domain until we have more information).

- iii. We began talking about Recommendation 1.

1. We decided not to rename Academic Planning domain to Academic Affairs. Do we need to reopen discussion on that?

2. Steve: No, we were leaning towards what you said. Case not closed, let's do a little more scope work.
- c. Recommendation 1 (second bullet point)
- i. Currently we have two administration research related domains – Research Administration and Research Compliance.
 - ii. Data Domain Group thought it was more common to have one (Research Administration), but nothing wrong with having two. Thoughts?
 1. Jocelyn: Direction to consolidate would suggest accepting this. Would be nice to hear from some research people. Wouldn't mind having fewer stewards and more professionalization (more concentration on being a steward).
 2. McKinney: I would prefer to consolidate them but feel uneasy since I don't have a great understanding of this space.
 3. Steve: I think they're different, but I don't know if they're different enough to keep separate. We could consolidate them and unconsolidated them later if needed.
 - a. McKinney: That's what I was thinking. We can see what the reaction is to the consolidation the two and undo it if there's pushback.
 - i. Group agreed.
- d. Recommendation 3
- i. McKinney pointed out current domain structure in Appendix 1. Domains are at trustee level, but some stewards are broken into smaller areas (could be called subdomains or steward areas).
 - ii. When we set this up a few years ago we left the steward areas at the discretion of the trustees. Some Data domains have multiple steward areas. This is also addressed in the Assumptions section.
 1. We found that we need more of a focus on the Data Governance skillset than a SME skillset. We would still allow for subdomains (which we will probably see more of in the future). The concern is that we're going to have a lot of stewards who don't have enough regular engagement with data gov to pick up the data gov rules and their role as stewards. This recommendation encourages the development of data governance expertise.
 2. Steve: I think that knowledge of data gov is important, but subject matter expertise is also important for contextual awareness.
 - a. McKinney: Agree we need subject matter expertise and organizational knowledge. What we feel we're lacking is the data gov piece.
 3. Jocelyn: I think there's an issue across domains. I see the challenge of aggregating all this in one data steward, but I see an opportunity for the data steward to learn all these pieces. We could add something explicit about the steward having to consult with SMEs.
 - a. McKinney: We could put something like this in the standards and procedures as we work on them.
 - b. Steve: This could become a divisive issue. If we try to force this on data stewards it could drive them away from data governance.
 - i. McKinney: The existing stewards don't have to be in a formal steward role. Functionally it doesn't have to be that different except that the single actions taken by steward, but others would be involved. It would be up to trustees.
 1. One option: Going forward, stewards will be named at the domain level. The Research Administration and Research Compliance domains would have a target towards consolidation.
 - a. Jeff K: That's a lot like how we laid out a lot of policy. Providing time to bring things into compliance.
 - b. Jocelyn: Seems workable/consistent with our other approaches.

- c. Steve: There's no philosophical argument against having single contact for data domains. I would like to see the language incorporated into the definition and roles/responsibility. Also to see emphasis on SME knowledge in there.
- ii. McKinney made comment in the document addressing the proposed revisions. Thoughts?
 - 1. Group endorsed the change.

5. **Data Issue Management Report**

- a. Data Issue Management Procedure (and policy) went live on January 1. One of the obligations for the procedure is for McKinney to report to the group monthly.
 - i. McKinney: In the beginning this is going to be a little clunky because it's a manual process to track these after the form is submitted. Working in ODMAS on setting up a workflow in Jira including the reporting.
 - ii. For now, McKinney has an excel workbook in the meeting folder. Not expecting to spend a lot of time talking about these at each DGC meeting unless there's a problem. Anyone in this group should feel free to raise issues/questions. All the issues this month are in the student domain. At our next meeting, the status and pending actions will be updated with more specific information.
 - iii. Report on Resolved Issues. None resolved yet but will be moving issues here in the future. As additional issues get submitted, we'll have more information on the Trends tab. Feedback is very much appreciated.