

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, Allison La Tarte, Alan Ng, Brad Sanders, Catharine DeRubeis, Britt Baker, Dan Voeks, JJ Du Chateau, Jack Talaska, Jeff Hilliard, Jeffrey Savoy, Jeff Karcher, Jeff Korab, John Zumbrunnen, Jon Terrones, Lee Konrad, Phil Hull, Tom Jordan, Sarah Grimm, Scott Owczarek

Data Governance Council Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, February 21, 2023

8:30-10 a.m.

1. Updates

- a. Official name of merged ODMAS and APIR offices is now Data, Academic Planning & Institutional Research (DAPIR).
- b. DAPIR has hired a data enterprise management director, Brad Sanders.

2. Update on Low/No Code Platform Recommendations (JJ Du Chateau)

- a. JJ presented an overview on the UW Low/No Code project.
- b. Possible data governance impacts
 - i. Data and security risks
 - ii. Compliance risks
 - iii. Increased data duplication
- c. Discussion
 - i. What happens when somebody creates something and allows others to use their login credentials? Have run into this problem in that past with bypassing authorization/authentication procedures.
 1. All the recommendations support SSO login. Interfaces can focus on identifying applications instead of individuals. Use application credentials instead of individual credentials.

3. Data Integration Standard Draft (Tom Jordan)

- a. Tom presented background, objectives, challenges, key recommendations for the Data Integration Standard, which was specified within the data integration policy.
- b. Discussion
 - i. Is there a data owner definition? Is the data owner the provider? How might data be opened to external parties?
 1. We tried not to cover this if it's been covered before. Some discussion of an integration provider/deputized data steward, and additional responsibilities to go with that direction.
 - a. Might be interesting to see something that acknowledges the provider as a new role.
 - ii. Deputized data steward as data system custodian?
 1. Some version of that role might work in the data integration space.
 - iii. The Data Documentation Standard as published focused on the enterprise data warehouse. What about integrations that don't involve the data warehouse? Is there a scaled down approach or has that been discussed?
 1. Integration data catalog is something we discussed. A consumer might have a list of integration sources they can go to, and it has some documentation about what data is provided and the rights and responsibilities for that data set. Then the consumer has a mechanism to know what the right thing to do is in terms of the integration context.

- iv. In the inventory there are APIs and integrations from the consumer space. Is that going to be listed in the inventory or is this focused around DoIT-developed integrations? We also have campus integrations/solutions. Are those going to be leveraged, and how will they be governed for access?
 - 1. That will be something for the data owner to determine. When we look at each of those as potential integrations, we can decide if they work. Challenge is how do we do the institutional decision making.
 - 2. How are integrations defined? What integrations do we catalog. Is there anything we can do to help with the policy.
 - a. We've identified different levels of integrations. When we change out a major ERP system, we catalog everything, and when we have an integration, we may need to catalog everything in a similar way to understand the impact.
 - 3. Security and enforcement of the standard? How will monitoring and tracking of integration approvals work?
 - a. This is a question around what is implementable with technical controls. Not all systems can control what an individual can access. We can encourage users to use things with the best set of technical controls. Also want to have some social controls around things too with instructions for use.

4. **Creating, Reviewing, Approving Data Definitions – Draft Procedure (Lisa Johnston)**

- a. Lisa presented on the draft procedure for creating, reviewing, and approving data definitions.
- b. Feedback
 - i. Stewards don't have the time to engage with a definition multiple times. Would be nice if the definition went through some review first.
 - 1. That's been removed from the stewards' role. Understand there's a lot on the stewards' plate. May need to delegate some responsibilities to others in new roles.
 - ii. Can you clarify the scope of terms?
 - 1. Terms could be defined differently in different systems. This will have to come together in how we manage our definitions.

5. **EdX Follow-up (Phil Hull)**

- a. As part of EdX project, we have been going through all the data involved in this project and assigning stewardship as part of our documentation. It's become clear that some of the data is outside the student record domain. Historically a student has been enrolled for credit for a course at UW-Madison. Some of the data we have been working with on this project has been non-credit and doesn't meet that definition. Do we consider non-credit learners to be students as defined by UW-Madison? Who should the steward for these records be?
- b. Discussion
 - i. This is sometimes also unclear in the Teaching and Learning domain.
 - ii. For this EdX program, it seems like it should go to the RO/student record domain.
 - iii. Could we have an incremental approach? Test out and learn from results?
 - iv. Will continue discussion.