

Members: Cathy Lloyd, 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, Rob Cramer

Attendees: Cathy Lloyd, Rob Cramer, Steven Cramer, Sarah Grimm, Jennifer Klippel, Lee Konrad, Jeff Korab, Nancy Lynch, Jocelyn Milner, Bob Turner, Catharine DeRubeis, Britt Baker

Data Governance Council Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, April 27, 2021

8:30 – 10:00 a.m.

1. Welcome

- a. With McKinney Austin's departure from UW-Madison, Cathy Lloyd is now chairing the Data Governance Council.

2. Review/Approve Minutes from 3/23/2021

- a. Approved

3. Data Classification Policy Subcommittee Charter

- a. Bob Turner provided an overview of the charter. Open to suggestions from the council.
- b. Bob: Any volunteers for the subcommittee? We will need a couple non-DGC members too.
 - i. Lee Konrad and Catharine DeRubeis volunteered. The council didn't have immediate suggestions for other members.
- c. Sarah Grimm: Do we need to include research data in this policy? It may need to be added to the purpose in the charter.
 - i. Bob: In this policy it seems we need to classify research data.
- d. Cathy: The classification scheme also applies to non-institutional data?
 - i. Bob: If we're handling data from another organization and they have their own classification, we should honor that and make sure it aligns with one of our data classifications if they aren't congruent.
- e. Cathy: Do we as the DGC have the authority to do something broader for research as well? We could charge a committee to determine if it's applicable to research data.
- f. Cathy: It seems like these are the questions:
 - i. Do we have the authority?
 - ii. Does it belong under data or IT?
 - iii. Should research data be in scope?
 1. Bob: We could write a separate line in the charge to explore proper classification of research data.
 2. Nancy Lynch: If one of the challenges is to avoid a conflict with the UW-System classification policy, we need to ask the committee to discuss this as well.
 3. Bob: This goes back to the "what statement" and the difference between policy and procedure. With a lot that comes across my desk, the data has been pre-classified.
 4. Nancy: This could become a point of negotiation for our folks in RSP. Looking at UW-System policy now, it's quite simple/broad as opposed to how UW-Madison policy carves out research data.
- g. Cathy: What I'm hearing is that we want to take this charter, refine the language, talk to RSP, and get someone to participate on this subcommittee to make this determination. Correct? We'll put this on agenda for next month, send out a revised charter, and try to find out more.
 - i. The council agreed. Bob will start the conversation with RSP, and Cathy will send out another version of the charter and ask council members to vote virtually.

4. Teaching and Learning Data Domain Profile

- a. Steve Cramer: We talked a little about this at our last meeting. We've tried to put in a minimum amount of structure with scope, subdomains, data trustees, stewards, data systems. All this provides a basic structure and a good starting place. I think the hardest part in crafting these documents is the overlap, ambiguities, gaps, and trying to sort out the different mission directions we take within the university that are sometimes in conflict with each other. We'll need to figure out how to navigate these conflicts without being overly restrictive while protecting data. The DGC will have to struggle with these questions as we learn more. A lot of this was written by Dan Voeks who is a data steward of the teaching and learning domain.
 - i. If you knew nothing about the Teaching and Learning domain, does this document provide clarity? If not, what are the gaps? What are your questions?
 1. Jocelyn Milner: I thought the thoroughness was helpful. It might help to be explicit about how it connects with the student data domain and have a paragraph about the gray area or intersection.
 - a. Steve: There is a statement somewhere about overlap, but we can look at this together offline to see if this answers that or if we should add more.
- b. Cathy: Are there trustees that want to do this their own spaces? Any questions from folks looking to do this for their data?
 - i. Lee: I think this is a very useful model for pulling this together. This is a good generalizable framework.
- c. The DGC voted and approved accepting this in principle.

5. Review/Approve Slate of DGC Project/Initiatives Timelines

- a. Cathy: Before McKinney left, I asked him to provide a list of everything in the pipeline for the DGC.
 - i. Does the group have feelings around the prioritization about any of these? Over and above what's already been prioritized for September?
 1. No comments from the council.
 - ii. The Institutional Integration Standard was one that was really needed by Interop, so we'll work on for that for the next meeting. The Systems Planning and Implementation Standard has been started and would be a good one to follow up the Institutional Integration Standard. Does that sound right?
 1. The council agreed.

6. Data Issue Management Report

- a. No comments or questions.

7. Next Steps

- a. The next DGC meeting is May 25, 2021.