

# Data Governance Committee (DGC)

## Meeting Notes

---

Date 12/10/2020

Phone; 10:30am to 12:00pm

Attended	Commission	Name	College
X	<b>Co-chairs</b>	Carmen McKenzie	SBCTC
X	<b>Co-chairs</b>	Jennifer Tuia	South Puget Sound CC
X	<b>Business Affairs Commission (BAC)</b>	Ed Jaramillo	Skagit Valley College
	<b>Business Affairs Commission (BAC)</b>	Linda Schoonmaker	Big Bend Community College
	<b>Human Resources &amp; Management Commission (HRMC)</b>	Christina Nelson	Bates
	<b>Human Resources &amp; Management Commission (HRMC)</b>	Kirk Walker	Clover Park Technical College
X	<b>Information Technology Commission (ITC)</b>	Brandon Ray	Lower Columbia College
X	<b>Information Technology Commission (ITC)</b>	Eva Smith	Edmonds Community College
	<b>Instruction Commission (IC)</b>	Emily Lardner	Highline Community College
X	<b>Instruction Commission (IC)</b>	Tod Treat	Tacoma
X	<b>Public Information Commission (PIC)</b>	Katie Rose	SBCTC
	<b>Public Information Commission (PIC)</b>	Janelle Runyon	SBCTC
X	<b>Research and Planning Commission (RPC)</b>	Darby Kaikkonen	SBCTC
X	<b>Research and Planning Commission (RPC)</b>	Greg Schmidt	Bellevue
X	<b>Student Services Commission (WSSSC)</b>	Keith Sayles	Spokane Falls
X	<b>Student Services Commission (WSSSC)</b>	Ruby Hayden	Lake Washington Institute of Technology

## Next Meeting:

Next Meeting is in January – Primary topic; MOU Continuation and Course Modality

## Meeting Notes:

### Agenda:

- Query Governance and the college Reporting Leads
  - How do they fit in with this committee
- The draft MOU as well as a draft Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) form.
  - The attached NDA is the form that we have already implemented and required for any access to dataLink or Query Manager for query developers and will probably need to be modified for this broader purpose.
  - The idea is that we would submit an enhancement request to implement a pop up form that displays the NDA to staff when logging into ctclink for the first time and annually thereafter.
- Facility ID proposal

### Notes:

- Creation of Query Governance sub-committee: The system has a community of query developers and each college may have many query developers. Each college must select a reporting lead. The reporting lead at each college is usually personnel in the institutional research office. The reporting lead is part of the reporting leads committee. The reporting leads committee discussed the emerging need to have a governance structure to ensure integrity among query/report development. The system has thousands of queries. There is increasing pressure, as more colleges come on board with ctclink, to create/modify queries that break with the initial rules of query development. An example is using 'hard-coded' values within a specific query, which limits the usefulness of the query outside of the original college. The reporting leads group discussed who the authoritative governance body is that will address query development issues. The group discussed the feasibility of having a governance body for query development, which would entail charters, approvals, formal meetings, minutes, etc. The group asked Carmen to approach our data governance committee to inquire if a standing sub-committee could be formed under the data governance committee. This committee would be called the query governance sub-committee. Any decisions made by this sub-committee would roll up to our data governance committee for approval. Everyone on the call thought this would be a good plan. Carmen said more information would follow after meeting with the reporting leads committee.
- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU): The current problem is ctclink contains all the data in one database. During support calls and other instances, it is possible that college personnel can view data that is not within their college. This violates FERPA. The optimal solution is a technical solution. There is not a feasible technological solution. The second option is to create a policy and procedure to address this issue. A draft MOU (the policy) and NDA (the procedure) was introduced to the committee as a first step to address the issue. The points of discussion are as follows:
  - An NDA is between two entities, how can it be valid for use among all CTC's?

