

Committee of Data Stewards

12/5/08

Discussion Items

D1) Policy Group

Merri Beth reported on progress on IP05 Policy. A few changes were made to the wording and it is ready to go through the normal full review process, Step 3; this means it goes to ½ of stakeholder list. Their comments will be incorporated and further consultation with Policy subgroup will take place if needed. It then goes to Step 5 which is everyone on stakeholders group.

The associated documents (standards, etc.) will be reviewed by Merri Beth, Tom Davis, Mark Bruhn, Dennis Cromwell and Phyllis Davidson before bringing the draft document back to the full group. Encryption, for instance, may affect some of these standards.

D2) Education/Awareness (Mark)

Short-term project for this group was the e-mail communication that Mark sent out a couple of weeks ago. Now, we need to take a look at simplifying the work of this group for next semester. Don remarked that this group had gone from very broad to very detailed; so the question is where do we go from here? We need to find nuggets of information that can be distributed. Marilyn brought up the fact that it is important to know who is traveling out of the country and taking their laptops. Mark noted that travel disseminates a document when you request approval; this might be a good place to add some information to raise awareness about the issues that can come up when traveling out of the country. This should be incorporated into a new travel system. Vic brought up the fact that there is travel which does not go through IU; there is no authorization in this instance. It would be helpful for the CDS to discuss international issues and projects as they relate to data.

January 28th is International Privacy Day – Merri Beth suggested that people in Travel Management might take a look at what is entailed. Merri Beth will try to incorporate information into publicity for this event. This might allow us to incorporate information about traveling with a laptop.

Mark reported on the responses to his e-mail communication to all faculty and staff. Sometimes the message got forwarded to an outside entity and was no longer valid. Dennis said they could do an analysis on who is forwarding their e-mail and whether it is primarily faculty or students or staff. Another response was, "I don't work for I.U. anymore". Other than those quirks, there were a lot of thank yous, and quite a few questions which were forwarded to appropriate people to answer. Some were apologizing for something they did which they thought precipitated their receipt of the message.

D3) Provisioning/Access (Dan)

In the near-term this group has been working on documenting the processes by which access is granted for all of the enterprise systems. We now need to look at them to determine if there are places where we could streamline processes or combine some.

Also, there was a small group charged with putting together recommendations for “role” or position based access. The provisioning group has approved this approach as something we’d like to pursue; base access on position, rather than on the individual. Dan went through the main points of the recommendation (the proposal is in OnCourse). One issue is the fact that hourly positions are pooled and do not have a specific position number for each individual; this would need to be dealt with. Barry noted that this is a long-term process but it is a good idea to take some short-term progress keeping the long-term in mind. Mark noted that the new Strategic Plan has this particular item outlined in it. At this point it is unclear how or what will get funded. Mark suggested that everyone take a look at the latest draft of the Strategic Plan; there are many areas directly related to the work of the Committee of Data Stewards. There is a brand new section relating to preservation/retention.

Dan wanted to recognize Mary Byrde for her work in chairing this small group and bringing forth the recommendation. The question on the table is, exactly what are we going to ask UITS to do? Dan felt we should make the general recommendation that we develop access based on profiles (roles). This would expedite the granting of access. Barry would like to see this fleshed out a bit more by the CDS before going to UITS. There is currently nothing actionable in the document; Barry is happy to have people from his application areas, also Dennis Cromwell’s to enter into discussions with a subgroup of the CDS to further detail the recommendations to UITS. Add a small group of users to determine how this might work from the users’ perspective. Dan Rives will help arrange this. Lora O’Conner will also participate. Dan will pull this together.

D4) Preservation/Retention

This group hasn’t met since the last CDS meeting, but will meet this afternoon with the primary discussion item being the archiving of e-mail.

D5) IUF/IU/IUAA Data Sharing Agreement

Don discussed the “final draft” of this document. There has not been a formal agreement relating to the sharing of data in the past; these are 3 legally separate organizations. This has caused many problems. Therefore, this document is an attempt to frame the rules surrounding the sharing of data. (document is on OnCourse). Once IUF receives student data (upon graduation) there are changes made (contacts, etc.) even though the original data came from I.U. The gist is that I.U. should treat requests for access to such data from I.U.F personnel just as they would from I.U. personnel. They are subject to following all I.U. policies; the process works in reverse as well. I.U. Personnel should be treated the same as I.U.F. personnel when requesting data and are subject to all IUF policies and procedures.

