

Policy Committee

April 17, 2009

Discussion Items

- 1) ISPP-25 Policy – Eric described the new format for the policy as proposed by Vice President Applegate’s office. The content is the same. Some feedback received indicates that many people have not been familiar with the work of the Data Stewards. The Policy Office hopes to only have two revisions before going forward. One change will be to add a couple of standards as examples. Another detail to be added would be the composition of the Committee of Data Stewards; indicates the wide representation and experience. Context is important in getting people to understand the policy better. Another comment is the checks and balances in place; what are they? Eric asked for feedback from the policy committee to address these concerns. Examples: when new standards are developed, will there be a review/comment period for the broader community? Is there an appeal process? People look at the policy and see it as something that hands down rules and procedures and where does the authority arise from?
 - a. Vic suggested that something be added to show to whom the committee is responsible. Kathleen suggested that people need to know that there is a period of comment and review by those affected by such policies. So, is it a sentence pointing out the process we use? Steve talked about making it clear on the Data Stewards website what the purview of these committees are. Paul and Vic felt that it still needs to be made clear under what authority this committee makes these policies since they have to do with information governance in general, not just in IT. The primary concern was raised by faculty at BL and IUPUI; can this be addressed by simply adding a bullet point about the review process. Vic brought the use of the term processes in bullet #4 – it is UPO and USO who are responsible for the processes.
 - b. What happens next? The review period ends on May 6th. After looking at this feedback, there will be a rewrite which includes standards. In the Fall, there will be another review of the updated document. Once there is broad consensus it goes out for approval; through CIO and depending upon the scope it could go to the Board of Trustees. There are academic stakeholders on the review group. The deans (Garland Elmore and Brad Wheeler) will be advised to take the policy through the Academic Leadership Committee which is the top academic leadership group for the University.
- 2) Merri Beth reviewed the Standards Documents as they stand so far; trying to fit into the 12 areas within the Data Privacy and Security Program. Most of the items that were in historical documents fit nicely into these 12 standards.
 - a. Merri Beth explained that we asked for feedback from the Data Managers on each of these standards. The document distributed (OnCourse) is a compilation of the feedback from all of the Data Manager Symposium sessions.
 - b. Merri Beth proposed that there be a subgroup (not the Data Stewards themselves) comprised of Data Managers to go through these documents in more detail to work out what should be in each of these standards. Merri Beth would have a couple of retreats with this group to work out these details. Examples would be Julie Kamarauskas and someone in HR who reports to Dan Rives. The committee concurred. Beth Cate would also be in this group. Chris Puckett is in the college and would be a good person for this group. Tim Brown in School of Medicine would be a good person; he can recommend someone else if he himself does not do this. Laura Kress from HR; Sterling George from FMS; Mark Federwisch in School of Science; Pat Goodall; Teresa Case would be a good choice as well, or else could recommend someone. The only concern is the timeline; it is budget time through June and even into July.
 - c. Right now this is just a compilation of all of the input; it needs to have a reality check done against this input. This could be done before our next quarterly meeting.
 - d. Merri Beth also sent the Policy and Standards to Burton Group for their input into structure and procedure. She will be meeting with them in the next week.
- 3) Challenges and Opportunities – Phyllis will de-duplicate and collate in general areas of topic and redistribute to the Data Stewards. (April 25) We would like feedback by the end of May. Merri Beth gave an update on the Data Manager Symposiums and how they worked using the outline from the presentations; they were very well attended. Some people did not know we had 3 levels of data classification and now have 4, and some did not know who their Data Steward was. Some of the Regional campuses did not like to have to drive and requested use of video conferencing. Mark explained that due to the audit we felt we needed to meet in person since it had been so long, and in the future we will use video conferencing.

Action Items

- 1)** Merri Beth will convene the group to work on the details on the content of the Standards.
- 2)** Phyllis will try to de-duplicate or collate the items on the Challenges and Opportunities into like items by April 25th.
- 3)** Merri Beth and Eric Cosens will continue to work through the process with the ISPP-25 Policy and report back to the committee later in the year.