

Data Governance Council Agenda

2/21/2017

President's Conference Room/WebEx

Council Members – Voting

| Attendee | Present | Attendee | Present | Attendee | Present |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Jerry Sheehan | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Joann Stryker | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Alisha Schroeder | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Paul Lambeth | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Terry Leist | <input type="checkbox"/> | Dave Bonilla | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Chris Fastnow | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Kathy Attebury | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ron Larsen | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Cathy Hasenpflug | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Adam Edelman | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Kellie Peterson | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Laura Humberger | <input type="checkbox"/> | Chris Kearns | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Justin van Almelo | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Eric Wold | <input type="checkbox"/> | Brendan Mumey | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | |

Council Members – Non-Voting

| | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Neil Zandonella | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------|--------------------------|

PMO

| | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| Julie Clay | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Paul Lindsay | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Karen Schmidt | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Logistics

Start Time: 2:00 pm MT

A. Call to Order and Announcements by Jerry Sheehan

B. Approval of January Minutes

Call for comments – (minutes were sent by Paul Lindsay)

Motion to approve by Select Name, second by Select Name.

Motion Approved Rejected.

Agenda Items

1) Software Review

Time Allocated: 5 minutes

Presenter: Sheehan / Fastnow

- a. Discussion: Requested by President to review software investment to assess the value beginning with DegreeWorks, Academics, and College Scheduler: 1) Technical assessment 2) Application owner – what is coming so if there are upcoming choices and 3) Satisfaction with this software. Each tool has a different set of stakeholders. What are the outcomes and individual satisfaction for each? CatCourse – people who are benefiting from the use. SWAT group, orientation leaders, and academic advisors. Last two groups are a gauge of student impact. Freshman are required to use CatCourse, while others have an option. May do a Popup survey asking for feedback or a focus group on Freshman 15 and room utilization. DegreeWorks – preliminary assessment. These three were chosen not with contract deadline, but will add any that will have a contract deadline coming up to the assessment. It is hard to replace a tool after people are comfortable with it. There is usually a financial incentive to renew.
- b. Comments: Would there be an assessment that measured if got everything we thought we purchased

(value)? CatCourse scheduler – We would like to gauge the metrics that we get from this tool. What are we expecting our faculty to do with this tool? SWAT Academic advising council will give us insight into these. Other software will have other users that we would like to identify for value assessment. Do we want to ask if we want to consider alternatives? Looking at something else is usually triggered by the RFP process. Does the DGC want to open this option as we go through this process? Activity Insite has an add-on that we could tap into. DegreeWorks has an Athletic academic eligibility component. Banner 9 (XE) has new capabilities that are unknown outside this group. When looking for product capabilities. How do you look at the current landscape? Where do we want to be as a university? Do we want to be cutting edge with certain applications or are we looking for a known? Not every tool is covered by a Gartner landscape report. Do we have a list of our enterprise solution software? We have initiatives to get at this question. CatCourse scheduler is MSU-Bozeman only and as we move to DegreeWorks, how do we incorporate all the users? Each campus will have the same user groups. Will rely on DGC to identify the specific users at each campus for each user group. Is the DGC the correct place to go to for the correct users? The approach is to do this in a quick and light way. DGC is the correct group to ask about the users, but the complete use does not need to be included in the review of the list, etc. Make this a standing agenda item for updates.

