



**University of Kentucky**  
**DATA STEWARDS MEETING**  
**August 20, 2002 11:00am – 12:00 a.m.**  
**132 Funkhouser**

**COMMITTEE:** Data Stewards  
**Presiding:** Connie A. Ray  
**Members Present:** Rex Bailey, Murray Clark, Karen Combs, Ben Crutcher, Zed Day, Liz Demoran, Roger Huston, Marc Mathews, Phyllis Nash, Paul Taylor and Don Witt; **Ex Officio** - Jayna Cheesman, Penny Cox, Jill Esham, Doyle Friskney and Kathy Hamperian  
**Guests:** Nick Arnold, Michelle Bliffen and Mary Ferlan for T. Lynn Williamson; **Email Requirement Committee** – Darwin Allen, Toni Graham, Kathy Johnson, Phil Latiff, Lee Meyer, Sarah Nikirk and John Tibe  
**CC:** Senior Vice President Jack Blanton  
 Vice President Eugene Williams  
**Recorder:** Jayna Cheesman

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome and Introductions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connie welcomed everyone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes of Previous Meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No corrections. July 30, 2002 Minutes are on the web.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly Data Stewards Report: <i>Personnel Resource Allocations</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distributed and a brief overview given.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connie asked “Man-Months” be changed to “Staff-Months” on the report.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PRF Update</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No new PRFs.</li> <li>• Jayna reported the Course Management Data Mart (PRF-00025) requirements development has uncovered numerous data quality problems that will require programming to resolve. Since this PRF has already been approved, she will document these specific data quality programming tasks, but will not create new PRFs for these.</li> <li>• Kathy said we should append the documentation of these tasks to the original PRF.</li> <li>• Marc requested Jayna notify the Stewards if these programming tasks significantly change the original request for the CMDM.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jayna will ensure any individual programming tasks for data quality are appended to the original PRF for a Data Mart.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data Warehouse</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jayna reported there was no consensus in the recommendations she received from</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kathy and Jayna will talk</li> </ul>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Environment (DWE) security	<p>the Data Stewards and Custodians concerning security within the DWE. In general, the business owners prefer the access to be like it currently is in mainframe FOCUS (i.e. based on system, but no value-based security). However, the “end-users” usually prefer the same security as in the online systems (i.e. value-based security).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jayna has asked Mike Carter to survey our benchmarks to see how they are addressing this issue.</li> <li>• Kathy said we need to define a policy on how we handle security in the DWE for users who do not have online access in the source systems.</li> <li>• Penny reported the external auditors recommend using the same security in the DWE as used in the online systems. However, they did not comment on how we should address those users who need access to the DWE, but do not currently have access in the source systems.</li> <li>• Zed indicated we need to consider how HIPAA will affect our security decision if the patient care data is in the DWE. Research, athletics, etc. data may also raise special security considerations. Zed said there is a campus-wide committee to evaluate the ramifications of HIPAA, but they are just getting started. Betsy Hall is the Privacy Officer for HIPAA.</li> <li>• Marc said there is some benefits information in HRS that could be interpreted as an indication of who has a given illness, and thus subject to HIPAA regulations.</li> </ul>	<p>to Betsy Hall about what data needs to be protected from a HIPAA perspective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kathy and Jayna will develop recommendations on security for the DWE for our next meeting.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GASB Phase II Update</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jayna reported Phase I of GASB included the automated production of the institution’s financial statements according to GASB standards, and this is near completion. Phase II of GASB will deal with infrastructure issues, such as automating the execution of jobs through the production schedule, developing a means of purging, archiving and restoring data to the DWE, etc. These tasks will assist in the implementation of other data marts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ad Hoc Space and Scheduling Committee Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connie gave a brief description of this committee and its goals. The recommendations have been sent to Dr. Todd, Dr. Nietzel and Dr. Blanton.</li> <li>• Jayna distributed the document “Recommendations for Classroom Utilization Data Quality Problems”, which was included in the committee’s recommendations. There was a general discussion of the various items.</li> <li>• Phyllis indicated she was not opposed to loading the MC meeting pattern data into SIS, but had been previously told SIS could not handle all of their volume. She asked if SIS could now accommodate all of the Medical Center’s meeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don and Jayna will check with Registrar staff to verify SIS can currently accommodate the MC meeting pattern data.</li> <li>• Jayna will talk to Suzanne Perras about</li> </ul>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>pattern data, as they have numerous meeting patterns for each course. Jayna indicated it was her understanding SIS can accommodate their data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phyllis noted their data is currently in Schedule 25, and asked if their data could be uploaded from that database to SIS. Don indicated Schedule 25 would probably need to be modified in order to do this.</li> <li>• Phyllis asked if we could load data into SIS for rooms used to teach courses, but are not classified as classrooms or class labs. Jayna indicated SIS currently has many such rooms for the courses taught by the Provost's area.</li> <li>• Penny asked if we had/could store information on the condition of the rooms and what equipment is in them. Jayna said she thought there was a flag in the Facilities' room file to indicate the room condition. Nick said there is some data in PPD's database, but it is just for maintenance issues, and cannot be considered the "source/official" data. <b>(NOTE: Jayna subsequently talked to Courtney Higdon about this issue. Courtney said there is a flag on the building file, but not the room file. The condition of the buildings is assessed every other year by the PPD. However, in order to assess progress on one of the current Strategic Indicators, there was an assessment conducted several years ago for a large group of classrooms, and their condition has been evaluated each year. PPD has this data.)</b></li> <li>• Don said there are many people involved in the ownership, scheduling and maintenance of the classrooms/labs, and that this needs to be centralized for the benefit of the institution. Connie indicated the Provost has opened discussion with the deans on this subject.