# Data Governance Committee (DGC) Meeting Notes

**Date: 10/5/2023** Phone/Webex; 10:30am

Information about DGC:   <https://www.sbctc.edu/colleges-staff/commissions-councils/dgc>

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attended | Commission | Name | College |
| X | **Co-chairs (SBCTC)** | Carmen McKenzie | SBCTC |
| X | **Co-chairs (RPC)** | Jennifer Tuia | South Puget Sound CC |
| X | **Business Affairs Commission (BAC)** | Carie Edmiston | Peninsula College |
| X | **Business Affairs Commission (BAC)** | Linda Schoonmaker | Big Bend Community College |
|  | **Diversity and Equity Officers Commission (DEOC)** | Consuelo Grier | Bellevue College |
| X | **Diversity and Equity Officers Commission (DEOC)** | Jennifer Wade | Olympic College |
|  | **Human Resources & Management Commission (HRMC)** | Brook Marshall | Walla Walla CC |
|  | **Human Resources & Management Commission (HRMC)** | Josh Ernst | Everett Community College |
|  | **Information Technology Commission (ITC)** | Vacant | Replace for Brandon |
| X | **Information Technology Commission (ITC)** | Eva Smith | Edmonds Community College |
|  | **Instruction Commission (IC)** | Heidi Ypma | Bellingham Technical College |
|  | **Instruction Commission (IC)** | Vacant | Replace for Wendy |
| X | **Public Information Commission (PIC)** | Katie Rose | SBCTC |
|  | **Public Information Commission (PIC)** | Sherry Nelson | SBCTC |
| X | **Research and Planning Commission (RPC)** | Summer Kenesson / Diana Knight | SBCTC |
| X | **Research and Planning Commission (RPC)** | Lia Homeister | Renton Technical College |
|  | **Student Services Commission (WSSSC)** | Steve Ashpole | Bates Technical College |
| X | **Student Services Commission (WSSSC)** | Ruby Hayden | Lake Washington Institute of Technology |

# Next Meeting:

Next Meeting is: 11-16-2023, 10:30 am

# Meeting Notes:

**Agenda:**

* Status Updates for Approved Proposals
  + Self-Service Questions
* New one-pager for DGC process
* New Proposals
  + Course Modality Proposal
    - Review and Discuss
    - Ready to send out for system feedback?
  + Continuing Education
    - Review and Discuss
* Review System Feedback
  + DemoCom Diagnosis Codes
    - CS Support feedback/questions
    - Ready to vote?
  + Name
    - Ready to vote?

Proposal Update

*Self-Service Questions*: The proposal was presented to the college collaboration group. The feedback received aligned with the feedback received from the commissions. There was concern about the language on some of the questions but Carmen explained that those concerns were reviewed and the language required by the Perkins grant is precise and there wasn’t any room to alter the questions. This proposal is now moving to the working group for review.

DGC One-pager: Carmen takes DGC proposals to many committees and the process for DGC proposal approval is repeated frequently. Carmen will create a document to use as a reference for explaining the DGC proposal process. Carmen is also going to review the DGC website for ease of use because the site is receiving more traffic as more proposals come through.

New Proposals:

