

Data Governance Coordinating Committee
Meeting Notes

March 28, 2017

Present: Susannah Livingood, Chris Kennedy, Terri Pinkston, Dan Shuart, Erin Wolfe, Tim Marley, Joey Albin

Absent: Carl Grant

Guests: Erin Yarbrough, Glenn Hansen

1. Review of prior meeting notes

Meeting notes were approved with no changes.

2. DRRG item(s), if any

- a. Request 3.1 - OU Innovate Append Data Feed

This request would add full building name to existing feed, which currently only has building abbreviation. Original request asked for parking permit information also, but that portion of request was withdrawn due to technical problems. Request was approved with no caveats.

- b. Request 19 - Data Architecture Phase I Raw Layer

The request, as submitted, includes student and HR data. Terri said full review of which HR tables might be included in this project was not yet complete, so she was not comfortable with including it in the proposal currently being considered. She cited concerns about privacy/security safeguards and possible issues with API pulls into other systems causing system of record problems.

There was a lengthy discussion about the exact nature of the raw data layer, as described in the proposal document. It was not clear to all at the meeting whether this request would create a new set of data tables or if it was creating some sort of infrastructure without data storage. If new tables are going to be created and stored somewhere, more information is needed about where they will be stored

and what policies will be in place to ensure current security policies are enforced in the new location(s).

DGCC approved this request for student data only, and on condition that more information be provided to answer questions about access, storage, and security. Chris will set up a meeting with Jeff Well, Susannah, and Terri to discuss concerns from the discussion.

c. Request 23 - IBM OU Engagement

Erin Yarbrough and Glenn Hansen attended the meeting to address any questions about this request. They clarified that the only personally identifying information in the supplied file - PERSON_UID from Banner - is only meaningful to those within OU with access to our databases, so the risk of exposure in supplying to an external entity (IBM) would be minimal.

There was some discussion about whether the contract with IBM contained appropriate language regarding data safeguards, and whether the DGCC was the appropriate body to be checking on that aspect of partnership agreements. Consensus was that while DGCC's scope does not include conducting legal negotiations, it would still be helpful to have in the information packet some documentation of what process has been followed, for full background and context.

Requestors were asked why the full student address was necessary, as opposed to zip code or city only. They responded that the address information would be used to match from other data sources, such as Zillow, during the IBM analysis; this is expected to create meaningful payment predictors. It was established that transfer method will be sFTP. Request was approved with no caveats.

3. Outstanding action items

a. Contacting Legal Counsel

Tim Marley broached the subject with Anil Gollaholli. He will work with their office to set up a meeting. Susannah, Chris, and Terri asked to be included in the meeting.

b. DRRG

Erin reported there is still some with frustration with lack of transparency on status of requests. Chris will talk with DRRG about ways to address this.

Susannah will check with DRRG on the status of the charter, a prerequisite to scheduling a meeting with the Executive Committee.

4. Other items

No other items were discussed.