

# Data Governance Committee (DGC)

## Meeting Notes

---

Date **03/17/2022** Phone/Webex; 10:30am to

Attended	Commission	Name	College
X	<b>Co-chairs</b>	Carmen McKenzie	SBCTC
X	<b>Co-chairs</b>	Jennifer Tuia	South Puget Sound CC
	<b>Business Affairs Commission (BAC)</b>	Ed Jaramillo	Skagit Valley College
x	<b>Business Affairs Commission (BAC)</b>	Linda Schoonmaker	Big Bend Community College
	<b>Human Resources &amp; Management Commission (HRMC)</b>	Vacant	
x	<b>Human Resources &amp; Management Commission (HRMC)</b>	Josh Ernst	Seattle Colleges
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>	Vacant	
	<b>Instruction Commission (IC)</b>	Vacant	
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>	Summer Kenesson	SBCTC
x	<b>Research and Planning Commission (RPC)</b>	Michael Horn	Cascadia
	<b>Student Services Commission (WSSSC)</b>	Vacant	
x	<b>Student Services Commission (WSSSC)</b>	Ruby Hayden	Lake Washington Institute of Technology

## Next Meeting:

Next Meeting is: Thursday April 7<sup>th</sup>, 10:30 AM

## Meeting Notes:

### Agenda:

- Data Usage and Privacy Statement pop-up form
  - Second round of User Acceptance Testing
  - Timing of implementation
- Demographic Subcommittee Status Update on proposal for adding new ethnic background options
- Possible new topic: Course numbering for continuing education classes
- Possible new topic: Defining a class and “dummy” class
- Membership review

### Notes:

#### Data Usage and Privacy Statement UAT

This is not quite ready for acceptance testing, still a couple of days until it's ready. We'll review it at the next meeting. The 5 attempts enhancement has been implemented.

#### Demographic Subcommittee Proposal

A proposal developed by the demographic committee (DemoCom) has been submitted to the Data Governance Committee for review and next steps.

In the Legacy system when new race/ethnicity codes were requested, those requests were granted without examination resulting in many codes that in some cases were inappropriate along with coding issues for multiracial identification. At the launch of CtcLink, it was discovered that many new racial/ethnicity codes were not included in CtcLink to adequately represent the student and employees of the Community Technical College System. To address this issue, the DemoCom group created a framework/methodology for the consideration of adding new race/ethnic/ancestry identification. The proposal details the methodology used to develop the framework, which relied heavily on work completed by OSPI in 2016/2017. The DemoCom had robust discussion and there was significant time and effort to develop this proposal.

This proposal requests that the framework is used moving forward in considering addition or subtraction of race/ethnicity/ancestry identification. Furthermore, using the framework, identifies inclusion of 200+ race/ethnicity identifications. The proposal is asking for a large initial insert of codes into CtcLink but future additions will only need the DemoCom approval, not the Data Governance Committee approval. There is also a two-tiered approach to roll in HCM after the initial launch of the CS.

To move forward, there was a suggestion to just move forward without system feedback, relying on the conversations and significant work already accomplished by the DemoCom group. The proposal is dense

and feedback would delay the implementation longer. However, after discussion with the DemoCom representatives on the the Data Governance Committee, feedback is necessary. The DemoCom group was told that there would be an opportunity for feedback and looking forward to getting feedback from the system. The topic and work is too important to rush.

Carmen will create a data alert for the proposal and Carmen will draft an email for DGC to send out to their representative commissions. The email will have a link to a feedback form developed by Ruby. The contents of the email will focus on feedback regarding the action items (adopting the framework and inclusion of the initial codes) to prevent word-smithing since significant discussion already occurred regarding terminology throughout the proposal. Feedback will be open until mid-April. The two DemoCom representatives on DGC will compile the feedback and collaborate with others in DemoCom to determine any action items. The feedback results will be available for the DGC May meeting.

#### Course numbering for continuing education classes

Course numbers are designated by policy. Course numbering for continuing education does not necessarily follow this policy and is inconsistent. In the new CtcLink integrated system, this vagueness is starting to cause data quality problem. Because this is a data quality issue, it belongs to the Data Governance Committee. This would be a good educational opportunity regarding the importance of coding and consistent language. Because a policy change would probably require work to clean up existing codes and catalogues are already developed, a soft launch is attractive. The actual proposal creation could move forward in a timely manner and the traditional feedback process followed then a long (1-year) implementation timeframe. Questions that came up are: how strict should this be? What is the numbering range for CE? How does it impact that have been following the current course numbering policy? This work will be added to our workplan.

#### Defining a class and “dummy” class

Dummy classes were created in Legacy as a technique used to implement functionality (like a class to charge a fee). In CtcLink, dummy classes aren't necessary, there is almost always a new way to do something without the creation of a dummy class. Having dummy classes is impacting other things in CtcLink and showing up in error reports, extraction processes, etc. Data services is anti-dummy class. Should this be a policy to eliminate dummy classes? Should it just be announced/communicated the detriment of dummy classes? Carmen would like system feedback to ensure that dummy classes are not necessary or identify a valid reason for a dummy classes. Get feedback as first steps to find out what is actually happening in ctcLink with regard to dummy classes. This item will be added to our next meeting.

#### Membership Review

DGC membership fulfillment remains challenging. There are currently 4 vacant positions: 2 for IC, 1 for WSSSC, and 1 for HRMC. Josh will ask his colleagues at the HR commission but is skeptical. ~~Ruby~~ Eva will reach out to the IC representative in a different committee and ask for IC representation on DGC. On another note, the Equity Officer Commission had 2 representatives for DemoCom but one has left and

there were not any volunteers for DGC. Perhaps because the commission is new and many campuses don't have an exclusive position for an Equity Officer but rather one person in two roles (such as HR and Equity Officer as the same person). Carmen will reach back out to Ha the State board.

---

---

**Data Governors to do/Things to remember:**

---

---

- Draft commission email regarding DemoCom proposal
- Sent out data alert regarding DemoCom proposal
- Ruby to create feedback form
- Continued recruitment to fill vacant roles in DGC