

Data Governance Coordinating Committee  
Meeting Notes

**May 24, 2016**

Present: Susannah Livingood, Carl Grant, Dan Shuart, Erin Wolfe, Joey Albin  
Absent: Chris Kennedy, Terri Pinkston

1. Meeting notes

The prior meeting's notes, posted to the DGCC shared Google Drive folder, were approved with one minor addition suggested by Carl. Susannah will add them to the website.

2. Slate CRM project

Chris was unable to attend; this item was tabled until next meeting. Chris did provide this update via email after the meeting:

*I was planning to give an update on the Slate implementation. The Office of Admissions and Recruitment is working to get an initial list of data which will flow from Slate to Banner so we can start the process of putting together the document which can be presented at DGCC. There is potential to think through how we look at Admissions data, since although we will be passing a lot of information to Banner, there is a large amount more stored in Slate which will probably end up in the ODS and could provide insight into the education process for what we do when we have new data available to the community.*

3. Other items?

a. Informatica update

Dan reported that IT is in the process of developing use cases for the more advanced features of the tool. While it will take some time to get all the data systems "hooked up" using this tool, IT is ready to start using it to build APIs.

b. DGCC metrics

Carl briefed the group on his research findings to date. He talked with Stanford about their efforts to create metrics for data governance but found they have not yet defined any metrics and are therefore not in any position to advise us.

Carl distributed a one-page summary (attached) of his notes on this topic. In reviewing the notes, there was discussion about next steps for DGCC. The main question is how will the DGCC obtain data needed for meaningful metrics? DART is best positioned to capture this information, given their topic-driven subgroups. It is also important for us to make sure we're looking at DGCC website traffic, as that is one way to gauge how informed Norman Campus is about data governance activities. There was discussion about how to increase traffic to the website - social media, presentations about DGCC to established groups around campus (CITL, etc.).

Action items from the metrics discussion:

1. Susannah will check to make sure analytics have been set up for the DGCC website.
2. Carl will work on getting a presentation about DGCC onto a CITL meeting agenda soon.
3. DGCC members will think about any other groups it may make sense to have DGCC present to.

c. Data Request Committee / Pending DGCC Projects and Requests

Susannah asked if anyone knew status on the data request committee that was discussed and approved at the 4/12/16 meeting. She was particularly interested in finding out what additional members had been identified to be added, given the mandate from DGCC to add representatives from CCE, HR, and Financial areas. It was asked whether this group had come up with a name either for itself or for the triage process that should be established. No one present could answer those questions.

There was discussion of the plan to have DGCC look through the pending OCRC request list items, to see which items should go to the new request group versus those that are for the newly refocused OCRC. Group needed input from Chris, so this discussion will be resumed when he can be present.

Susannah will go through the list of topics discussed by the DGCC so far and bring a summary of them to the next meeting. At that meeting, the group will go over status for each and determine what action is needed.

## Thoughts on metrics for the OU Data Governance Committee

Remember, metrics need to be **SMART**, i.e.:

**Specific** - that measure success of DG work.

**Measurable** - clearly defined, simple to understand & measure.

**Actionable** - easy to capture, realistic, practical, quantifiable

**Realistic** - has relevance

**Timely** - establishes a sense of urgency and measures a trend.

Metrics should have two categories:

1. Quantitative Metrics - savings in resource utilization, or cost savings that resulted.
2. Qualitative Metrics – measures of improved satisfaction, data quality scores, etc.

Possible metrics (for discussion purposes only)?

1. Quantitative:
  - a. Number of DG Committee requests processed, filled and/or returned for more information?
  - b. Number of data issues that were reviewed by DG Committee because of HIPAA or FERPA issues?
  - c. Time between when DG Committee received request and when the data was available for requestor's use?
  - d. % the OU data warehouse is growing over time?
  - e. % of satisfied users after interacting with DG Committee?
  - f. % of satisfied users resulting from interaction with DG Committee website?
2. Qualitative:
  - a. Number of requests coordinated and filled through one response?
  - b. Number of requests that required secondary review by the DG committee (indicating an issue not solved on first processing)?
  - c. Measure of financial impacts (such as increased costs, decreased revenues or higher penalties, fines and other direct costs stemming from data quality problems or a decline in data quality problems.)
  - d. Number of collaborative projects that originated as result of DG Committee recommendations? (Intra and Inter-departmental)?
  - e. Number of times DG Committee provided feedback/guidance related to policies/procedures with respect to digital assets?