</li> <li>• Phyllis said when the Medical Center centralized the scheduling of their classrooms/labs, they offered to centrally fund any maintenance/renovations of the rooms and to handle any scheduling conflicts in exchange for the ability to centrally control the schedule. She felt this was a good tradeoff for the deans.</li> <li>• Zed said the problem is that space, equipment and scheduling have been seen and handled by different groups on campus, but we need to take an institutional perspective in order to best use our resources.</li> <li>• Marc suggested the Data Stewards draft a recommendation to support the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Space and Scheduling Committee Report. Connie asked for volunteers to draft this recommendation and Don and Jayna volunteered. Connie indicated she would also ask Jack Supplee, since he was</li> </ul>	<p>loading the MC meeting pattern data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jayna will add collection of data on the condition of the classrooms/labs to the Course Management Data Mart requirements.</li> <li>• Connie will ask Jack Supplee to work with Don and Jayna on drafting a recommendation from the Data Stewards supporting centralization of classroom scheduling, etc.</li> <li>• Jayna will talk to Tony Day about the possibility of using the smart classrooms or all classrooms/labs as the pilot project in the Provost's area to use the Medical Center's space and equipment systems.</li> </ul>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>involved in the research space project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jayna told Marc she had received one suggestion to use the smart classrooms or all classrooms/labs as the pilot project in the Provost’s area to use the Medical Center’s space and equipment systems. Don said he thinks this is a good idea.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data Stewards and Custodians evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connie briefly discussed the evaluation results, and the areas she wants to try to improve.</li> <li>Connie asked if anyone would volunteer to work with her on the ARs and our procedures, evaluate where we are “on target” and suggest changes in areas where we got an evaluation of 3.6 or below. Jayna volunteered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data Stewards will let Connie know if they can help Jayna and her evaluate our ARs, etc.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommendations from Email Requirement Committee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members of this committee introduced themselves.</li> <li>Connie reviewed the core recommendations.</li> <li>Zed recommended adding a phrase about “use of email is consistent with UK Computing Use policy.” to <b>Core Recommendation IV</b>.</li> <li>Doyle questioned the second sentence in <b>Core Recommendation II</b>, “The address should be based on the system used by their hiring department.” This will cause problems in automating the creation of an email ID at the time of hire, and if the departmental system were discontinued, then all of those employees would need to be reassigned to another system.</li> <li>Kathy suggested the faculty and staff email IDs should be an “uky.edu” address, as Don has agreed to use for all student email IDs. Doyle said this would be more comprehensive than the original recommendations and easy to set up. Students and employees could then forward their email to another address if they wish. Zed said the email address should be “UK authorized”. Nick asked who would be the responsible agent for granting email access, and Kathy said if we use the “uky.edu” address, we could automate the process based on their assignment activation in HRS. Everyone agreed to remove the second sentence from Core Recommendation II, and do as Doyle and Kathy suggested.</li> <li>Connie asked if there would be a problem with using email as a means of official communication, when some email attachments get rejected for security/virus/size reasons. Doyle said this “rejection” is usually based on the type of the attachment.</li> <li>Murray expressed concern about <b>Implementation Recommendations F and M</b>. He said we need to clarify the difference between using email as a means to distribute information, versus as a means to confirm delivery/receipt of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jayna will make the requested revisions to the recommendations.</li> </ul>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>information. Zed suggested “M” should be changed to “employees who wish to receive an electronic copy of the Open Enrollment information should send an email response”. Several people questioned why the mention of Open Enrollment was part of this recommendation. Jayna indicated the committee wanted to recommend a deadline for the implementation of their recommendations. Phil said the intent of “M” was to provide a test. Jayna said part of the reason for this test was for potential cost savings. The suggestion was made to define the Open Enrollment project as a “pilot” to test the use of email as an official means of communication.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zed expressed concern about the groups of employees who may not use email.</li> <li>• There was a general discussion on how we communicate now.</li> <li>• Zed suggested classifying mail into types. Type A would be email sent to individuals (Benefits type information). Type B would be Official email notifications sent to everyone or large groups of people, and supervisors would need to decide how best to communicate this to their staff.</li> <li>• Liz said there should be a central office designated to control the broadcasts.</li> <li>• Zed said there should be an official distribution list rather than everyone having their own personal lists. Kathy said that John Tibe’s project is heading in this direction.</li> <li>• Mark noted the last part of <b>Implementation Recommendation G</b>, “...and/or inserting documents in paycheck or direct deposit envelopes...” should be deleted, as these are no longer an option with the new print process.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Email ID Requirement Implementation Committee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connie asked for volunteers for the Implementation Committee. Zed recommended Eric McWhorter represent the Medical Center. Nick Arnold and Ben Crutcher volunteered. Kathy Hamperian indicated either she or John Tibe would be on the committee. <b>(NOTE: Jan Bates subsequently contacted Jayna and volunteered for the committee. John Tibe will be the IT representative.)</b></li> <li>• Don said he and Kathy are pursuing the requirement for students to have an email ID. Paul Taylor expressed an interest in this project as well.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jayna will email the Email ID Requirements Committee to see if others wish to participate in the Implementation Committee.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ERP Vendor Presentations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Penny said KPMG is trying to develop a schedule on the ERP vendor presentations that would create an overlap in the HR/FR/SIS demonstrations.</li> <li>• Penny asked if the Stewards felt anyone would want/need to attend all the sessions, and Zed said he felt people should be able to sit in on all the demonstrations if they want. Others agreed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Next Meeting: September 24, 2002, 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon, 132 Funkhouser.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Future meetings will be from 11:00 to 12:00, except for the quarterly joint meetings with the Data Custodians that are 10:00 to 12:00.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li></li></ul>