# Data Governance Committee (DGC) Meeting Notes

**Date: 03/06/2025** 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 |
|  | **Business Affairs Commission (BAC)** | Carie Edmiston | Peninsula College |
|  | **Business Affairs Commission (BAC)** | Linda Schoonmaker | Big Bend Community College |
|  | **Diversity and Equity Officers Commission (DEOC)** | Thalia Vaillancourt | Centralia College |
|  | **Diversity and Equity Officers Commission (DEOC)** | John Hudson | Everett CC |
|  | **Human Resources & Management Commission (HRMC)** | Stephanie Groom | Walla Walla CC |
| x | **Human Resources & Management Commission (HRMC)** | Josh Ernst | Everett Community College |
| x | **Information Technology Commission (ITC)** | Jason Brandon | Shoreline Community College |
| x | **Information Technology Commission (ITC)** | Eva Smith | Edmonds Community College |
| x | **Instruction Commission (IC)** | Teya Viola | Cascadia |
|  | **Instruction Commission (IC)** | Vacant |  |
| x | **Public Information Commission (PIC)** | Katie Rose | SBCTC |
| x | **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 |
| x | **Student Services Commission (WSSSC)** | Steve Ashpole | Bates Technical College |
| x | **Student Services Commission (WSSSC)** | Ruby Hayden | Lake Washington Institute of Technology |
| x | **SBCTC** | Lou Sager – Ex-Officio |  |

# Next Meeting:

Next Meeting is: Thursday, April 3, 2025 - Webex

# Meeting Notes:

**Agenda:**

* Meta-Major
* Data Classification
  + Questions about the selection of members
* Enhancement Requests – Currently In-Flight
  + Student Group for Disability Services (ER #291)
    - Implemented
    - Data Classification subcommittee reviewing the Data Classification level for the new student group
  + Pronouns in CS (ER #27 4 of 5)
    - ETA within the next 2 weeks
  + SOGI and Pronoun description updates (ER# 27 5 of 5)
    - Phase I (Adding new values)
      * ETA within the next week or two
* Student Self-Service Questions (ER #232)
  + Postponed until Summer 2025
* Enhancement Requests – in the Queue
  + Updating tribal ethnicities to federally recognized tribes (ER# ?)
  + Pronoun Usage (ER #27 3 of 5)
  + Name Proposal (ER #257)
  + Course Modality Helper Text (ER #259 2 of 2)
  + SOGI and Pronoun description updates (ER #27 5 of 5)
  + Updating Descriptions
* Study Abroad request
  + Identify classes with location code?
  + Or Identify students with student group?

Meta-Major

Reworking MM to develop a prototype for implementation using the requirements feedback and write a proposal based on that. Will we have to agree on global MM coding? No, still local definition for MM with a global way to manage them through ctcLink. What is the benefit of having MM for the student and what are we trying to solve having it in ctcLink? Having MM in ctcLink allows for those values to be in the data warehouse. This will be necessary because system level reporting requirements are due in 2029. The other importance of having MM in ctcLink is any student success software will be able to utilize the values. Checking in with leadership at the State Board (Grant and Joyce) the response was having MM in ctcLink is still a priority. There remains a question about how to roll-up/aggregate to system level values. A meeting with Carmen and a few colleges is ongoing as she pilots a proposed solutioned. Once the solution seems viable for the few colleges a proposal will be written for the DGC and go out to commissions for feedback. Add Renton Tech. to the colleges in the pilot. A question was asked about students and their interaction with pathways, because all colleges have established pathways, students will have to acclimate to the pathways at the college they are enrolled in.

Data Classification

The subcommittee met 3 or 4 times. A few members of the subcommittee are not part of any commission. These members are part of the subcommittee but are not on the commission itself. Discussion regarding whether it should be mandatory to have commission representation. It was suggested that at least one member from the commission level should be required for subcommittees. It was also suggested that others should be allowed to participate in the subcommittee.

Enhancement Requests – In Flight

Enhancement requests go through an extensive process for implementation. A change was made to identify “quick win” enhancement. These are enhancements that are configuration changes only. The idea is to move these requests quickly since they don’t require ctcLink modifications and are…. A quick win to get the request off the list.

*Student Group Disabilities*

Phase 1 implementation has been completed. The next phase involves removing diagnosis data and security roles associated with that data now that student groups are established. A consideration is the handling of Category 4 data, specifically regarding student groups. The student group designation is a binary "yes" or "no" value so is it still category 4? The problem is that students’ groups are not a table column, such as social security number, where the column itself is category 4 but rather the student group VALUE is category 4. The DSS council would classify the student group for disability as a category 4 data element. The data classification committee is looking into this and Carmen will reach out to the DSS council for more conversation.

*Implement Pronoun in CS*

This is now a configuration request since the functionality is now delivered as part of ctcLink when at the creation of the enhancement request it would have been a true enhancement. It mimics what has always been in HCM.

*SOGI and Pronoun descriptions*

The democomm committee ensures the data is current and accurately reflects appropriate language.

The latest updates are a two-part process. Creating new definitions and rewording values of existing definitions. The value configuration is considered a ‘quick win’ therefore that will happen in the next couple of weeks. The new descriptions is not considered ‘quick win’ because it’s on a tool tip and not a simple configuration. There is not an ETA on this part.

*Student self-service questions*

Postponing until Summer 2025.

Enhancement Requests – In the Queue

The list in the agenda are all enhancement requests that DGC had their hands on and are not part of the quick win, semi-immediate implementation.

Study Abroad

There is an ongoing conversation about college classes abroad or students who travel abroad. When students register, are they aware they are registering for a study abroad class? The international consortium which the colleges participate in, engage with the companies that organize study abroad opportunities. We talked about what problem we are trying to solve, with a voice that colleges are generally perceived to be handling study broad identification effectively. There was discussion about the need for global code other than ‘off-site’ (for location) or should colleges have their own local codes if the need arises. The international consortium has requested more robust coding for study abroad programs. Identify classes with location code? Create a global code? Eva will lead a conversation with Lou and Teya and her team to explore the issue further. This may not be a top priority but keep this on the DGC list.

*Other*

New request to store HS SSID in ctcLink. We store this data for running start students. Where should be store other SSID’s? External ID? How would we collect this data? What is the purpose for collecting the data ad what are the risks? Clarify these questions before reaching out to OSPI or ERDC. Carmen and Summer will begin a discussion.

Voting

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

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

* N/A