

Members: McKinney Austin, 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

Attendees: Jocelyn Milner, Bob Turner, Jeff Korab, Steven Cramer, Sarah Grimm, Jennifer Klippel, Dan Langer, Nancy Lynch, McKinney Austin, Amanda Reese, Scott Owczarek, Britt Baker

Data Governance Council Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, April 28, 2020

8:30 – 10:00 a.m.

1. Review/Approve Last Meeting Minutes & Updates (McKinney Austin)

- a. Approved Minutes from January meeting.

2. Interoperability Initiative

- a. Tom Jordan talked with group about interoperability initiative and news about the ERB interoperability task force.
 - i. Interop initiative launched to modernize and streamline how we do applications on campus, identify and access management, and in how university data is integrated with applications to achieve functionality and make sure integrations are done in a way that is in line with security policy.
Building out infrastructure
 - ii. Two major initiatives:
 1. Program out API interfaces.
 2. Integration platform (Informatica) to do data with applications that use ETL.
 - iii. Important to do integration in effective manner in order to business policy on campus.
 - iv. We're trying to make sure applications have easy line between institutional definitions and the applications they're using.
 - v. We're also working to make sure approval and use processes are reflective of campus definitions and campus security policy.
 - vi. Time frame for interop task force – interop task force is moving forward with API gateway, data structure specification, mapping data structures to definitions consistent with organizational data definitions.
- b. Questions
 - i. Dan Langer: Is there third party or other costs related to timeline?
 1. Yes, it is associated with infrastructure buildout. Is task force evaluating elongated the timeline? Yes, we've been working on Lois on several different financial scenarios. Fluid and dynamic discussion.
 2. Stakeholders are listed on the charter, and Tom would be happy to shepherd any feedback or concerns if you would like to be more involved. Data Governance Council is already identified as a stakeholder.

3. Collaboration Software Recording/Data Questions

- a. There have been many questions recently around recording sessions and meetings with video conferencing software.
- b. In meeting material, there were three documents related to this topic. This is a list of questions that McKinney has received:
 - i. What is the classification?
 - ii. Is a recording a public record?
 - iii. How is records management applied?
 - iv. What tools are approved?
 - v. What about chat records/transcripts?
 - vi. Any other questions?

1. Scott Owczarek: Received quite a few concerns about FERPA, online recording of lectures, inquiries from a few schools and colleges where students were taking lectures and publicly posting those. There was an email sent to instructors about student privacy guidance. Since then, there haven't really been questions about it. They can use the language from the email and website for their syllabi. I have been hearing more about commencements and how to do it via Blackboard or Webex. We will need disclaimers that these will be posted publicly.
 - a. Nancy Lynch: We are happy to help with the public disclaimer portion.
2. Bob Turner: There has been a lot of curiosity about Zoom – recording features, how long to retain, etc. We are doing a risk assessment on Zoom 5.0. Hope to have results out early next week so we can potentially add Zoom to the list of tools we use. Sarah Grimm can weigh in on record retention.
 - a. Sarah Grimm: There were many questions at the beginning of quarantine. Everything that is being collected or recorded needs to be assigned to a record lifecycle so that it can be scheduled for archive or destruction. Most people are not used to working with recordings, including how to store, where to store, and when to stop storing. I have been talking to Lisa Hull from UW System about putting together high-level guidance and what it means for public records requests.
3. McKinney Austin: The second document in Box refers to IT Policy. Do we need to record everything?
 - a. Sarah Grimm: We should be able to do a decision tree about how to manage these.
4. McKinney Austin: What role, if any, should DGC have in this? Does Sarah need anything from us?
 - a. Sarah Grimm: Yes, it would be great to review it with this group after we put something together to see if it makes sense administratively.
 - b. Nancy Lynch: From a legal premise, I would think the default would be that you wouldn't record. The default would be not to record. Just because we're having meetings using technology, doesn't mean it's that different from a normal in-person meeting.

4. Institutional Data Policy Subcommittee Update

- a. Status of policy development and timeline (Document 5 in Box)
 - i. Vast majority of feedback was positive/enthusiastic about having formal policy in this area
 - ii. Suggestions for clarifications/expansion were majority of constructive comments.
 - iii. Subcommittee will begin discussing the feedback tomorrow. Foresee having a draft ready at June or possibly May DGC meeting.

5. IDPS Planning (McKinney Austin)

- a. Review of IDPS charge; draft policy content; potential standards and procedures; data issue management procedure purpose; highest priority standards and procedures; and procedure and standard development plan.
- b. The council agreed that IDPS should continue to move forward. When the subcommittee meets its charge, DGC will look at pulling together new groups.
- c. There has been feedback on Systems policy. We did two rounds of comments. We submitted those through the early access group and revised draft was posted for standard comment period. Did not get additional comments on that. Took comments from first round and found that half of comments were addressed. We did get our comments in.