



ATTENDEES: Janet Baynham, Mike Cantrell, Jayna Cheesman, Debra Claunch, Becky Harp, Courtney Higdon, Gary Lindle, Tonya Prince, Ruby Watts

PRESIDING: Jayna Cheesman

PROJECT COORDINATOR: Jayna Cheesman, Kathy Hamperian

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty/Student Ratio 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jayna asked Gary how multiple instructors in one course are handled, how faculty/student ratios are figured, when it was appropriate to 'double count' instructor hours, etc. Gary indicated he doesn't do any faculty/student ratios for the reporting he does. He suggested contacting Roger Huston, or Larry Scheurich. As far as he knows, they do an FTE ratio, which is not the same as the faculty/student ratio. ACTION: Jayna will talk to Connie Ray to see if there is an existing process for calculating faculty/student ratios.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review previous minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACTION: Committee members are to review the minutes from 7/17/02 and let Deb know of any changes as soon as possible.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Outstanding Action Items 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6/26/02 Tonya will check the source of the data she used for a recent presentation on course demand. (No change in status). 6/26/02 John will check the A&S College Senior Survey to see if there is any course related data which needs to be in the data mart. (No change in status). 6/26/02 Jayna asked members to identify any surveys which may have course related information that needs to be in the data mart to help analyze or improve data analysis. (None have been received. No change in status). 7/3/02 Gary will talk with Connie Ray to see if any benchmark information is required. (No change in status). 7/3/02 Jayna will talk with Connie Ray about security and how far down and to who it should be authorized. Can it be handled by views (SIS/HRS/FRS?) (Security for the Data Warehouse Environment was discussed, at the 7/30/02 Data Stewards Meeting. Jayna asked all the Data Custodians and Stewards to send her recommendations on these security requirements by 8/7/02. So far, most people feel the security of the data mart/warehouse should mimic the security of the source system. Jayna asked everyone to provide feedback by Wednesday, August 7, 2002 regarding how security for CMDM should be set up). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jayna said there would be instances where someone would need to report on data when they did not have access to the data online. She said she thought we could set people up in the online systems for the value-based security, but not give them access to any screens. Mike indicated they were able to set up this type of security in IDMS, but the auditors did not want this. Jayna said it may be hard to cost justify 'value based' security for a reporting environment. If a person signs a security release, they should be held accountable for their actions if they misuse or abuse the system. Tonya asked if a person is given access to student views in the data warehouse, would they have access to all areas of the warehouse. Jayna said this is not the case, and security for HRS, SIS and FRS could be different. Ruby said SIS security is based on screen views. There is also some security at the academic unit level which is a value-based security. This can be applied at the college level as well, but is not at the present time.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7/3/02 Janet will send Jayna and Mike Cantrell a list of people currently receiving the CDR reports. (7/31/02 Mike Cantrell requested that a copy of the CDR reports be sent to him as well.) • 7/3/02 Jayna will check with Purchasing to see if there is a model for coding equipment. (7/31/02 Deb indicated there is a Federal Classification Code used for coding equipment and supplies, but it does not go to the 'brand name' level. She is not sure if Purchasing is currently coding equipment and supplies.) • 7/3/02 Jayna will talk with Mark Denomme about the 'packages' being defined for smart classrooms. (Jayna met with Mark on 8/1/02, and will provide information at the next CMDM meeting). • 7/17/02 Jayna will talk to Bill Pfeifle about chairing the Policy/Definitions Sub-Committee. (Completed 7/22/02). • 7/17/02 ACTION: Jayna will talk with Connie Ray about the College Profile Reports and whether or not information from these needs to be in the data mart. (On 7/19/02, Connie suggested Jayna contact Lu Wang about this. 7/31/02 No change in status.) • 7/17/02 : Get copies of surveys from Roger Sugarman: (7/31/02 No change in status). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (1) Graduating Senior Survey – questions 14, 16 and 33 (done annually) The Graduating Senior Survey has college information. ○ (2) Undergraduate Alumni Survey – question 1e (done biannually) ○ (3) Graduate Alumni Survey – questions II-8 and II-9 (done biannually) ○ (4) Freshman Survey – will add question about course availability (done at beginning and end of each academic year)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Issues/Data List 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Issues/Data List has been replaced with the Tickler and Summary Lists. ▪ Jayna explained the ticklers are running lists of items pulled from the minutes of the committee and sub-committees. Each item on the ticklers should end up on the corresponding Summary list. The information contained in the summary documents will become part of the CMDM Requirements document, and should contain complete and 'English' explanation of items on the Tickler Lists. ▪ Ticklers and Summaries will be updated and posted on the CMDM web site as Deb receives copies of the minutes from each committee. ▪ Items identified in meetings that belong on any of these lists, should be marked as such in the minutes so the lists can be updated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CMDM Action Items: a list of all action items assigned at the various meetings. Those in 'gray' are completed. ▪ CMDM Data Needs Tickler: a checklist to identify all systems and elements needed for extracts. ▪ CMDM Data Needs Summary: identifies all elements needed for extracts, the system table and screen(s), description of each element, corresponding elements in other systems, etc. ▪ CMDM Data Quality Tickler: a checklist to identify data quality issues raised in the meetings. ▪ CMDM Data Quality Summary: detailed description of each DQ issue, recommendations for resolution of problems and when they should be done (i.e., in source system, during load to Data Warehouse, etc.), time and cost estimates, and risks. ▪ CMDM Policy/Definitions Tickler: a checklist of definitions and policy issues raised during the meetings. ▪ CMDM Policy/Definitions Summary: a detailed description of existing definitions or policies, and the impact they have on the CMDM implementation. ▪ CMDM Reports Tickler: a checklist of reports identified during the meeting. ▪ CMDM Reports Summary: detailed list of reports needed. This should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reconciliation Reports – used to reconcile the source data with data in the data warehouse. ▪ User Reports – pre-defined reports. The Performance Measures should be referenced when defining these. ▪ Data Quality Reports – reports to check the quality of the data.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Operational Reports – reports that need to be converted. Jayna indicated these may be part of the Web FOCUS conversion. ▪ CMDM Business Rules Tickler: a checklist of business rules identified during meetings. ▪ CMDM Business Rules Summary: Jayna explained the Business Rules will be based on items identified in the lists above and will help the technical people in creating the records for the data mart. There will be business rules that apply before, during and after loading the data. Business Rules include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extraction logic, to include which is the official source of data stored in multiple places, missing data and referential integrity rules, i.e., if A equals X and B equals Y, then C has to be equal to Z, etc. ▪ Evaluating data quality ▪ Calculated Elements – rules to follow for calculations (contact hours), summary statistics (handling duplicate records), etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review IV Chain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jayna said Performance Measures 49 through 58 were added by her from her review of the Course Demand Reports. ▪ Jayna asked if Performance Measures should be added for the number by Activity Type and also Activity Type by Delivery Mode. ▪ ADD Performance Measure #59: # courses by activity type ▪ ADD Performance Measure #60: # and % change by term type of courses by activity type ▪ ADD Performance Measure #61: # courses by activity type and level of course (i.e., graduate, undergraduate, professional, etc.) ▪ ADD Performance Measure #62: # and % change by term type of courses by activity type and level of course. ▪ Gary said the Delaware Group tracks benchmark information. Only information regarding Arts & Sciences was submitted, but we plan on doing the rest of the institution. ▪ ACTION: Jayna will ask Connie Ray for a copy of the latest survey. ▪ Gary believes Barry Rankin produces a report for course sections by course level, but it is not based on activity type. ▪ Jayna said data for the Performance Measures will be pre-calculated in the data mart to improve performance of the system.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Data Sort/Aggregation Spreadsheet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jayna said Performance Measures 49 through 58 were added to the spreadsheet and sorted according to the order they are in now in the Course Demand Reports. ▪ ACTION: Committee members should review PM's 49 through 58 and let Jayna or Deb know if additional sort levels are required. ▪ Janet said it would be helpful if users could see the meeting pattern and location of the open sections. ▪ DATA NEED: The data mart should provide the ability to drill down to the detail records behind any summary statistic, including meeting pattern data on open sections. ▪ Jayna asked the committee to start assigning the Snapshots required for each Performance Measure. ▪ Ruby mentioned some departments build courses after the Schedule Book is printed and this contributes to a lot of courses showing TBA for the instructor. There is also a lot of data missing in the system for early snapshots to be effective. ▪ Tonya said faculty information is often not in the system until two (2) weeks after the last day to add a course. ▪ Mike suggested maybe all data from SIS should be extracted. Flags could be applied for missing data. Disk space is cheaper than time spent changing extracts in the future. Jayna said extract programming would be easier if we extract all the required data each time. ▪ SNAPSHOTS: Each of the snapshots listed on the spreadsheet will be taken for each Performance Measure listed, as applicable.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updates from Sub- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data Quality Sub-Committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ruby indicated he may have a fix for the data quality problem of matching the course meeting pattern and instructor with the

