

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, Jeffrey Savoy, Jeff Karcher, Jack Talaska, Lee Konrad, Lisa Johnston, Catharine DeRubeis, Sarah Grimm, Andrew Johnson, Jeff Korab, Jesse Winters, John Zumbrunnen, Scott Owczarek, James A Yonker, Allison La Tarte, Britt Baker, Steven Hopper, Jeffrey Shokler, Mary K Thompson, Dan Voeks, Michelle Young

Data Governance Council Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, July 26, 2022

8:30-10 a.m.

1. Welcome

2. Presentation: UW System Enterprise Data Analytics and Governance Program (Steven Hopper)

- a. Establishing a data strategy for the UW System. About one year in the works. Need to put data together in a meaningful way to drive decision making.
 - i. Strategy
 1. Bring data together into common infrastructure.
 2. Immediate need: The future ATP system (HR/Finance/Research Admin) will only bring in two years of data. We want to use data infrastructure/strategy to pull in legacy PeopleSoft data, eventually Workday, connect HR and Finance data, to do analysis.
 3. Student data: UW-Green Bay is piloting student data lifecycle analytics.
 - a. Replaces a separate Common Data Repository (CDR) repository not connected to data and analytics. Enables central reporting. Makes it easier to report CDR data up to System. May grow this to other interested campuses.
 4. Data governance and literacy: What the data means, how to interpret it properly.
 - a. Establish a System level data governance council that has different domains and subcommittees.
 - b. Make decisions about enterprise level data (definitions).
 - c. Connect with campus level council(s). Have campuses inform what happens at System level, keeping in mind that all data is not System data.
 - b. Questions
 - i. Anne: What duty does System have to students for migrating their data over to the System data lake. Privacy/transparency issues.
 1. Compliance reporting requirements, etc. will of course continue to be in place, but the subset of System data is much smaller than what a campus has on a student. For example, UW-Green Bay will have its own part of the platform that other campuses can't see, or System can't see. Appropriate safeguards will be in place. Need to have the venue (governance council) to discuss what's appropriate.
 - ii. Andrew: What is the plan for the longitudinal data, especially for Finance? What level of granularity will be there?
 1. No decisions have been made. Would like to have as deep a level of granularity as we can, and the hope is not to summarize/lose granularity if we don't have to. One of the things we're working on with Workday is to create a mapping table from old to new structures (e.g., chart of accounts), which will form foundation of the longitudinal piece.
 - iii. Dan: Are you envisioning learning data as in scope for system enterprise data? UW-Madison has independent implementation of learning management systems and differently structured data.
 1. Yes, planning to bring in all Canvas data from the twelve schools that are on the common Canvas instance (not Madison, it has a separate instance). If Madison wanted, they could

also join. Looking to use Heliocampus – they have a lot of models built out for learning analytics.

- iv. Scott: First, regarding the Peoplesoft chart of accounts to Workday financial model crosswalk. Broader concern at Madison is that the student information systems at the UW campuses each have their own academic structure. Need advocacy to make sure we could try to move forward together in the future. Second, operational data availability needs governance (for example, the Registrar's Office and enrollment data - student data issues).
 1. Agree to both. As we set up the data governance council and the student-centric subgroups, I would look to have members from the RO/Admissions. Want us to be able to publish definitive data and agree we should have governance checks and balances.
 2. Regarding the academic hierarchies in Peoplesoft, I will continue to bring this up with ATP executive council. These three things are foundational to the project and the data we want to do long term:
 - a. Crosswalk between chart of accounts and FTM
 - b. The crosswalk between UDDS and org hierarchy in Workday.
- v. Sara: What's the UW-Green Bay timeline?
 1. Negotiations with the vendor are taking place in August/September. October former kickoff project, 6–9-month implementation.

3. **Discussion: UW-Madison's Data Warehouse Plan (Allison La Tarte)**

- a. Current path for our Madison data warehouse/analytics strategy is to migrate to cloud (Snowflake)
 - i. Changes at the UW System have been happening over the last 3-4 months.
 - ii. Migration continues. Moving our InfoAccess into Snowflake.
 - iii. Ties to ATP/System Warehouse are very important. But this shared warehouse has existed.
 - iv. Opportunity/decision – do we pull historical Workday data into Madison Data Warehouse (Snowflake)? Rather than just rely on what System is setting up.
- b. Jeff: Do we know what technology they are picking? Informatica as example where Madison was ahead, and UW System is catching up.
 - i. Heliocampus uses AWS. For the student side, all campuses able to opt in (starting with UW-Green Bay). Lots of campuses don't have a student warehouse. They draw directly from SIS or rely on System CDR. Issue: if they build something without Madison's input, then it's probably not going to work for Madison.
- c. Jeff: Does the Unizin consortia piece play into this at all? -Yes
- d. Scott: Systems main goal to build a better CDR. Lots of questions on this topic. How are we going to architect that thing? Would teaching and learning data be brought over?

4. **Updates**

- a. Institutional Data Policy Roadshow Update (Lisa)
- b. Round robin

5. **Next Steps**

- a. The next meeting is August 23, 2022, on Microsoft Teams.