Data Governance Coordinating Committee
Meeting Notes

August 30, 2016

Present: Susannah Livingood, Carl Grant, Chris Kennedy, Dan Shuart, Erin Wolfe (remote), Joey Albin
Guests: Nick Key (IT/DRRG)
Absent: Tim Marley, Terri Pinkston

1. Meeting notes

The prior meeting’s notes, posted to the DGCC shared Google Drive folder, were approved with no changes. Susannah will add them to the website.

2. DRRG validation guidelines/procedures

Nick and Chris presented a revised Data Request Process (included at the end of these notes), developed by the DRRG and modified to address feedback about the validation part of the process. The revised process indicates that a validation plan will be drawn up in consultation with data stewards, and validation will be complete before the request is sent to DGCC for final review. A list of required process documents has been added, to include an executive summary, a data owners list, a validation checklist, the data specifications, and any supplementary materials.

There was discussion about what kind of approval the DGCC is providing. Is it final, for all time, or is there a review process? Nick noted that the revised process allows for some flexibility: yes, no, yes-but… The idea is that after DGCC review there should be documentation of the decision, including any concrete steps that need to be taken on either a no or a yes-but decision, to track any follow-up work needed. Carl also suggested an automatic period for review be built into our processes, whether that be six months, a year, etc., so we can monitor how successful the end product was, note any necessary tweaks, etc. There was some support for instituting this in the future. Because DGCC and DRRG will be tracking approval dates, we can set up rolling reviews in the future.

There was discussion about the roles of each group in the review process. Nick stressed that the DRRG represents users, and that at times their advocacy for user access may seem in conflict with DGCC’s advocacy for data governance processes. It was agreed that both groups need to keep in mind always the ultimate goal of creating a quality
reporting environment that helps OU employees better support student success. Susannah expressed appreciation that the new process accounts for the possibility of not reaching full consensus on validation. A project might move forward if deemed sufficiently validated by a majority of stakeholders, but documentation of minority viewpoints would be attached for the record. Chris noted the DRRG plans to post approved proposals online, to increase transparency of the process.

Chris reviewed a sample Data Owners list drafted by the DRRG. The contacts listed would serve as the initial contact point for the DRRG when getting feedback on user stories and developing validation plans. The sample list also included suggested components for a validation checklist. Chris asked for feedback from DGCC; he will bring an updated version to a future DGCC meeting for further review. Susannah asked that DRRG remember that input is sometimes needed from more than the data “owner” - key stakeholders can sometimes be broader than that, or not always immediately apparent. For example, if a project needs to use functional HR data, the data owner of HR is sufficient contact. If a project needs HR data for a reporting function, however, that falls under both HR and IRR, because of the reporting dimension. Susannah asked the DRRG to please keep that extra dimension in mind when revising the draft document.

There was strong support from the DGCC for the revisions presented. A revised set of procedure documents will be presented at the next DGCC meeting scheduled after the revisions are done.

3. Other items?

No other items were discussed.
Proposed Process: Data Request Process

1. User submits data request for data specific to business, financial, or any other category.
2. User provides data stewards with data request data.
3. Data stewards review data request.
4. If data request is valid, data stewards plan validation.
5. Data stewards create draft data spec.
6. Data stewards finalize and publish data spec.
7. Request validated?
   - Yes: Request package is submitted to DEC.
   - No: Return to step 5.
8. DEC receives request?
   - Yes: DEC approves.
   - No: Return to step 7.
10. Deliver to project execution.

Supporting Materials:
- Data spec: Details data required to fulfill the request.
- Validation checklist: Lists all required validation items.
- Data owners list: Outlines data owners and data stewards.
- Process details: Reference and associate use cases.

Executive Summary: Includes basic request information, delivery mechanism, and associated use cases.
Action Items

- Agree on an official communication method to facilitate conversations between DCC and DRG on a request package level
- DCC and DRG: Agree on an official communication method to facilitate conversations between DCC and DRG
- Approvals Process
  - DCC: Determine optimal turnaround time for requests
  - DRG: Create a data request form
  - DCC and DRG: Finalize validation criteria
- Complete a package template and submit to DCC for final approval. This package + the process flow will represent version 1.0 of the data request
**Sample: Validation Checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nick Hetherway</th>
<th>HR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terri Pinkston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Hetherway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Hetherway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Steward(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample: Data Owners List**