*Course Modality*: Course modality is made up of different data points (facility ID, meeting pattern, class start/end times, and Instruction mode). Instruction mode is the main focus of this work. The committee had a lot conversation around class fee structures, reporting, financial aid, student perception and how it relates to course modality. It’s really about instruction mode. Many elements of course modality is defined at the college level such as facility id and meeting patterns. Instruction mode is defined at the system level. Moving forward, if a guidance document of how to use course modality is necessary that would be generated by individual colleges because of the local definitions of the other course modality components outside of instruction mode. Covid surfaced the need to re-evaluate instruction mode (formerly called distance ed codes in Legacy) definitions. The last update to instruction mode codes was 2010. Carmen went over the proposed code changes and updates (pg. 6 in the proposal). The code for online has the most changes and has 4 different categories. Self-paced is included, the committee wanted this code. This is not competency-based education but rather more like a correspondence course. The proposal was presented at IC in Draft form to ensure there weren’t any obvious issues or concerns. IC supports the proposal and looks forward to the system generated feedback. There was considerable discussion regarding the timeline. The proposal time line (23-24 development year/24-25 implementation) is aggressive. The alternative is pushing the implementation to the 25-26 academic year. There was discussion how the instruction mode changes will affect faculty negotiations and how college staff are building class schedules by the year due to guided pathways as oppose to quarter-by-quarter prior to the system implementation of guided pathways. A delay will ensure there is plenty of time for union notification and be easier for college staff who are responsible for class scheduling. However, the current definitions of instruction mode continue to be confusing for students. Pushing the timeline does a disservice to students and how they experience college. Carmen will add a statement in the proposal regarding the reasoning for the aggressive timeline. We expect a lot of feedback on this proposal. Jennifer will send out an email template to DGC for commission feedback.

*Continuing Education*: There is no academic structural changes. Coding is already in place to track what is needed for reporting. Carmen went over the proposal which is mostly completed by Data Services. A CE coding manual will be developed and the college CE divisions are to align their practices to this manual. Jennifer will send out an email template to DGC for commission feedback.

Pending Proposals:

*Disability Diagnosis Codes*: BAC and ITC will discuss this proposal at their commission meeting next week. The other commissions didn’t have feedback. CS Support had a significant amount of feedback. Carmen went over their feedback. The decision was made for Carmen, Ruby, and Monica to meet with CS Support and go over the feedback in detail to determine what is possible, realistic, and what items need clarification. The current proposal states that local disability offices are tracking category four disability data and the need to ensure security of this data. This is to highlight what is currently happening, the proposal is not initializing the activity of storing data locally. Feedback from the ITC commission will be welcome. On another note, disability information is also sometimes documented in advisor notes. This should also be protected to ensure FERPA compliance and may open up other discussions about what is documented in advising notes. A question regarding historical records was raised and this would be a big lift to update historical records, more work is needed around the process for that. In summary, this proposal is not ready for a DGC vote. DGC needs feedback from ITC and BAC, a meeting with CS Support needs to happen, and the historical data issue needs evaluated. Carmen will update the November agenda to include more discussion and if we are ready for a vote. Another person brought up the idea of eliminating a page that wasn’t in use by the disability office. This request is “would be nice to have” as oppose to an obstacle of the proposal. However, this is out of the scope of the original proposal because ultimately the proposal is about configuration changes and complete elimination of a page is an enhancement request. Carmen will notify this person to submit an enhancement request.

*Name Enhancement:* The proposal went out and there was not any feedback by the commissions. As noted above, BAC and ITC are meeting next week. One question that arose is when changing preferred name to chosen names, is this the value within the field or is it a column name (label name) change? Carmen stated, according to CS Support there is a drop-down configuration that changes the from primary to chosen and is just changing the description. The labels on pages, in CS, it’s also just a configuration change and change for the configuration description. However, at this point in time an impact analysis has not been completed. In HCM, this would be a modification to pages and the impact is unknown and finance hasn’t been evaluated either regarding how primary name and chose name will work.

Therefore, there is analysis that is necessary to detail the exact impact of how this change will work. The proposal itself sounds reasonable. A vote by DGC will take place to move the proposal forward so once the impact analysis is complete, if there are no concerns it can move directly to presentation at the working group. Once the impact study is done, it may result in elaborate modifications or the proposal might come back to DGC with concerns once the impact analysis is complete.

No Updates

* ITC and IC vacancies
* *Best Practices for EMPLID:*

# Voting

Only decisions regarding coding require a vote. Nine votes representing seven commissions and one State Board will vote. Voting shall be approved by two-thirds (or 6) votes.

**Data Governors to do/Things to remember:**

* Meet with Jen about EMPLID
* Launch meta-major discussion within ctcLink