



University of Kentucky
DATA STEWARDS MEETING
September 24, 2002 11:00am – 12:00 a.m.
132 Funkhouser

COMMITTEE: Data Stewards
Presiding: Connie A. Ray
Members Present: Murray Clark, Karen Combs, Ben Crutcher, Liz Demoran, Melissa Huffman, Roger Huston, Angie Martin, Marc Mathews, Phyllis Nash, Jack Supplee, Paul Taylor; T. Lynn Williamson **Ex Officio** - Jayna Cheesman, Zed Day, Jill Esham and Kathy Hamperian
Guests: Michelle Bliffen, Ruby Watts for Don Witt
CC: Senior Vice President Jack Blanton
 Vice President Eugene Williams
Recorder: Jayna Cheesman

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome and Introductions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connie welcomed everyone. • New member – Melissa Huffman from B&E 	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of Previous Meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No corrections. August 20, 2002 minutes are on the web. 	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Handouts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda, Monthly Data Stewards Report, PRF-00030, PRF-00031, Data Warehouse Environment (DWE) Security, draft memo on “Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Space and Classroom Scheduling”, and Data Stewards Faculty Database Workgroup Charter 	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly Data Stewards Report: <i>Personnel Resource Allocations</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distributed and a brief overview given. 	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRF Update 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRF-00030 TA Credentials Screen: Connie explained UK received seven recommendations from the SACS Committee concerning credentials and use of TAs, faculty, and/or part-time faculty. They were most concerned about the credentials, and recommended UK establish a strong central method of monitoring these. Any instructor is supposed to have at least 18 credit hours in a related graduate program in order to qualify to teach an undergraduate course. This PRF is the best way to address this issue within the existing systems. Kathy indicated the programming effort does not appear to be significant, but they will 	•

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>need more detailed specifications before the amount of effort can truly be determined. Jayna indicated Dale Austin would assign a priority to this PRF after we determine the amount of programming effort involved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRF-0031 Alphanumeric Deduction and Benefit Codes: Marc and T. Lynn explained we have reached the maximum number of deduction codes HRS will allow. If we are to offer new health plan options, then the deduction field in HRS must be changed to alphanumeric. Michelle indicated that each health plan takes an average of 15 deduction codes. Marc said he expects this PRF to have a high priority, because it's a "have to do". • The Data Stewards approved both of the above PRFs. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Warehouse Environment (DWE) security 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jayna explained the recommendations she and Kathy developed for the security within the Data Warehouse Environment. Jayna explained that the responses from our benchmarks were as varied as the responses she received from the Data Stewards and Custodians. The online security contains both a screen-level (i.e. which fields can be seen/updated) and a value-based (i.e. which department, account, etc.) aspect. Jayna and Kathy's recommendation is that security within the DWE be based solely on the value-based security. This means that if someone has access to a given department in the online system, they will be able to report on any data attached to that department, even if they cannot see/change that data in the online system. • Ruby explained that core SIS access is restricted by academic unit. An academic unit is a group of academic organizations (i.e. colleges) using similar academic policies (i.e. grading options, programs, etc.). • Recommendation 1: Security for financial aid (FAM) and Student Billing and Receivables will be all or nothing in the DWE. There is no value-based security for these systems. • Recommendation 2: Security for the remainder of SIS will be based on the academic unit security in the online system. • Recommendation 3: Security for the Faculty Effort System (FES), Financial Resource System (FRS) and Human Resource System (HRS) will be based on department number security in the online systems. • Issue: <u>How do we address reporting access for those people who do not need access to the online systems?</u> Kathy indicated our (IT) preference is to keep all the security on the mainframe. Kathy explained this issue and noted the external 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>auditors have historically had a problem with our having IDs on the mainframe with value-based access, but no screen access. The users have no means to access the data online. If we decide to put both the online and DWE security on the mainframe, we would have to add many such IDs for those people who need to report on the data, without requiring online access. For example, many people need to report on their grant accounts, but would never log onto FRS. Marc said the external auditors recently indicated this is ultimately a management decision based on our internal controls, and he thinks we can justify doing this for business processing reasons. If we are willing to allow people to view data in the DWE they can't see online, then it's our decision to make. In this case, it's more efficient to maintain one security system for both the online systems and DWE. Everyone agreed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation 4: Security for both the DWE and online systems will be maintained on the mainframe. Consequently, any users who do not need access to the online system will only have value-based security, and no screen access. • Jill asked how she would get access to report on accounts to which she has no online departmental access. Currently, her FRS access is based on account number and corporate entity, rather than department number. Marc said he would suggest she be given full access to the FRS data for reporting purposes. • Issue: <u>Should we automatically grant employees access to the DWE data, if they have access to the corresponding online system?</u> Kathy explained this would streamline the process to get access to the DWE. Everyone agreed. • Recommendation 5: Any user with online access will automatically be given access to the DWE. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ad Hoc Space and Scheduling Committee Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connie explained why the draft memo was developed to support the data quality recommendations of the "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Space and Classroom Scheduling". This memo was drafted in response to a request at the last Data Stewards' meeting. The three main points of the memo are: 1) support for the recommendations to improve the data quality between SIS and the Facilities files, 2) support for UK to move to an integrated, institutional system, and 3) support for a physical audit and process to ensure data quality is maintained in the Facilities files. • Marc indicated he supported the memo, and Murray reiterated the need for any new institutional system to meet the needs of the entire University community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karen will send Connie and Jayna the official name of the MC space and equipment system. (Completed 9/24/02.) • Connie will modify the draft memo according to the suggestions, and send it to Dr. Todd, Dr. Nietzel, Dr. Holsinger

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zed suggested we add “(i.e. Office of Undergraduate Admissions and Registrar)” after the “...address the issue of centralization” to identify who would be responsible for the centralized scheduling of the Provost’s classrooms. He also suggested we add “and suggest consideration as an alternative, interim system the Medical Center’s eBARS (electronic Bar-coded Assets Resource System)” after “...to implement an integrated Facilities and Equipment database”. Everyone agreed with his suggestions. • Angie indicated Real Properties in Frankfort has a database for space in the public organizations. Eventually, all universities will have to use or interface with their software. She said they are starting small, and are offering the software at a reduced rate to encourage universities to participate. Angie said the CPE and Real Properties have two different systems, but Real Properties is recognized as the official database for the state. • Ruby noted that LCC is still scheduling their own classrooms. 	and Dr. Blanton.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project updates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connie gave an update on the Faculty Database Workgroup. They are focusing on a pilot project within one of the Provost’s colleges. (See handout for additional information.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Meeting: October 29, 2002, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon, 211 Student Center 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the quarterly joint meeting of the Data Stewards and Data Custodians. We will present updates on all the current projects (DWE security, Email ID Requirement Committee, Faculty Database Pilot, etc.), and hopefully, have an ERP update concerning the project charter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •