

Data Governance Committee (DGC)

Meeting Notes

Date **02/03/2022**

Phone/Webex; 10:30 am to 12:00 pm

Attended	Commission	Name	College
X	Co-chairs	Carmen McKenzie	SBCTC
X	Co-chairs	Jennifer Tuia	South Puget Sound CC
	Business Affairs Commission (BAC)	Ed Jaramillo	Skagit Valley College
x	Business Affairs Commission (BAC)	Linda Schoonmaker	Big Bend Community College
	Human Resources & Management Commission (HRMC)	Kim Garza	Big Bend
x	Human Resources & Management Commission (HRMC)	Josh Ernst	Seattle Colleges
x	Information Technology Commission (ITC)	Brandon Ray	Lower Columbia College
x	Information Technology Commission (ITC)	Eva Smith	Edmonds Community College
x	Instruction Commission (IC)	Matthew Campbell	Pierce College
	Instruction Commission (IC)		
	Public Information Commission (PIC)	Katie Rose	SBCTC
x	Public Information Commission (PIC)	Janelle Runyon	SBCTC
x	Research and Planning Commission (RPC)	Summer Kenesson	SBCTC
x	Research and Planning Commission (RPC)	Greg Schmidt	Bellevue
	Student Services Commission (WSSSC)	Keith Sayles	Spokane Falls
x	Student Services Commission (WSSSC)	Ruby Hayden	Lake Washington Institute of Technology

Next Meeting:

Next Meeting is: TBD

Meeting Notes:

- **Agenda:**
 - New SBCTC Researcher representative – Summer Kenesson replacing Darby
 - MOU and Data Usage and Privacy Statement
 - Approved by Presidents and ready for implementation
 - User Acceptance Testing – I'll do a demonstration of the new functionality and run through our testing scripts
 - Posting documents online
 - Communication to the system
 - Timing of implementation
 - Other implementation tasks?
 - Demographic Subcommittee Status Update on proposal for adding new ethnic background options
 - Conducting a data governance assessment and possible restructure

Standing Status updates

- DemoComm Activities
- Query Governance Update
- MOU & DP

Notes:

Status Updates

- DemoComm Update
 - Update – The committee is working on the proposal of how to add additional race/ethnic categories as they are suggested. The proposal aligns with work completed by OSPI who undertook this work a couple of years ago. For this initial addition, a large number of race/ethnic backgrounds were added. It was decided that to add a race/ethnic code, the approval process did not need to flow through our DGC group but could be approved within the DemoComm committee. However, this first one is different because it is a large scale update along with the grounding and philosophy of the process for adding additional codes. A final draft proposal is close to finished and will come to DGC soon and will include a schema to determine how sub-race/ethnicity are added and how each sub categories rolls up to the federal reporting categories. It looks like a solid proposal and there has been a lot of thoughtful and robust discussion in democomm to develop this proposal. A question regarding how historically underrepresented/underserved terminology is incorporated into this work.
 - The next steps; the proposal will come to DGC, we will review and discuss, we will send it out to our commissions and councils for feedback. We come back together to discuss

potential changes, send it back to democomm if necessary or if it's approved a formal vote, then implementation.

