

Members: Cathy Lloyd, Sarah Grimm, Jeff Karcher, Jennifer Klippel, Lee Konrad, Jeff Korab, Dan Langer, Anne Bilder, Allison La Tarte, Scott Owczarek, Jeffrey Savoy, Mark Walters, John Zumbunnen

Attendees: Cathy Lloyd, Sarah Grimm, Jeff Korab, Jeff Karcher, Anne Bilder, Allison La Tarte, Scott Owczarek, Jeffrey Savoy, John Zumbunnen, Michelle Young, Elizabeth Simcock, Catharine DeRubeis, Britt Baker

Data Governance Council Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, January 25, 2022

8:30-9:30 a.m.

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from 11/30/21

- a. Approved

2. Director, Data Governance Update

- a. ODMAS is in the process of making an offer.

3. Data Documentation Standard Update (Michelle Young and Elizabeth Simcock)

- a. Elizabeth and Michelle discussed the overlap from the cybersecurity documentation and data documentation perspectives. Cybersecurity would like to reach the level of documentation that the standard asks for, but what they are getting is not what is required. Our recommendation is still to review the implementation statement in a year.
- b. Jeff Savoy: During our assessment process, documentation such as this would be useful for categorizing the system and mapping the controls appropriately.
- c. Cathy: This was the item left over from us approving the standard. We will ask everyone to vote electronically.

4. Institutional Data Management Policy Discussion

- a. Cathy: A Teaching and Learning data steward has concerns with implementing the Institutional Data Policy at the system level, they have sent along the document that is attached (“Draft IDP Compliance Memo for Trustees”). This is a letter to the trustee confirming what the policy is. It would be helpful for us to have a roadmap to compliance to include taking inventory, what progress can be made on an annual basis, and what would satisfy the policy in case of an audit.
- b. Comments/questions from the group:
 - i. Data Stewards group could provide feedback.
 - ii. ODMAS should ideally have a substantial number of templates and other resources to help people get started, as well as an order of operations for inventorying.
 - iii. More detail is needed about what is reported to the DGC.
 - iv. Systems could be prioritized based on size and risk categorization, from most restricted to the least restricted.
 - v. How do we communicate that we need people to get in compliance?
 1. Cathy: We were thinking that ODMAS needs to provide some tools and templates to help make getting in compliance clearer, which is something for the new data governance director to address. We will come up with some language to add to the implementation statement. I think one of the things we’ll want to do is work with a subcommittee to help identify and create artifacts that we want in addition to that letter.
 - vi. Guidance about major versus non-major systems?
 1. Cathy: When I’ve talked to other peers about how to implement data governance programs, they have this concept of “valuing” the data. They’re focusing in on the critical data

elements they're trying to monitor. That's another lens we could take on the systems. Major systems could be those that are critical to our success as an institution.

- c. Cathy: It would be helpful to meet with the Teaching and Learning stewards to find out what their thoughts are for next steps, what would be helpful to them, what we want to collect and monitor going forward. And there are areas we don't have standards for yet, so we could add statements about compliance not existing yet. I'll plan to follow up with those stewards and put out a note to see if anyone is willing to help.

5. **New Domains/Subdomains for InfoAccess Data**

- a. Cathy: As we're looking at moving some InfoAccess data, we are finding that some domains do not exist. When we originally came up with the domains, we added one for Facilities, Person, etc., but we haven't gotten down to one like Housing, which falls in the middle. Should we reconstitute the original committee as best we can that previously worked on domains? What's the right level for that discussion?
- b. Margaret Tennesen: It makes logical sense to me that a subgroup would bring forward a proposal to this group.
- c. Cathy: I'll look at McKinney's notes and work on recruiting the available members of the original group.

6. **Data Issue Management Report**

- a. The Data Issue Management Procedure (and Policy) went live on January 1, 2021. One of the obligations for the procedure is to provide a report to the group monthly.

7. **Next Steps**

- a. The next meeting is February 22, 2022, on Microsoft Teams.