

Functional Data Governance Committee

Meeting Minutes

Virtual TEAMS Meeting Thursday March 11, 2021
Functional Data Governance Committee Meeting #13

In Attendance:

Michael Gibbons, Shane Allen, Deepa Arora, Beverly Bergman, David Biek, Samantha Boswell, Beth Byers, Kevin Cantwell, Adon Clark, Christy Colvin, Erin Crider, Geoff Dyer, Laura Gay, April Gregg, Corey Guyton, Lora Foskey, Amanda Funches, Alex Koochang, Tamatha Lambert, Debra Matthews, Dian Mitchell, Tripp Mitchell, Joel Morgan, Amanda Register, Natalie Rischbieter, Melinda Robinson-Moffett, Mary Roberts, Chip Smith, Vicky Smith, Brian Stanley, Michael Stewart, Chris Tsavatewa, Tara Underwood, Margo Woodham

Absent:

Ron Ardelean, Jenia Bacote, Cheryl Carty, Julie Davis, Steve Morse, Shane Roland, David Sims, Josh Waters, Mary Wearn

Recorder: Laura Gay

Meeting began at 11:00AM

1. **Approve Agenda** – approved as is
2. **Review and Approve Minutes** - Will send out minutes from previous meeting to be approved via email. If no changes, will post as is.
3. **Updates from the FDGC Chair: (Gibbons)**
 - a. **USG Update** – Tier 1 and 2 – Michael Gibbons reported that MGA had just submitted document to USG saying we're mostly done with Tiers 1 and 2.
 - b. [Records Management Policy](#) **Committee voted on this policy via email so this passed with 10 yes votes, 0 against. Will add to webpage. **
 - c. [Tier 3 Committee Assignments Document](#) This document shows the sign-up sheet for the different committees that was sent after the last meeting. Michael Gibbons warned the committed that if they haven't started on this, they need to get started. As a whole, MGA is making progress.
4. **Technical Data Governance Committee Update** (Dyer) No update
5. **Old Business**
 - a. **Update - Data Governance Training** (Tsavatewa) Rollout is going well. Hoped everyone would be done by end of month, but still 17 outstanding. Everyone is a data owner trustee or steward must take the training before it is rolled out to users. Gibbons asked Tsavatewa to send a list of those who have not completed the training to Secretary (Laura), who will follow up with link to training.
 - b. **Update - User Roles and Access Permissions** – Documentation and Process (Boswell, Bergman) Samantha Boswell reported that they had rolled out spread sheet and process. The received feedback and seems to be working fine, but would appreciate any additional comments from the group.
 - c. **Update Safeguards Standard** (Morgan) Joel Morgan reported he is making slow progress due to workload and competing priorities. He met with auditors last week for compliance issues, which took priority on safeguard issues.
 - d. **Records Management Program Workgroup** (Waters) Tsavatewa gave an update in Josh's absence. They have had 1 meeting. The group is reviewing templates and resources

from other institutions, and are also working through division of labor and how to meet milestones for next couple of months. They are planning to be finished end of May/first of June, ahead of deadline

6. New Business

- a. Data Elements and Data Definitions Workgroup (Boswell) Boswell reported that this group has met quite a few times to research best practices. They finalized a data elements dictionary of systems that Joel needs and will reach out to custodians/stewards to share template and walk through process. They will need completed dictionary by May 10 to allow time to compile everything into one clean MGA data elements dictionary. Given our timeline, the group had concerns about completing this part, but they are starting with 3 primary banner tables and continue to add to as we can. The primary goal is the critical system in DED and then add to banner as we go along. They are confident they will be meet deadline. Margo Woodham and Michael Stewart said there may be 2 systems that won't be done by May 10. Tsavatewa said USG has been understanding of competing priorities especially for institutions who didn't have resources to buy a product. The Committee must to make best effort and start process, then prioritize work continue to move forward, and this will meet BOR's expectations. USG knows work will continue through the life of BPM, over next many years. By choosing 3 tables in Banner, this group knows they will have any meetings after June to work on rest of Banner. Most important that we prioritize our system internally. If can't get entire system done, having a clear priority of the most commonly used/most important/causes most problem plan will show we are in good faith making progress that USG expects. Dian Mitchell asked how to address when departments are between systems (imaging system). They can't include it, since the system doesn't exist yet and rollout has been delayed. She asked if we can get a waiver on that system before the May 10 deadline. Chris will talk offline with Dian about this. Michael Stewart would like feedback on what he has already submitted so he can get it right up front and fix any issues before he moved on.

- b. Data Quality Workgroup (Gibbons) (Must Begin)
Gibbons reported that this workgroup hasn't begun but he understands the need to do so. Below are questions to be answered. They will have to work with Samantha's group to do data elements.

Gibbons, Trip Mitchell, Melinda Moffett, Vicky Smith and Cory Guyton

For all data essential to operation and reporting:

- Has the institution documented and promulgated data standards and definitions to ensure accurate data entry/creation?
 - These standards and definitions should be part of data element dictionaries where they exist for data systems per subsection 12.3.2 above.
- Are there documented schedules of collection times and when information is updated to ensure timeliness of data?
This maybe as straightforward as putting a calendar/schedule on webpage to list data transfers going on. Surveys, IPEDs, ADC, etc.

- Does the institution assess collected data on at least an annual basis to ensure accuracy, completeness, and adherence to standards?

This is one going to have to talk about because there's going to be some interpretation there. If we can set up annual or quarterly postmortems for when we have problems, we would meet expectations. Kevin Cantwell spoke further on the calendar of review so we identify key data sets. Tsavatewa agreed this allows us to build on the classification model of the financial data streams, academic record streams, etc. We have a lot of informal post-mortems but sometimes takes months for other divisions to find out there were issues. Monitoring/audit piece will go on past the June end of program. Cantwell referred to the way MGA handles comprehensive program review on a rolling schedule, working through 3-4 sets each year allows us to quickly establish a pattern of review/set calendar/provide evidence that we're doing it, speaks to best practice.

- Data entry validations are best practice.

- Does the institution regularly consult data users or stakeholders to ensure data usability and relevance?

We can take FDGC and put on a data summit of some kind/regular meetings where we present what we're doing to rest of the university, field questions will suffice. Gibbons will send out email to his work group regarding this.

Gibbons reminded the group that the purpose of the rolling mini-rolling audits is not to place blame for problems, but rather to break down silos so we all have access to data.

- c. Logical Access Discussion (Vicky Smith) This group hasn't set up a meeting yet, but it will be forthcoming.
- d. MGA FDGC Monitor/Audit Subcommittee (Stanley)
This subcommittee's work is in good shape, given what all has been accomplished. They have broken down monitoring section - done and auditing section broken down further into; Data governance structure complete – Dyer and Morgan have good data system documentation and have 1 outlying question; Data elements not yet addressed; Data quality control and data life cycle not yet addressed; Cybersecurity addressed; Logical access done except for 1 small piece – Morgan referred the group to the access standard that's already been passed; Training done as well.

**Cantwell asked about the approval of the policy mentioned earlier in the meeting. Gibbons said 10 people had responded in affirmative, but today there are 32 people in meeting. Is 10 adequate number to approve? After discussion, Gibbons took a Records Management Policy vote with hand raise on Teams and took a screen shot of the vote.

Meeting adjourned at 11:49.

****Voting recount for Records Management Policy: 23 of the 32 members on the TEAMS meeting/call were voting members. All 23 voting members were in agreement to the Records Management Policy. The policy will now be added to the website. 3.22.2021****