MEMORANDUM

TO: Loretta Early, Chief Information Officer
    Kyle Harper, Senior Vice President & Provost
    Nick Hathaway, Executive Vice President

FROM: Data Governance Coordinating Committee
      Susannah Livingood (Chair), Carl Grant, Terri Pinkston, Dan Shuart, Erin Wolfe, Tim Marley

DATE: August 10, 2016

RE: DGCC Executive Committee Update - Annual Report 2015-2016

Per the Data Governance Charter, our group is charged with submitting an annual report to you.

The DGCC was originally chartered to address problems with data integrity, reliability, and usage on the OU-Norman Campus. There was confusion about who was responsible for data quality control and prioritization of requests, a lack of clear accountability for project progress and content, and difficulty in quickly pivoting to meet challenges and opportunities.

During this group’s initial exploration phase, we worked on trying to understand the state of things as they were. What we found boils down to three core issues that need to be addressed: communication, prioritization, and documentation.

**Communication**
Lack of communication is the biggest barrier to effective data governance. The DGCC has found there are many small groups working on data projects, but they are often working in isolation. Several different groups may be unknowingly working toward the same goal. There have been cases where a project was close to completion before it was discovered some stakeholders had not been consulted. There were some committees set up to deal with these issues (OCRC, OSCB, ODS Committee), but they were not effectively communicating with each other, and none of them were handling questions related to the HR and Financial systems.

**Prioritization**
The lack of a centralized framework to track projects results in overlapping initiatives, each one competing for limited funding and staff time. Requests for new software integrations were getting put in the same queue as requests to fix broken processes and regular software upgrades. Items that would be “nice to have” might be completed before items needed for compliance or advancement of strategic initiatives. A lack of clear priorities meant that projects were constantly being started and stopped, resulting in extra work for both IT and end users.

**Documentation**
There is a lot of information available to end users, but almost no centralized, validated documentation guiding use. Definitions for reporting database fields, documents explaining how
key concepts are defined (e.g., what each GPA means and when it should be used), and policies regarding appropriate data use and storage are all needed, but there is no centralized authoritative repository for these things.

What is abundantly clear to us after our research is that our campus needs a data governance framework to help guide our efforts. Rather than try and build something from scratch, however, we decided the best approach would be to take existing groups and processes and fit them into the new framework. This would give appropriate recognition to those already working hard on these issues, and it would be less disruptive to day-to-day business. This new framework is still being developed - there are plenty of gaps and duplicative processes in evidence - but there is marked improvement over the state of things one year ago.

Accomplishments this past year include:
- Took existing functions of OCRC/OSCB and ODS Committee and incorporated them into a new advisory structure (see Figure 1) that allows for regular communication flow between all groups.
- Worked with functional areas and IT to create a group to handle requests for new data and software integrations, currently called the Data Request Review Group. They act as initial triage for user problems and requests, delegating and communicating to the other groups in the flow as appropriate (see Figure 2).
- Created a DGCC website to make sure data governance discussions and activities are clearly visible to campus. Committee members also work to increase campus awareness of these issues whenever possible through presentations and individual meetings.
- DGCC has identified five core areas for tracking: Builds, Data Definitions, Integrations, Policies, and Communication. We document project status and progress for items in each of these categories (see Table 1).
- Established some metrics we will use to assess the effectiveness of this group and the governance process overall during the upcoming year. Those metrics will include time from initial request to committee decision, statistics from the DRRG about their workload and time to completion, and indicators of campus awareness (website traffic, presentations, etc.). These will likely be provided in a dashboard form as data for them starts to become available.

While the amount of work left to do on these issues is daunting, we believe the last year’s accomplishments provide an excellent foundation for future progress. There is increased communication between leadership of key areas and more organization of efforts directed toward improving data quality on campus, helping us create better documentation and policies.

If you have any questions about the above report, or if you would like to meet to further discuss our progress, we are more than happy to provide whatever information you need.

Thank you for your continuing support!
Figure 1
DGCC - Data Governance Coordinating Committee
OCRC - Ozone Change Review Committee
DART - Data and Reporting Team
DRRG - Data Request Review Group
Data Request Flow