2) Clean Address

Time Allocated: 15 minutes / Q & A 5 minutes Presenter: Lambeth

- a. Discussion: Paul Lambeth – Clean Address software by Runner Tech is the only software that integrates with Banner. The CA Project team has run into a lot of questions from campuses and groups. Clean Address validates addresses per the USPS. We are focusing on address only, not email and/or phone number. Benefits are - reduced mailing costs, etc (See Benefits slide). Technical side of house: largest time saver is not needing to track down issues from bad data. This also applies to our vendors that use addresses. UPD uses Banner addresses for emergency response. CA solution provides 1) real-time address solution. This happens at point of entry so information goes into Banner correctly and 2) Batch processing that is configurable to go through historical data. This has raised questions. What happens when an invalid address is encountered? How far back do want to go to clean ACTIVE records? We can only go forward now
- b. Comments: Is the question regarding who deals with the invalid addresses? Is there value in making the addresses valid? Is historical batching worth it? You don't know if you need the data until you need it now. We know there are pools of data outside of Banner that may have already been cleaned, so cleaning the address in Banner may not be fixing anything. One of the questions is who will deal with the invalid flagged addresses. The answer is that no one must do anything. The addresses that can be cleaned will be cleaned. No changes need to be made to the flagged addresses. Suggested strategy: Recommend that technology has already been tested so we want to move forward with cleaning new data coming in. Second phase is to go back into historical addresses and conduct an assessment of quantity of how many addresses historically are invalid and would need to be corrected. The DGC can make the decision on how deal with historical data. CA team can present the data at a future meeting. Request for comments from the DGC: Impact info from other groups is important. With the audit finding, what is the value and/or impact of this to our current user groups? What proportion of addresses are invalid? At an earlier assessment, if we go back two years on active addresses, there were some invalid addresses. There are odd addresses in rural Montana. Are these recognized and how will these be dealt with? The autocorrect does have the capability of being over-ridden with the user's choice of address. What will it take to move into real-time address correction? Would like CA team to come back to the DGC with roadmap and over-ride options. There are self-service options in Banner that are not turned on because we do not have clean address real time. Staff make mistakes too.

3) Business Analytics Readiness Initiative (BARI)

Time Allocated: 15 minutes / Q & A 5 minutes Presenter: TBD

- a. Discussion: Now called: Systems and Application Assessment. High level goal is to determine what data is in each system. We will have many systems and we need to prioritize. We have a start on the integration points into our system for various reasons. Ultimately, can we arrive at an assessment of end-user satisfaction? We want to pool the data for analytics and understand the integrations for Business Recovery plans. These are the two practical reasons. Slide lists high-level fields we are populating on first pass. Are we making they systems better going forward? Easier to do it at the time of implementation. Preventive strategy to minimize the effort going forward. One concern that caused the creation of this group is the need to understanding the data across the systems. When we get those data definitions, they should go into iData Cookbook. This is the common platform for the MUS. First pass is the high-level data type and we will move to detailed iData input. This leads to cloud storage and knowing what data is stored there. Looking to do this for all of systems. First pass and then deeper dives into prioritized software and applications. Timeline – Initial cut with basic elements is also being used for Banner upgrade so need in March timeframe.
- b. Comments: How do we determine when we replace/renew software and applications? What are the data points to get the metrics to make decisions? Would like team to take another month to run with this and then the DGC can review the status.

4) Review Action items

Time Allocated: 5 minutes

Presenter: Action Owner

- a. Discussion: Discussion Notes
- b. Comments: Comments

Jerry: Document retention other future agenda items? Neal at Foundation an update on data being used there.

Action items

| Agenda Item | Action | Owner | Deadline |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| 3.1 | Make the Software Investment a recurring agenda item | PMO | Update monthly |
| 3.1 | Report back with roadmap, functionality, approach, and impact metrics | PMO | Update at March DGC |
| 2.1 | Report back Roadmap, override options, historical record numbers | PMO | Update at March DGC |

Attendance

| | 2017 Attendance | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC |
| Jerry Sheehan | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Paul Lambeth | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Chris Fastnow | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cathy Hasenpflug | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laura Humberger | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Joann Stryker | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Terry Leist | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kathy Attebury | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Adam Edelman | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Chris Kearns | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alisha Schroeder | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dave Bonilla | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ron Larsen | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kellie Peterson | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Justin van Almelo | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eric Wold | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Neil Zandonella | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Julie Clay | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Paul Lindsay | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Karen Schmidt | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brandan Mumey | | X | | | | | | | | | | |