

Committee of Data Stewards

August 3, 2009

Discussion Items

Scott explained the reason for wanting a picture of the CDS; it was decided to postpone this until the next meeting.

Policy Committee

Steve reported on the work being done by Merri Beth and her Standards subgroup. Data Classification was discussed and there was a question raised about University Internal and Restricted. No decisions as yet, but as the Standards are put together these classifications will be further enhanced during the process.

Education/Awareness

Phyllis provided an update on the work of this group in Don's absence. The group discussed the Roles & Responsibilities document that Mark provided and gave feedback on how they thought it might be changed. There was a short discussion of the new wording for the Appropriate Use Agreement and the current Starter Kit language. The group agreed with the suggestions of the UITS User Experience Group for making the document more readable. There was a discussion of how to move forward with the Challenges & Opportunities and the group suggested that Phyllis provide a summary document of the actions taken this year for each of the subgroups. This summary was developed and sent to the Chairs for their input.

Access Provisioning

Dan reported on the agenda for his subgroup which included Mark talking about the Roles & Responsibilities and Challenges & Opportunities. Alan Walsh gave an update on the UITS project from Empowering People Strategic Plan which relates directly to the work of the Role-Based Access committee which Dan has formed.

Dan gave an update on the Business Intelligence Task Force – Dan provided a handout (in OnCourse). Dan is chairing this task force. Dan expects this group will grow and expand as needed. One of the first things they did in partnership with UITS was to have IBM do a current assessment of our current state, and IBM provided a roadmap forward. 125 participants were interviewed from a broad spectrum of the University. This is also part of the Empowering People Strategic Plan. The next steps are to gather feedback and develop the IU specific roadmap or plans for moving forward. Vision, scope, etc. will be developed by the Task Force. They are planning an all-day session sometime in August to take the information provided by IBM and decide how to move forward. They will also look at what other Universities have done and ask people from those places to provide input into the process. Dan's handout provides a lot of information about how this initiative is moving forward. Dan said that there seems to be agreement that we need to move forward on such an initiative but it is not clear what the scope will be.

Vic indicated that we are not talking about technology solutions, but definitions and collaboration of how to deal with data and interpret and analyze it. What is the timing? This is a long-term project. Right now they want to get some sort of roadmap put together to see how they will move forward and how other projects might fit into this one. Vic indicated that we should see some progress toward defining the scope in the near future. Dennis indicated that there are technical constraints with the current technology and getting the IUIE schedule completed each night; Vic indicated that this is partly because of the lack of BI.

Retention/Preservation

Paul reported on the discussions with Rick Jackson on e-mail archiving. The group reiterated the major goals of such a system. One of the major concerns is departmental archives. Rick is taking this information and will ask his engineers to determine how much of this is possible in the new version of Microsoft Outlook. Semantic has a very nice solution, but that is very expensive.

Roles & Responsibilities – took a little different perspective. Felt there was too much responsibility being put on the Data Managers. Feedback was sent to Mark.

Retention Schedules – we will distribute to all Data Stewards asking them to fill out. What advice are you giving external departments about what to keep and how long. If you have a document that departments complete and send in, are you asking them to keep documents, or keeping those centrally. If they need to keep it, tell them how long to keep. Paul noted that one of the items that came out of a different committee he serves on had to do with academic bulletins; the official

repository from the Registrar's perspective is online. So how do we retain the websites, and for how long? ArchiveIT is one means to do this and the IU website is a part of this site.

Beth asked about the Semantic product; it basically is meant to replace the individual .PST files. It also has a way of going through and removing duplicates which is nice. It is very elaborate though. Beth asked about OnBase and how widely it is used; about 30 departments and 1M documents. Lorelei says Purchasing is going to be coming online soon; FMS has had a lot of success with the product and is the biggest user.

Tom reported on Information Disclosure Incidents for Merri Beth. There was nothing to report to State Attorney General.

Kevin reported on audits, one in SPEA. General IT controls for School of Medicine. All audits were yellow which is good; it shows that departments are being more vigilant about handling IT. School of Medicine has a management group but only 9 of 27 departments report to Vince Sheehan; this was pointed out. Next year they will go to the Department of Medicine. Michael Jackson asked if department heads are accepting this report; Kevin says it is not getting pushback, but it went to the Dean. Mostly history and tradition that only 9 departments contract with Vince Sheehan to provide IT services to them. A memo was sent out to the department heads that they were going to start consolidating. Michael asked how to separate out practice data from departmental data. For instance, practice plans? There was discussion regarding virtual networks and virtual firewalls. Dennis indicated that most of the discussion has not been on IT issues, but on compensation issues. Clarian expects that they will run IT services for the Indiana Clinic. As such, that would provide much more stringent rules, such as filtering web access.

Mark forwarded the follow up to the IUIE audit to the CDS; asked that everyone take a look at that. Kathleen noted that she was impressed with the response to that audit.

Action Items

- 1). Phyllis will find out from Alan if the planning document for the Role-Based Access Action Item No. 42 from Empowering People can be made available to the CDS.