# Data Governance Committee (DGC) Meeting Notes

**Date: 04/10/2025** Phone/Webex; 10:30am

Information about DGC:   <https://www.sbctc.edu/colleges-staff/commissions-councils/dgc>

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attended | Commission | Name | College |
| x | **Co-chairs (SBCTC)** | Carmen McKenzie | SBCTC |
| x | **Co-chairs (RPC)** | Jennifer Tuia | South Puget Sound CC |
| x | **Business Affairs Commission (BAC)** | Carie Edmiston | Peninsula College |
|  | **Business Affairs Commission (BAC)** | Linda Schoonmaker | Big Bend Community College |
|  | **Diversity and Equity Officers Commission (DEOC)** | Thalia Vaillancourt | Centralia College |
|  | **Diversity and Equity Officers Commission (DEOC)** | John Hudson | Everett CC |
|  | **Human Resources & Management Commission (HRMC)** | Stephanie Groom | Walla Walla CC |
| x | **Human Resources & Management Commission (HRMC)** | Josh Ernst | Everett Community College |
|  | **Information Technology Commission (ITC)** | Jason Brandon | Shoreline Community College |
| x | **Information Technology Commission (ITC)** | Eva Smith | Edmonds Community College |
| x | **Instruction Commission (IC)** | Teya Viola | Cascadia |
| x | **Instruction Commission (IC)** | Vacant | Johnny HU |
|  | **Public Information Commission (PIC)** | Katie Rose | SBCTC |
| x | **Public Information Commission (PIC)** | Sherry Nelson | SBCTC |
| x | **Research and Planning Commission (RPC)** | Summer Kenesson / Diana Knight | SBCTC |
| x | **Research and Planning Commission (RPC)** | Lia Homeister | Renton Technical College |
| x | **Student Services Commission (WSSSC)** | Steve Ashpole | Bates Technical College |
| x | **Student Services Commission (WSSSC)** | Ruby Hayden | Lake Washington Institute of Technology |
| x | **SBCTC** | Lou Sager – Ex-Officio |  |

# Next Meeting:

Next Meeting is: TBD - Webex

# Meeting Notes:

**Agenda:**

* Enhancement Update from CS Support
  + Pronoun collection (ER #27 4 of 5)
  + Updating SOGI descriptions is CS and HCM (ER# 27 5 of 5)
  + Self-Service Questions (ER #232)
* Data Classification Update
* Metamajor
* Other

Enhancement Updates

Dani Bundy, Director of CS Support provided a presentation update regarding specific enhancement requests. Refer to the attached powerpoint.

*Self Service Questions ER 232:* Question language has been changed with consultation from Perkins policy staff at SBCTC. The timeline for implementation is July/Summer because of the need to have both the student and staff portion launch at the same time.

There was significant conversation regarding the override of proposal requirements by CS support. There was concern about the administration of a survey that did not include DGC or RPC regarding the modification of the proposal requirements. A conclusion by Dani is to circle back to Carmen with changes recommended by the UAT in the future. The implementation of a service indicator as a better solution (vs. activity guide) and will meet the requirements of the proposal was unclear. Each institution should have the opportunity to administer the survey at the time of registration and possibly a service indicator will accomplish that. The indicator is student centered, while the collection of historical effective data is in institutional tables. Are student indicators student specific or global(?), this is dependent on how it is set up.

It is necessary for the student responses to be specific to each institution the student attends. It is necessary that the student has the ability to disclose information via the enhancement to each institution separately and that the information provided by the student may not necessarily be the same, for example a reported disability at one institution but not disclosed at another institution. Student attendance at multiple colleges within the same quarter is 1%.

Dani will bring these concerns to her team and come back to DGC with a report.

*SOGI ER# 27 5 of 5*: this is part of phase 2. This is not an easy win because it’s not a simple description change but a resource intensive technical process. There is not an ETA at this time, it is in the column of ‘future work’.

Implementing pronouns is a quick win.

Data Classification

The subcommittee is meeting every 2 weeks and making progress. They are firming up the classification schemas. The subcommittee was provided white papers from Gartner Consulting and they are working on a handbook based on this. They anticipate bringing this to DGC in May for review. It will go to the ITC commission as well. This is not an enhancement request.

Metamajor

Carmen is working on putting together a framework of how this would look in the data warehouse from a global perspective using a few colleges data. Once it is in an appropriate form, there can be discussion about next steps.

Other

Having Dani present was helpful and informative. There are three concerns that DGC would like to address further; The first concern is if there are necessary changes during the ER pipeline (in this case at UAT testing), that there wasn’t a documented pipeline to address concerns and provide feedback from the sponsor of the ER (in this case DGC). The second concern, is that because ER 232 is ultimately for the purpose of a federally mandated report, the RPC stakeholder position in this process was ignored. The final concern is the direction received from CS support about “not solutioning”. This is a new directive. It has manifested in the metamajor subcommittee as a problem receiving feedback because commission members (especially RPC) were unclear how the solution was going to look and were therefore hesitant to move forward.

In response to these concerns, it was suggested that the committee/commission sponsoring any enhancement request should be in lock-step so changes are communicated effectively and discussed openly to the concerned parties and kept in the loop of critical requirement changes. It was suggested to bring in college collaboration group earlier in the process. DGC was in place before the other governance structures so it’s time to revisit the process flow. Carmen will connect with Dani then report back to DGC.

Voting

Only decisions regarding coding require a vote. Nine votes representing eight commissions and one State Board will vote. Voting shall be approved by two-thirds (or 6) votes.

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

* N/A