1. Data Request Made
2. API for Requested Data Exists
   - No
   - Yes: Use Case which leads to Data Need Exists
     - No: Submit Data Working Package
     - Yes:
       - Yes: Version API Working Package with new Data Elements
         - Yes: Data Governance Approval
           - Yes: IT Approves Work
           - No: Request API Development
         - No: Add Addendum to Existing Document Version
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Build Type</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Approved?</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
<th>DGCC Lead</th>
<th>Issue Description</th>
<th>Actions Taken</th>
<th>Other Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA1</td>
<td>Build</td>
<td>API Build</td>
<td>Student profile</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>Version 1.0 approved 9/11/15</td>
<td>07/28/16</td>
<td>Chris Kennedy</td>
<td>The student profile API will collect frequently-used student data points into a single package that will in turn be available to developers of student-centered applications on campus. This item is for building the Student profile API itself, as opposed to other tracked items that are requests to use the student profile API</td>
<td>The student profile is in active development and will likely have several tracked versions as it matures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA2</td>
<td>Build</td>
<td>API Access</td>
<td>OU Bound</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td>Development only</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/28/16</td>
<td>Erin Wolfe</td>
<td>Used for mobile application to help with new student on-boarding</td>
<td>In development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA3</td>
<td>Build</td>
<td>API Access</td>
<td>OU Innovate</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td>Development only</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/28/16</td>
<td>Chris Kennedy</td>
<td>Used for students to manage their daily activities at OU</td>
<td>In development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA4</td>
<td>Build</td>
<td>API Access</td>
<td>Scholarship Genius</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td>Development only</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/28/16</td>
<td>Chris Kennedy</td>
<td>Used for students to manage their scholarships at OU</td>
<td>In development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS1</td>
<td>Build</td>
<td>Star Schema</td>
<td>D2L / Course management system data</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td>Development only</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/28/16</td>
<td>Chris Kennedy</td>
<td>Bringing data from the D2L course management system into a format where it can be used for reporting and analysis</td>
<td>Data has been extracted, evaluation of contents and possible structures is in progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS2</td>
<td>Build</td>
<td>Star Schema</td>
<td>D2L / Course management system data</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td>Development only</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/28/16</td>
<td>Dan Shafer</td>
<td>Creating data objects that could be used to answer questions like those asked by deans and administrators that are best answered by operational data</td>
<td>It is working with IRR and ESFS to create appropriate specifications before building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Campus visibility for DGCC</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07/28/16</td>
<td>Carl Grant</td>
<td>How do we make campus more aware of the DGCC and its efforts? Website in place; looking to present at established committee meetings (CITL, Associate Deans).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Data Definition</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Reporting definitions</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07/28/16</td>
<td>Susannah Livingood</td>
<td>All data elements used for reporting by campus users should be clearly and correctly defined, and those definitions should be readily accessible. The definitions should be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure continued accuracy. Any changes to the field or its contents should also be documented.</td>
<td>DART subgroup has been working on metadata for OUCUSTOM objects for some time now, but it is far from complete. There is also no formalized process for continuing review, and those working on the metadata are volunteers. Representation may not be as complete as it could be. There is not currently any central definition repository for non-ODS objects; IRR maintains a set of definitions for their reports, some of which are available on their website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.1</td>
<td>Data Definition</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Centralized data definition repository</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07/28/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>To meet the goal of D1, it is possible to create or purchase software to facilitate a user-friendly, centrally-accessible location for data definitions?</td>
<td>Need to explore whether OU purchased Data Cookbook or something similar with Informatica/Mulesoft purchase. What tools does OU already have to address this need? If none, what options are available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.1.1</td>
<td>Data Definition</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>GPA rules document</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07/28/16</td>
<td>Susannah Livingood</td>
<td>Definition of different types of GPA, appropriate uses for each.</td>
<td>Draft document created by DART (ODS); reviewed by functions then revised by DART; waiting for DGCC review/approval. SL put on hold due to potential discussions about GPA in Banner by ESFS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Minerva Decision Support System</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td>Update due September 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/28/16</td>
<td>Susannah Livingood</td>
<td>IRR’s reporting site, powered by SAS Visual Analytics</td>
<td>Approved, project next review in August/September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Slate CRM</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td>Development only</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/28/16</td>
<td>Chris Kennedy</td>
<td>New customer management system for Recruiting &amp; Admissions; replaces Hobson/Connect</td>
<td>In development/implementation stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>CollegeNET Graduate Management Module</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07/28/16</td>
<td>Susannah Livingood</td>
<td>New module development to allow for better tracking of graduate student requirements (committees, thesis, etc.)</td>
<td>Unsure - need to see if this is on hold pending degree audit RFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Appropriate data use policy</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07/28/16</td>
<td>Susannah Livingood</td>
<td>What policies exist governing appropriate use (and local storage) of data? How are those policies publicized and enforced?</td>
<td>There are multiple discussions of this topic currently going on; what types of authority are needed to develop and enforce policies in this area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Data security issues</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07/28/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do we need finer-grain restrictions on data access than is currently employed under the Cognos model? How does security get factored into integration requests and API usage?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>