

Data Governance Committee (DGC)

Meeting Notes

Date **04/07/2022**

Phone/Webex; 10:30am to 11:30am

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
	Business Affairs Commission (BAC)	Linda Schoonmaker	Big Bend Community College
	Human Resources & Management Commission (HRMC)	Vacant	
X	Human Resources & Management Commission (HRMC)	Josh Ernst	Seattle Colleges
X	Information Technology Commission (ITC)	Brandon Ray	Lower Columbia College
	Information Technology Commission (ITC)	Eva Smith	Edmonds Community College
	Instruction Commission (IC)	Vacant	
	Instruction Commission (IC)	Vacant	
X	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)	Michael Horn	Cascadia
	Student Services Commission (WSSSC)	Vacant	
X	Student Services Commission (WSSSC)	Ruby Hayden	Lake Washington Institute of Technology

Next Meeting:

Next Meeting is: TBD

Meeting Notes:

Agenda:

- Status update on DPA/Pop-up (data usage and privacy statement)
 - Not ready for testing just yet
- Institutional training on the DPA/Pop-up
- Status update on continuing education course number ranges
- Dummy classes – collection of examples
- Status update on DemoCom ethnic back ground proposal
- Discuss and prioritize work plan

Notes:

Status update on DPA

Development has been pushed out due to go-live activities. Perhaps next month or the month after we will see this for user acceptance testing.

Institutional Training on the DPA/Pop-up

The original thought was to have a system Canvas class incorporating FERPA training and any other training that would be beneficial. However, there wasn't a lot of system support around that. The registrar group informed Carmen that FERPA training is institutional specific and colleges are responsible for their own training. The goal isn't for SBCTC to provide training on the Pop-Up but rather communicate the need for training, the number of times a pop-up bypass is allowed (five) and how to find out who is by-passing the agreement. The first step will be system communication via a data alert with the following components: a description of the process and why it's necessary, the opportunity to encourage institutional training to staff, identify if the agreement is by-passed, and communicating the query and table information for local security administrator knowledge. The data alert will be sent after DGC has passed the DPA user acceptance training.

Status update on continuing education course number ranges

Carmen is meeting with Carolyn McKinnon (Policy Associate, Workforce Education) to develop a problem statement. She is further meeting with the Continuing Education Council to discuss the issue. Once the problem statement is developed, she will meet with the Continuing Education Executive Team. This may result in further meeting with the CE council (again). Carmen will bring the results of this conversation back to DGC for next steps.

Dummy classes – collection of examples

Dummy classes are being discovered in ctclink. Upon reaching out to end-users it has been found that employees are creating these classes because “that’s how the process was handled in Legacy”. In actuality, there is usually a functionality available in ctclink that eliminates the need for dummy class creation. However, DGC membership is limited so it is necessary to gather feedback of who and why dummy classes are created in ctclink so each situation can be evaluated before a restrictive policy is put into place. In the case of a legitimate need for dummy classes then a standardized method for creating the dummy class has to be identified so it is consistently applied across the system. To achieve this feedback Carmen will create a document identifying the problem and request feedback of use cases for dummy classes via a survey link. She will send this to the DGC and we will forward it to our Commissions and Councils.

Status update DemoCom Ethnicity proposal

The DemoComm is meeting tomorrow and will review the feedback gathered so far. There’s been less than 10 responses.

Discuss and prioritize work plan

- Need to finish SOGI implementation. The remaining work is in HCM and will be re-visited after all college are on ctclink (May).
- Data classifications work has been slow and somewhat steady. The main part of this work is classifying data elements into data sensitivity categories. Category 1 is the lowest category and contains public information, such as course catalog data elements. Category 4 is the highest category and contains the most sensitive data elements, such as social security numbers and bank accounts.
 - The remaining work is identifying\documenting category 1 data within the HCM and Finance pillars and review category 4 data to ensure there is agreement. The remaining data elements fall into category 2 or category 3. DGC needs to define category 2. Once the definition is finalized and the data elements are identified, the remaining data elements can be assigned category 3.
 - A second component of data classification is identifying collaboration software (example: OneDrive) and how category 4 data elements meets the security criteria within other applications.
 - Finally, there is an opportunity to identify best practices around EMPLID. There are several ideas\opinions regarding the category treatment of EMPLID. A legislative bill suggests this should be a category 4. However, this doesn’t make sense within the use of daily business practices because it is the main source of identification across the pillars, therefore everyone would have to have access to it which doesn’t logically fit with the category 4 restrictive definition. The AG stated that the EMPLID is not a category 4 data element. Would it be a violation of policy to include EMPLID in an email? A best practices document regarding the use of EMPLID would be useful. This could be included in a data security canvas training. Carmen will compile the different statements\ideas regarding EMPLID and bring it back to the DGC for continued discussion.
 - The DGC committee was supportive of Carmen returning to the data classification work and incorporating this conversation into the DGC work plan and/or reaching out to DGC for additional support.

- Grading basis standard usage – GRD is used outside of typical credit bearing classes. Again, lack of standardization is resulting in error within reporting and SAP processes. As a first step Carmen will develop a problem statement and usage guidelines then share it with the applicable Commissions and Councils. We will wait and see if a standardization process needs to be developed.
- Add questions to CS and HCM is still on the workplan and part of the demographic subcommittee work.

Other Items

How is vendor access to ctcLink data managed? Is there a system policy and/or process in place regarding granting external access. Is it possible for a singular department in the system to grant access to system wide data? Is there oversight somewhere? For a first step, Carmen will reach out to Grant (Executive Director, IT) for input and bring that response back to DGC.

Data Governors to do/Things to remember:

- Continue to monitor Pop-Up DPA in development
- Carmen will create system communications regarding the DPA
- Carmen is meeting with Continuing Ed / and Carolyn regarding CE course numbering
- Carmen to develop a problem statement and feedback form for dummy classes
- Carmen to develop an EMPLID best practice document framework for DGC to build on
- Carmen will develop a problem statement and usage guidelines about grading basis standard usage
- Carmen will check with Grant regarding vendor access to ctcLink data