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

Attendees: Anne Bilder, Catharine DeRubeis, Sarah Grimm, Lisa Johnston, Allison La Tarte, Jeffrey Savoy, Jack Talaska, Margaret Tennessen, James Yonker, John Zumbrunnen, Patti Havlicek, Lynn Haynes, Mark Sweet, Stephan Johnson, Phil Hull, Dharvesh Naraine, Jeff Shokler, Tom Jordan, Heather Johnston

Data Governance Council Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, July 18
8:30-10 a.m.

Agenda
1) **Cybersecurity Risk Analysis Program** -Overview of process for reviewing new systems housing institutional data (Patti Havlicek, DHARVESH NARAINE, Steffanie Johnson) Slides
   a) Where did this process come from?
      i) Take federal requirements and line them up with NIST, HIPAA
      ii) National standards boil down to questions that we ask, which vary depending on the service we are looking at. Various "control families" of questions related to security on campus - e.g., Media protection, personal safety, etc.
      iii) Rate the likelihood of the data being secure in that platform. 1-25 (Inconsequential - Critical risk).
      iv) Present the rating to the risk executives. Medium risk and lower they don't need to be contacted. Medium and higher, they meet and produce a report with the IT team and system owner.
      v) Prefer that departments/units take an ongoing risk assessment posture, changes/audit require new risk assessment.
      vi) When do we need to do a risk review?
         (1) New Tools
         (2) Changes to the data, tool, or environment
         (3) HCC - each unit completes a risk review
   b) Data classification drives the type of review needed. This is where data stewards are involved.
   c) Challenges
      (1) Lots of tools! Distributed IT projects going on…lack of available resources.
      (2) Don't want to be a hurdle…but maybe we want to be?
      (3) Understanding of the acceptance of the risk - who is taking this on?
   d) Discussion
      (1) Jeff Karcher: Regarding purchasing: Do you have a regular process where people come to you with assessment questions, or do you have to approach them?
         (a) Varies by unit. Some procurements would request a review, but not hold up the purchasing process for that review.
         (b) Business services see lots of contracts. Want to improve the process of engagement.
      (2) Anne: Would it make sense to require review by you all before purchase since this issue has become so important and high risk?
         (a) Patti: Concern about the volume of work. When it comes to lower risk data, we can offer guidelines, rather than detailed risk review.
      (3) Anne: Who decides about the risk level?
         (a) Give campus the tools to do this work.
         (b) Institutional data - data stewards are responsible for classifying data in their domains.
         (c) Talk to Colleen Riley in Purchasing - she has a process that they use to determine when they come to cybersecurity.
      (4) Lynn: Federal guidelines tell people what they need to do. The problem with the HIPAA guidelines is that they are best practices, rather than directorial. Hard to understand if we are answering the questions correctly. Making those guidance more helpful.
         (a) Patti: We do have some of those tools available. Agree it needs to be clearer.
            (i) go.wisc.edu/hipaasecurity
            (ii) Cant offer standards that are too specific, need adaptable recommendations.
         (b) Lynn: Also, purchasing, not saying yes or not to a purchase. But it would help protect our institution if someone is working w/those business units to make the healthier risk decision. Unclear who is making the decision (IRB? Cyber?)
         (c) Mark: Agree with Lynn.   UW needs very clear determination who makes the decisions

       (5) Lisa: Scenario: We may procure the tool, but the data steward does NOT approve the request to put data in the tool?

         (a) Risk ask: "Can we?" Stewards ask: "Should we"

         (b) Campus understanding of the process (when to get a risk review? When to go to procurement? When to bring in Data governance?)...

2) **UW System API request and approval process** (Tom Jordan) - shared doc via email and in [box](#)

   a) Driver is ASP - some systems will be shifting or going away. How to approach the problem of data approval at the enterprise level.

   b) Working with EDGC - they have goals of where they would be involved vs where the campus would be involved.

      (1) Data spanning multiple campuses would fall in EDGC purview

      (2) Data for one campus would fall to the campus.

   c) Need to streamline this process since there are hundreds of systems that need to go through → standing approval would result in notification rather than approval.

   d) Tom presented this to UW System EDGC. Scott and others reached out to bring this into Madison.

   e) Became clear that there was not a firm connection between campus data gov and enterprise data gov. As a result - shifting the approach.

      (1) Primarily working with campus data stewards.

      (2) MOU about how the data will be used. Similar to how it works with identity management and applications.

3) **[New campus AI statement](#)** (Jeff Savoy, Heather Johnston) [slides](#)

   a) Tools are become increasingly used, such as ChatGPT

   b) Needed to respond to this with a statement to campus

   c) Looked at lots of other policies

      i) Generative AI statement: https://it.wisc.edu/statement-on-use-of-generative-ai/

      ii) U of Michigan AI statement: https://safecomputing.umich.edu/protect-the-u/safely-use-sensitive-data/AI-and-UM-Data

      iii) UCSD statement: https://adminrecords.ucsd.edu/Notices/2023/2023-3-23-2.html

      iv) UW-Madison CTLM AI & ChatGPT webpage: https://ctlm.wisc.edu/self-serve-resources/artificial-intelligence-and-chatgpt/

      v) NIST Trustworthy & Responsible AI Resource Center: https://airc.nist.gov/Home

   d) Use of generative AI is subject to campus and regent policies.

   e) Email for AI questions -> Todd Shechter <todd.shechter@wisc.edu>

   f) Summer Exploring AI webinar series - every Friday 9:15

      (1) This week: AI ethics and privacy.

   g) May need to have a policy in the future. Right now, learning about the needs and the use cases.

      (1) John Z.: This question comes up in the T&L space - people wondering if AI will be "banned" which of course is not going to happen, more about safe, responsible, ethical use. So thank you for this statement. Good reminders about the policies that are out there.

      (2) Request: If there are questions coming in about T&L data - would be great to know.

4) **Updates** (Lisa Johnston)

   a) EDGC website now live: https://www.wisconsin.edu/systemwide-it/councils/enterprise-data-council/

   b) [New KB and deadline](#) for specification review procedure performed by data stewards (e.g., Tableau)