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
Committees	<p>activity type. There is a two-character field on the Course Meeting record (IARRCRMT) that could be used to indicate activity type, and also filler. To link the instructor (IARRCIC) with activity type, we would need to use the filler. Ruby said Jacquie Hager would be willing to monitor this data from a point-in-time and forward. Ruby said the code could include a reflection of what formula should be used to calculate credit hours from contact hours. Jayna asked for what term this could be implemented. Ruby thinks maybe the Spring Term.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ACTION from DQ meeting: Mike Cantrell will talk with Pinnacle and other IDMS schools to see how they are handling this and make a recommendation. ▪ ACTION: If feasible, Ruby will submit a PRF (Project Request Form). ▪ POLICY ISSUE: Is there an official University rule on how instructor percentages are assigned? ▪ DATA QUALITY ISSUE: How should historical data be handled since it will not have the data to connect meeting patterns and instructors to activity type. ▪ Data Needs Sub-Committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jayna indicated the committee had met once and had focused on identifying elements in SIS. ▪ Right now we are waiting on the metadata to be updated so reports can be generated and comparisons made. ▪ DATA NEED: The sub-committee needs to look at HRS elements for faculty, and Facilities information. ▪ Hugo sent the logic for the room coding in the Medical Center system.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jayna said KPMG (consultant) sees the data warehouse as the first part of an ERP implementation, and that data cleansing is about 20% - 30% of the effort and cost of an ERP implementation. ▪ Jayna said data quality problems also need to address where the data will be fixed. Should it be fixed at the source, after it is extracted and before it is loaded to the warehouse, or after it is in the warehouse?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review element lists & domain values from SIS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Carried Forward
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NOTE: All documents will be posted to the web site as soon as possible. In the future, only the Agenda will be provided at meetings.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ August 14, 2002, 149 ASTeCC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