**Members**: Lisa Johnston, Sarah Grimm, Jeff Karcher, Lee Konrad, Jeff Korab, Anne Bilder, Allison La Tarte, Scott Owczarek, Jeffrey Savoy, Catharine DeRubeis, Margaret Tennessen, John Zumbrunnen, David Honma, James Yonker, Andrew Johnson, Jack Talaska

**Attendees**: Lisa Johnston, Jack Talaska, Jeff Korab, Allison La Tarte, Scott Owczarek, Jeffrey Savoy, Catharine DeRubeis, John Zumbrunnen, David Honma, James Yonker, Margaret Tennessen, Britt Baker, Tom Jordan, Steven Tan, David Leszczynski, Phil Hull

# Data Governance Council Meeting Minutes
### Tuesday, June 28, 2022
### 8:30-10 a.m.

1. **Welcome new member**
    a. Jack Talaska – HIPAA Privacy Officer in the Office of Compliance

2. **Presentation/Discussion – Unified Data Access (Tom Jordan)**
    a. Tom Jordan presented on the UW-Madison current state environment – data request and approval, challenges, relevant institutional policies, related/dependent efforts, ATP and UW System intersections, and a possible future state (see slide deck).
    b. Over time, we have evolved disparate data systems with various access processes.
    c. We do not currently have a good view of who has access to what or when they changed jobs, and how that access should change.
    d. Data replication is a challenge. E.g., Core Person data replicated across many systems.
    e. Related project efforts
        i. Data integration standard
        ii. Interop integration projects
        iii. ATP ancillary systems strategy (some systems can be absorbed by Workday)
    f. Possible future state: Using Badger Analytics model, UW-Madison could move away from a data approval process based on the system layer to domains-classification levels (e.g., Internal Student data).
        i. Has the potential to substantially change institutional behavior – rather than seeking data based on the platform that provides the easiest access to data, it allows us to provide a unified process for access to data with all the appropriate institutional controls around training, etc., and separates the decision about data access from the decision about appropriate means of consumption for particular use cases.
        ii. An opportunity exists at this point to think about a more holistic view of data access and approval.

3. **Charter Review/Approval – Joint Admissions Data Management Group (Phil/Dave)**
    a. Phil Hull: One of the common issues reported to us is about data collected during the admissions process. Having a consistent approach is important, but a problem is that the admission processes on campus are very diversified. Would like to see a formally chartered group that can meet to address data quality issues related to admissions processes. Need a central place to have discussions about how policy issues are implemented.
    b. Dave Leszczynski: There are various application tools across campus. Having the ability to implement data policy in a standard way would help. Need to operationalize records retention schedules.
    c. Lisa: I'm proposing the creation of a new Joint Admissions Data Management Group to help address these problems. Would fall under the DGC and report to it about issues it identifies and proposals for issue resolutions. Supports and helps inform the data stewards' ability to put policies in operation. Would also like the group to address data quality. Phil, Dave, and I will socialize with the various admissions offices and figure out membership, as well as work on naming.
        i. Feedback
            1. How to avoid a parallel data governance program?

  a. Intentional naming/structure to make sure it ties back to the DGC. Leadership of group through the data stewards should help align it directly with what is happening on campus.

  b. Feedback loops built into the charter. There are interpretation questions involved in implementing the institutional data policy.

4. **Proposal/Discussion – Institutional Data Policy Roadshow (Lisa)**
   a. Lisa: Proposing that different data stewards/DGC members, and I present on a compact set of slides to take out to various groups to raise awareness about the institutional data policy. About 15-20 minutes that could be presented during a staff meeting, for example.
      i. What's been done?
         1. APIR does webinars about data tools/products for consumption.
      ii. Would you like us/steward to present to your unit?
         1. HR groups
         2. FP&M
         3. SMPH
      iii. What other groups should we approach?
         1. ITCCC
         2. CTLM Strategic Partners – Leadership Council
         3. Administrative Council
      iv. Group looking at different subsystems (ADAM group?).
      v. Tom Jordan is working with 45 business units on Workday conversations – complete by fall timeline. Quick pass, then more detailed.
      vi. Migration from InfoAccess to Snowflake also raising some of these questions.

5. **Updates**
   a. Data Stewards working meetings started up in May (bi-weekly)

6. **Next Steps**
   a. The next meeting is July 26, 2022, on Microsoft Teams.