

Data Governance Coordinating Committee
Meeting Notes

August 16, 2016

Present: Susannah Livingood, Carl Grant, Tim Marley, Terri Pinkston, Dan Shuart, Erin Wolfe, Joey Albin
Guests: Anna Biggers (IT), Aaron Baillio (IT)
Absent: Chris Kennedy

1. Meeting notes

The prior meeting's notes, posted to the DGCC shared Google Drive folder, were approved with no changes. Susannah will add them to the website.

2. Draft data classification policy

Anna Biggers and Aaron Baillio, representatives from the Information Technology Security Governance Committee (ITSGC) Working Group, presented a draft copy of the proposed "Policy on IT System and Data Classification." It was modeled after a similar policy at OU-HSC. It is structured according to level of sensitivity: A. Regulated Data; B. Sensitive/Restricted Data; and C. Public Data. They clarified the policy was not created to control access to data, but rather as a resource to help during discussions of how different types of data should be handled. A lack of clear guidelines on how to classify data has been problematic for offices such as Internal Audit, as noted by Tim.

There was discussion about the concepts of confidentiality, integrity, and availability as they relate to institutional data. The DGCC might add some questions related to these issues to further request reviews:

- Has the data for the project been classified properly
- Are the parameters for appropriate access defined
- Will any of the project's data be public

There were a couple of small suggestions related to acronyms, etc. Anna said the policy will be presented for final approval at the next meeting of ITSGC, currently scheduled for 9/1/16. When asked where the policy would be posted once it was final, Anna indicated she did not know yet as that is still under discussion by the ITSGC.

3. Follow-up discussion of item BS2 (Star Schema - Deans dashboard) - especially how to handle quality control for approved projects

On 8/10/16, Dan initiated an email vote on item BS2, asking for approval from DGCC for a revised version of it based on stakeholder feedback that was due to Chris by the close of business that same day. Erin, Terri, Carl, and Dan were in favor. Chris was unable to participate (on vacation). Susannah was in favor of approving it as an initial version, but subject to final validation by stakeholders; she was against approving it if it was considered final. There was not clear agreement on exactly what was being approved, so it was agreed there should be further discussion on the topic at the 8/16/16 meeting.

Questions raised both in the email discussion and in the meeting:

- At what point(s) in a project should DGCC be involved and/or need to provide approval?
- Is it iterative or a one-time review; if iterative, is there a limit on number of reviews?
- At what level is a project approved - is it highest level, or by subpart or section?

Susannah argued that item BS2 was not fully validated so should not be considered fully approved. Dan said he was told that it had been validated and further expressed concerns that multiple reviews didn't fit with the DGCC's scope, possibly contributing to mission creep due to too many iterations of approval. He argued that DGCC should be more focused on data owner responsibility and the due diligence of data users, not on policy creation. There was discussion about whether it was feasible (or advisable) to "police" approved projects. There was also some discussion about appropriate participants in validation - data owners vs. stakeholders. Susannah argued that there are functional personnel on campus that may not be data owners in the strictest sense of the word but who have a very real stake in contributing to projects that impact their functional area.

There was also discussion about the roles of DART, DRRG, and other working groups on campus in relation to this issue. Dan expressed concern that multiple groups providing input on each project would cause projects to be slowed down unnecessarily, which could potentially negatively impact the core value of agility.

Consensus of the group was that DGCC should not require multiple approvals for a project, instead working toward a goal of a single, final approval made on complete proposals. Susannah will ask the chair of DART to come to a future meeting to discuss current activities, especially those of the various working groups.

Susannah initiated an email discussion after the meeting, asking the group their opinion about the distinction between building reusable objects and building of reports based on those objects. She argued that the reports aren't subject to DGCC approval, but the

objects should be. Carl suggested DGCC should use what the group learned from this experience to help refine the process going forward, especially to clarify the roles of different groups on campus to provide feedback during the validation process. Dan requested further discussion be done in person, either at the next scheduled meeting or in a special session. The group elected to wait for the next scheduled meeting to continue the discussion.

4. Other items?

No other items were discussed.