

Data Governance Coordinating Committee
Meeting Notes

May 10, 2016

Present: Susannah Livingood, Carl Grant, Chris Kennedy, Terri Pinkston, Dan Shuart, Erin Wolfe
Guests: David Wilkins

1. Meeting notes

The prior meeting's notes, posted to the DGCC shared Google Drive folder, were approved without changes. Susannah will add them to the website.

2. DART progress report

David Wilkins provided DGCC members with a written summary of DART activities and accomplishments so far (attached). The full DART group will meet every two months; topic-focused subgroups may meet more frequently depending on what timeline is most appropriate for that topic. Some subgroups have already been set up and are meeting. David is working with Web Comm on a free-standing DART website, which will be cross-linked with the Data Governance website.

One of the first things David did, as DART chair, was to survey the membership about perceived needs/issues and successes. Feedback received is being used to shape initial discussions and formation of subgroups. DART has two primary roles: bring issues to the DGCC with recommendations for action; and make itself available to administrative groups on campus - especially IT - whenever user feedback is needed for a project.

After reviewing the summary, David asked DGCC members for feedback or questions. Dan noted that some findings from the member survey are already known to IT and/or central administration, and DART needs to be careful not to duplicate effort as well as be mindful of not interfering with sensitive projects. David agreed this was something to watch out for, and that good communication between functional areas would help guard against that happening.

After reviewing his summary, David asked for input on the questions at the end of the document. There was discussion about the need to refine roles for various groups on campus. We need to figure out how DART will work best with central IT, administrative offices, cross-functional teams, etc. Susannah reminded David that one of the core values for DGCC - and by extension for DART - should be agility. Communication and

establishment of procedures are good, but not if they grow into something unwieldy or confusing.

David also asked about DGCC's project approval process and how it might relate to DART discussions. The answer was that yes, DART should forward appropriate projects to DGCC for approval through the posted process. Anything that would draw on central data resources needs to be reviewed by DGCC.

There was some discussion about how to handle dissenting voices in DART discussions. DGCC made it clear to David that DART needs to have a process in place for dissenting opinions to get an additional hearing. David noted that this issue had already been brought up and they are putting language in all of the group/subgroup charters or rules documents that explains how to proceed in case of a serious disagreement. Ultimately the remedy is that dissenting opinions can be brought directly to the DGCC for further discussion.

3. Other items?

No other items were discussed.

DART Activity-to-Date, 05-10-16

Communicate. Coordinate. Collaborate.

Hindrances: Meeting schedules among team members, Spring Break, David Wilkins out most of 3 weeks (surgery & SAS), Staff Week

Logo approved by Public Affairs

DART Meeting Guests

- Nick Key (IT) and Jeff Wall (IT), to discuss new data platform
- James Adams, University Libraries, to share library BI initiatives
- Kim Thomas (IT) to give OneDrive overview

Subteams Formed

- Subteams: Communications, Community Support, Data Dictionary, Data Review, Data Training, Policy and Recommendations, Reporting Tool Training
- Subteam Charters being developed & approved
- Subteam Leader guidelines developed
- Subteam Leaders being identified via nomination process
- Goal: Subteams function autonomously soon & begin accomplishing tasks instead of spending time on start-up activities; scale back DART meetings to bi-monthly

Reporting at OU Survey

Identify issues, successes, and wishes for the OU reporting environment. Look for short-term wins and possible long-term strategies. *Counts indicate number of respondents for a given category.*

Issues & Wishes Summary (Items identified as an issue or desired areas of improvement)

- Data Availability--13
- Data Structures--9
- Data Integration--15
- User-friendly reporting tool(s), including dashboard, graphics, metrics, drill-throughs--20
- Tool Repository--1
- Reports Requested--1
- Web portal/Report Distribution & Storage--7
- Communication & Sharing--3
- Other—13

Successes Summary (Items identified as areas in which people were pleased)

- Data Availability--5
- Data Structures--3
- Reporting Tool--4
- Support--9
- Other—5

Reporting Tools Survey

- Goal: Identify tools used by DART members. Identify areas of expertise. Given licensing, are there opportunities to expand use of some tools on campus and perhaps consolidate other tools?
- Findings: See document

Interesting Findings

- Faculty reporting is underserved. A departmental author is checking their report inventory to see if reports already exist for promotion to campus-wide use
- There is a real need for a dedicated advising portal, which would save hundreds of man hours advising students
- There is a desire for a more user-friendly web reporting portal
- Data Training Subteam—group believed that thought should be given to data entry training to improve data quality on front end, and to identify how data feeds from CRMS affect Banner data

General DART operation

- Working products and recommendations: *Brought before larger DART group for review, revision, approval. Documentation will be stamped with DART branding. Approved working products and recommendations will be sent to DGCC for consideration.*
- Conflict resolution: *If agreement cannot be reached on an issue, it will be elevated to the DGCC for resolution. Subteam charters will contain wording that requires notification to DART Chair and DGCC any issue needing resolution. There may be issues that DGCC is aware of that would sway a decision one way or another.*

OneDrive Setup—OneDrive folders have been created for each subteam. IT's Kim Thomas gave a OneDrive tutorial at the last DART meeting.

Website Setup—David Wilkins met with Katy Bergman in Webcomm and will attend training soon. DART Website mockup done (see document) and David is creating content as he has time.

DART as forum for BI communications on campus

- Sharing at DART meetings (Library)
- OU BI Fair (annual)
- OU BI Forum (semester)

Questions:

- Use of non-IT resources for 'production' work
 - Virtual Reporting Team to help create Cognos reports
 - Vetting Cognos reports against standards for those to be moved to Production
 - Possible tool-agnostic reporting web portal project
- DART Data Review Subteam role in reviewing data requests
- Proposed IT request management change based on 20-hour rule. Adopted or still in draft?
- Project request process
 - Follow project proposal on DGCC site for any recommendations?
 - How does using DGCC request form flow into request approval flow?