This agreement has a lot of positive outcomes; bringing research data together with IUF data for instance. The agreement is not the end of the work; it is the beginning of the work for data managers. A lot of work needs to be done in the implementation area. A major goal is to identify a point of contact (official) to serve as liaison. It is easier from Alumni or IUF, but more difficult to determine for IU as a whole; they do not want to add a laborious process or bureaucracy. It would be good to get input from the CDS on who this liaison should be. A suggestion had been made that Dan McDevitt, as student information Data Steward, might be the best person for this. The predominant information that will be exchanged is student data. Of course, the individual data stewards would be contacted regarding data distribution from their areas. It primarily has to do with the protection of data. Vic raised some issues which can best be considered in further conversation with Don and Dan.

Don also talked about the notion of trade secret; Beth & Kip have given this to the group as a legal characterization of this data. Data is valuable if people outside don't know it. Since IU is subject to open records act, this could jeopardize "trade secret" data. However, this type of data is excluded from Open Records Act. Therefore, we have to take reasonable measures to protect this data; if it becomes widely known, it loses its trade secret status.

D6) Hogan & Hartson client advisory – in order to participate in Title IV and receive student loans, we have to demonstrate that we have the administrative capability of handling sensitive data. If we have lapses or data which is somehow distributed, DOE may make inquiries about such breaches of security. A copy of the advisory itself has been placed on OnCourse. There is now the strong suggestion for DOE to be notified of any breach of security of data; if we notify the Attorney General about a particular breach then we should consider giving DOE notice. If it's strictly FERPA data (doesn't go to AG), maybe it should be reported to DOE (should be determined by Financial Aid office at IU). This is an example of another law and how we are under pressure to protect personal data.

D7) New requirements for establishing identify of distance learners HEOA – must have processes through which they can determine that the person who signs up for these courses is actually the person who takes the courses and receives a degree. We do not have to have cameras on them; we use practices to ensure to the best of our ability that this is complied with. There is NO way to actually PROVE such a thing. We can't even prove that in the classrooms on campus. This is still under review and comments and changes are under consideration.

D8) Data Managers List – Mark reiterated the definition of a Data Manager ("Data Managers are located in functional offices across the university, and are responsible for receiving, assessing and approving requests for access to university information systems and databases in accordance with policies and guidelines established by the Committee of Data Stewards. Data Managers are also responsible for ensuring that users receive orientation and training as dictated by the requirements of the particular data subject area to which they are assigned").

Vic raised the issue of access to tables which cross data steward areas; these are not on this list. Is there an application code for all of these? The theory is that every data file, extract, etc. has a DM designated. It is, however, imperfect.

This group of people will be the recipient of training, a data symposium, etc. Are they doing what the data stewards need for them to be doing? Mark asked the group to take a look at the current list and determine how good/bad the list is. If not, then we can enhance it with people who do not grant IUIE access, but do grant access to enterprise systems outside the IUIE. Data Stewards should report any changes to Phyllis within the next two weeks.

D7) Merri Beth incidents report – Merri Beth gave an update on security incidents for the past month.

D8) Discussion of Data Dictionary – past work was done on this in 1993. We are not sure if it was ever used or how it might have been used. What we need to discuss is whether we really do need some form of a dictionary with some minimal information in it, and what those minimal data elements might be; and some information about this data (metadata, such as valid values).

At a minimum, we should enhance the KB article on sensitive data. Vince felt that what we need is to get to definitional issues not covered in a traditional data dictionary. Beth noted that there still needs to be a way to tell people the rules for handling sensitive data which could be done in a data dictionary. The roadmap developed in 1993 actually had the technical name, the common name, a definition of what it meant to the University; however, we'll never get to that point. Merri Beth sent a link to a site at Iowa State which provides a different way to deal with the problem.

<http://www.president.iastate.edu/recordsretention/homepage.php> Don suggested that as Data Stewards, we collect the questions. In that way we might come up with a way to define those.

D9) Kevin Keough – audit reports

Action Items

A1) Phyllis will add discussion of international projects and issues as they relate to data to next CDS agenda.

A2) Steve Keucher will work with Dan McDevitt and UITS personnel on the next version of the recommendation to UITS regarding position-based access.