- An NDA has a very specific purpose and perhaps an NDA may not be the best title; perhaps acknowledgement of data responsibilities or acceptable data use agreement.
- A college can't have a blanket MOU (because it can't be enforced) the MOU has to be for each individual.
- Query developers are currently required to sign a similar NDA.
- The MOU resembles the MOU required by the MRTE+ agreement years ago.
- Envision the NDA would be a computer screen pop-up upon initial launch of ctclink for the end user. This seems to be the only feasible way to ensure compliance, a manual paper process would be too messy.
- The MOU should have language regarding the appropriate use of handling data.
- Work on the MOU first and put that in front of the presidents before moving forward
- We need to have this policy and procedure in place for finance and HR. The MOU references the RCW for student data it needs supporting references for finance and HR privacy laws. Perhaps Ed could talk to BAC about these supporting references.
- There was conversation about why a data-sharing agreement would not work in this instance. Data sharing agreements are in place for third-party contractors. Carmen explained the reasoning she received from AAG David Stolier regarding why this wasn't feasible.
- There are many unanswered questions, invite AAG Stolier to the next meeting to clear up some of the issues regarding MOU, NDA, and third party contracts. Hopefully, have the MOU fine-tuned enough that he can provide comment as to what is or is not acceptable.
- Create a sub-committee to wrap up fine-tuning the MOU. Eva and Carmen will meet to take care of this. Eva may forward the meeting invite to others in ITC in case they want to participate.
- Facility ID Proposal: There needs to be a mechanism in place to limit the ability to add/modify facility codes. The changing of facility identification has become a problem. The summary of the proposal is to ensure the security roles are appropriate for college personnel so adding/modifying facility identification is not an option unless specifically assigned to do so. To have the role that contains facility ID modification, a training must be successfully completed. We discussed the need for this to be sent out for commission feedback. We discussed that DirectLine is the source for facility management. Directline feeds into ctclink and 25Live. The committee agreed that this is a data integrity issue. There wouldn't be a potential problem by implementing specific security roles and training. Therefore, implementing the proposal in a timely manner outweighed the extra time necessary for commission feedback. The group agreed to formalize moving forward with the facility ID proposal. Ruby Hayden, WSSSC representative, entered the motion for the implementation of the facility ID proposal. Todd Treat, IC representative, seconded the motion to implement the facility ID proposal. There was no discussion. Per guidelines, each commission receives one vote. Six out of seven Commissions and the State Board approved to implement the facility ID proposal. There were zero votes for rejecting the facility ID proposal. Representation from the Human Resources and Management Commission (HRMC) was absent and did not vote.
  - Business Affairs Commission (BAC): Ed Jaramilla – Approve
  - Public Information Commission (PIC): Katie Rose – Approve
  - Information Technology Commission (ITC): Eva Smith – Approve
  - Student Services Commission (WSSC): Ruby Hayden – Approve
  - Instruction Commission (IC): Tod Treat – Approve

- Research and Planning Commission (RPC): Greg Schmidt – Approve, Jennifer Tuia - Approve
  - State Board (SBCTC): Carmen McKenzie – Approve, Darby Kaikkonen- Approve
- Course Modality: This went out for feedback to the commissions and there were several pages of feedback. E-Learning shared the proposal with IC and the final proposal will come to our data governance group. However, there was discussion that perhaps the IC and e-Learning commission aren't fully aware of the consequences of the proposal and the feedback received may not be incorporated into the proposal. The data governance committee should have the final approval regarding this proposal. This will require our committee to read the received commissions(s) feedback and modify the proposal. A sub-committee consisting of Greg and Jennifer from RPC, Carmen and Darby from SBCTC along with Eva from ITC will work on this. Greg noted that there is a problem in Legacy with Online Synchronous, because online tends to have the same room information and Legacy does not detect time conflicts when it's in the same room. Carmen and Darby will contact Carly and discuss the need for DG to finalize the proposal.

---

---

**Data Governors to do:**

- Carmen to set up time for ad-hoc course modality discussion
- Carmen and Eva to work on MOU
- Carmen to invite AAG David Stolier to our next meeting
- Data classification continuation
- January Meeting: MOU & Course Modality
- February / March: Self-service questions