DART Data Review Subteam Minutes, 06-09-16

Present: Adonis Nafeh, Patti Otto, Jeff Wall, David Wilkins, Kathi Robinett, Lindsey Johnston, Aaron Biggs.

- Review minutes from last meeting. The minutes were unanimously approved.

- Leadership vote and leadership rotation. Aaron Biggs was voted subteam leader by unanimous vote. Subteam leadership will rotate every two years, with elections at the end of odd-numbered years.

- Data Request Flow (recently approved)—Jeff Wall presented the process flow for data requests. This process flow will be used for APIs, additions to the ODS, Cognos packages, and other additions to data. While the request flow has been approved, it has not yet been universally accepted and adopted by functional business users yet, and the OCRC process still exists. The Request Review Group(RRG) will determine Use Case viability and notify the DGCC of their recommendation. DGCC will have final approval. Aaron suggested that a DART recommendation/approval line will be added to the top of work packages, ensuring DART Data Team review at the appropriate points. The two injection points for DART Data Review within the process flow are: 1) for "New Use Cases," between "Full Governance Package Creation" and "DGCC Facilitates Approval," and 2) for "Use Case Exists: Additional Data," between the creation of the "Version Governance Package" and "PKG to DGCC." These DART reviews will take electronically, if possible, to reduce the need for physical meetings.

- Student Profile API work package—Jeff Wall presented an overview of the Student Profile API data package, giving this team an idea of what a package looks like. Jeff said that Banner APIs had disappointing performance, making it likely that the Student Profile API would be built primarily from custom code. When an API request draws from a data source containing native APIs, those native APIs will be tested to ensure viability and performance. Jeff mentioned that Mulesoft's API Catalog would be the catalog of record. While the API catalog contains metadata, it does not contain the Notes/Business Rules and Sample Values like the ODS data dictionary. The data dictionary information may be different for APIs versus additions to the ODS. Although there is a desire to have that level of documentation for APIs, there are questions about who would write this data dictionary information, and when, in such a way that it didn't unnecessarily impede progress. David asked if it might be possible to read the ODS metadata tables and populate the description, notes/business rules, and sample values within the Mulesoft catalog from that data source, capitalizing on work already done by the DART Data Dictionary Subteam. Jeff agreed it might be possible. The flows for data dictionary information within each type of data request need to be determined.
  While the API catalog will eventually be visible to all, each request for usage will be weighed based on the individual Use Cases, with the DGCC making the decision on whether the requestor is allowed to see all data within the API.

- Possible future projects—David mentioned two new student curriculum history tables will be reviewed by the group once they are finalized. David also proposed creation of a process flow showing how the different DART subteams might be involved and helpful in different types of

data requests. The relevant subteams are DART Data Review, DART Data Dictionary, and DART Data Training. Having a process flow mapped out about the possible engagement points of these DART subgroups along the way as data requests flow through the pipeline would be helpful--from data request initiation through implementation. Such a flow (or flows) would help to document what should happen for various types of requests, and help guide subteams and leaders along the way.

- Establish next meeting date and time. Aaron said the next meeting time would be determined by Doodle Poll, and data request reviews will be done electronically when possible.