- Query Governance Committee Update
 - No Update
- MOU and Data Privacy Agreement (DPA) Update –
 - The MOU resolves the FERPA violation issue of viewing other college's data allowing a FERPA exemption designating ctclink users as school officials. The proposal for the MOU and subsequent pop-up DPA was approved by the ctclink working group this fall and by the Presidents at the last WACTC meeting. The MOU is complete. It will be located (probably) on the SBCTC [ctclink Support Page](#). Carmen is working with the policy people at the State Board to add language to the policy manual that refers back to the MOU to document that the President's approved the MOU and the DPA at WACTC. Carmen is working on a data brief for the system, similar to what was presented to the Presidents that will be out as a data alert to the system, it will detail that the MOU is posted, attach the DPA and that the pop-up box implementation is coming soon. It is going through an editing process and will be complete soon.
 - Carmen showed a demonstration of the pop-up box functionality. This serves as UAT for the pop-up box. The process stores the EMPL ID, the DPA version, and the date of user acceptance. The box comes up as expected, if the user chooses not to accept the agreement, the system is still available. This does not affect security roles or system access. The next time the user logs in, the pop-up box will appear again and will continue to do so on every login until the user accepts the agreement. In one year, the system will prompt again to accept the agreement. The box only shows up for staff, not students.
 - There was conversation about people who access the system but not through Peoplesoft (i.e. datalink). At that point, a paper form should be printed and signed. College should put that process into place.
 - Another item is training. Most of us automatically scroll through user acceptance agreements in other areas (i.e. iphone apps) but it is important to have users understand what they are reading. Each college compliance training is different and the DPA should fall into this training both through on-boarding new employees and as a continual training process. The form is for compliance but there should be weight on education.
 - There was conversation about if it's reasonable for a user to access the system, even once, if they have not agreed to the policy? The original thought was blocking employees out would cause havoc. A query is developed for security administrators to find out who has not accepted with the agreement. At this point, a college process to address this issue would be implemented. There was also a suggestion that the maximum number of by-passing the agreement is five times and then the user is locked out of the system.
 - Timing: The only window to install the pop-up box is after DG6a because then the pop-up box could be implemented for user testing for cycles b and c ensuring that end users in the last two rounds saw the pop-up box in training since it will be in the live system. However, this is cutting all the tasks close and puts everything on a tight timeline. A recommendation is to implement the pop-up box for the entire system after DG6c then after the stabilization process, the pop-up box is implemented. The committee felt that waiting until June to implement the pop-up box would be fine as long as the MOU is

posted and the Data Alert is sent out ASAP so colleges can begin training their users. One point brought up was that the MOU is the strong part of the process and puts us in compliance with FERPA, the pop-up for the DPA is a courtesy, employees are already bound by FERPA rules. The MOU and DPA should be incorporated into college education processes immediately.

- The action items for the pop-up box as a result of this discussion are:
 - Need a page header
 - Work on display to make it wider and easier to read
 - Discussion with ITC on monitoring staff who are not agreeing to the statement
 - What is the follow-up action for those who do not agree
 - 5 skip rule; after 5 times of declining to agree, the system is inaccessible for the user
 - Email the signed DPA form upon acceptance
 - Hold to implement after DG6
 - Work with app services to determine a firm implementation date
 - Send out the data brief now
 - Post the MOU now
 - Carmen to work with Dev on change and implementation schedule
- New DGC Assessment
 - Carmen completed the Data Management U data mastery class.
 - With this knowledge at the forefront, perhaps it's time to review our committee, charter, structure, and effectiveness. DGC is sponsored by RPC, there was an assessment project a couple years ago but it never really got off the ground. A maturity model was introduced during her coursework explaining how to do an assessment. DGC is currently a non-invasive committee meaning we leverage our commissions and councils in the data governance process. The alternative is an invasive process. We will further discuss what an invasive process looks like.
 - The other question brought forth was evaluating the number of representatives from each commission (currently two) and the frequency of the meetings (currently once a month approximately). The purpose of two members is to allow absence by one member and still have the designated commission represented. This structure probably needs more education about partnership vs. dual representation because one person dropped out since the other person was active in the DGC group with the thinking that their time could be better spent elsewhere. Both representatives are welcomed/encouraged to attend all the meetings but it's not a requirement if there are two representatives and a two representative model allows for absence but still maintains coverage. Two members present felt meeting once a month was valuable as oppose to a change to a quarterly meeting schedule.
 - Next steps – Carmen will send out an email with some bulleted discussion points sharing her knowledge and initial ideas about a DGC assessment project. Members felt that an assessment process is important and is timely as we think about data systems, not just technical but what we do with data once we have it. There is also a conversation about building more formal intersections between other committees (strategic technology committee?) moving forward – Eva and Carmen will discuss how to move forward.
- Other items

- Introduction - Summer Kenesson is interim Research Director and will probably stay as the SBCTC representative.

Data Governors to do/Things to remember:

- Carmen will send out the data alert and post the MOU
- Carmen will send the committee thoughts and resources regarding committee assessment