



AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
Review previous minutes	Jayna apologized for the delay in getting the minutes from 8/14/02 sent out. She asked everyone to please review the minutes from the 8/14/02 meeting as soon as possible, and if there are any changes or corrections, please send them to Deb.
Review Outstanding Action Items	<p>ACTION 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9/11/02 John indicated most of the questions on the survey are program specific questions and he didn't believe any of them were course related. He will review the survey and let Jayna know if any need to be part of the CMDM. • Completed 9/13/02. John reported to Jayna there are no questions that should be in the CMDM. <p>ACTION 6/26/02: Jayna asked members to identify any surveys that may have course related information that needs to be in the data mart to help analyze or improve data analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed 9/11/02. None were received and Jayna feels enough time has passed and feels this task is complete. <p>ACTION 7/3/02: Gary will talk with Connie Ray to see if any benchmark information is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed 9/11/02. Gary feels the External Data listed on the IV Chain i.e., CPE Standards, Delaware Group Study and IPEDS data will be sufficient for benchmark information. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ACTION 9/11/02: Jayna will review CPE Standards for benchmark information for CMDM. ○ ACTION 9/11/02: Jayna will review Delaware Group for benchmark information for CMDM. ○ ACTION 9/11/02: Jayna will review IPEDS data for benchmark information for CMDM. <p>ACTION 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?)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8/20/02 Security was discussed at the Data Stewards Meeting. There was no consensus from the Data Custodians and Stewards on the security requirements. Mike Carter is surveying our benchmarks, so Jayna and Kathy Hamperian can make a recommendation to the Data Stewards at their 9/24/02 meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ACTION 8/20/02: Jayna and Kathy to make a recommendation on security for CMDM to the Data Stewards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 9/11/02 Jayna said she met with the HR Managers on 9/9/02 and they are leaning towards a value based security system, based on department number. They want the SSN and some other fields to be hidden. Jayna said there is no clear consensus on how security for the data mart should be handled. She and Kathy will be meeting to make a recommendation. <p>ACTION 7/17/02: 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Completed 8/15/02. Connie said Jayna should talk with Lu Wang about the College Profile Reports. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ACTION 8/15/02: Jayna will meet with Lu Wang to discuss College Profile Reports. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8/23/02 Jayna had her first meeting with Lu Wang. Many new performance measures have/will be added due to this report. Lu is sending Jayna electronic copies of all report output, and providing additional information on the definition and business rules for the calculation of these statistics. Additional meetings will be required. Additional cross-reference tables will be needed to merge SIS and FRS/HRS data.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 9/11/02 Jayna said she is about 1/3 of the way through the reports she received from Lu. Performance Measures 63 through 80 were added as a result of Jayna's analysis of the reports and others will be added in the future. ▪ 9/11/02 Gary said detailed documentation needs to be included in the data mart definitions. For instance, retention is calculated from Fall to Fall, while enrollment is calculated for Fall only. The statistics need to be defined to tell what time period a measure/data is based on. ○ 9/11/02 Barry Rankin has developed a cross-reference table between FRS and HRS for department, degree programs, and colleges. This table will need to be verified and finished. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACTION 9/11/02: Jayna will set up a meeting with Ruby Watts, Barry Rankin, Tonya Prince and Lu Wang to talk about the cross-reference table and CIP codes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 9/18/02 Email was sent to Alice Porterfield asking her to schedule this meeting. • ACTION 9/11/02: Jayna will talk to Ruby about being responsible for verifying and maintaining the cross-reference table. ▪ 9/11/02 Gary would like the CIP (Classification Instruction Prefix) code to be added to the course level for additional reporting needs. Tonya said the 2 digit CIP is on the course inventory and that the Council on Postsecondary Education does not ask for a more detailed code, at this time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACTION 9/11/02: Jayna will talk with Keith LaVey to see if everything in SIS is being extracted to FOCUS. The 8-digit CIP is required for reports. <p>ACTION 7/17/02: Get copies of surveys from Roger Sugarman:</p> <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) • Completed 8/14/02. Gary said these are available on the IR web site: http://www.uky.edu/IR/ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ACTION 8/14/02: Deb will compile copies of the surveys Roger Sugarman collects and identify pertinent questions for the CMDM. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Completed 8/15/02. The questions identified have been put on a common document available at: http://www.uky.edu/IS/DataAdmin/DOCS/ware/IUUN0012-CourseManagement/CMDMHandouts/IRSurveyQuestions.pdf. Links to the original surveys are imbedded in the document as well. <p>ACTION 7/31/02: Jayna will talk to Connie Ray to see if there is an existing process for calculating faculty/student ratios.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8/15/02 There are none, but Connie will talk to others about this and get back to Jayna. • 9/11/02 John indicated the FTE for faculty and students is not available now. Departments are trying to do these now for self-study reporting. They need to calculate these manually. He said rules for calculating faculty and student FTE need to be developed, so everyone knows how to calculate them and does them the same way. Calculations for graduate and undergraduate FTE are different. CPE used to require FTE. The IPEDS formula is different from what CPE uses and now there is a new calculation recently reported in US News and World Report for calculating FTE. • 9/11/02 Gary said these calculations are for head count and not tied to the course level. Larry Scheurich does the FTE for students, Roger Huston does them for faculty, Ruby does them to estimate tuition and Barry Rankin does

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>them for CPE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9/11/02 John said FTE counts could be required at the department or course level. Outside reviewers of programs often want to know FTE's. It is also used to formulate funding and prove that more teachers are needed. Having a pre-calculated FTE would be beneficial, especially if calculated to match the organizational requirements for different reports. John said the institution needs a clearly stated policy even if the calculations are not pre-calculated. • 9/11/02 Gary said the calculations for student/faculty ratios vary across organizations. Medicine is 1:1, Law is 10:1, etc. • 9/11/02 Jayna asked if there were any targets to indicate if we are too high or too low, what is our target ratio? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ACTION 9/11/02: Jayna will talk to Connie about student/faculty ratios and FTE calculations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 9/18/02 Connie will talk to others about this and let Jayna know. ○ ACTION 9/11/02: Jayna will set up a meeting with Larry, Roger, Ruby and Barry to discuss FTE calculations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 9/18/02 Email sent to Alice Porterfield asking her to schedule this meeting. ○ POLICY DEFINITION 9/11/02: Define calculations for faculty and student (graduate and undergraduate) FTE. <p>ACTION 7/31/02: Jayna will ask Connie Ray for a copy of the latest Delaware Group survey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8/15/02 Connie will locate the latest copy and give it to Jayna. • 9/11/02 Gary said he is working on a report now to submit to the Delaware survey. Jayna asked if he knew where to obtain a copy of the last survey. Gary indicated he thought a prototype was available for reporting because JoLynn had entered the data for it. • Completed 9/17/02. Copy received 9/18/02. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ACTION 9/17/02: Deb will put the Delaware Group study into electronic format and post on the web site. <p>ACTION 7/31/02: Committee members should review Performance Measures 49 through 58 and let Jayna or Deb know if additional sort levels are required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed 9/11/02. Jayna indicated after the College Profile Reports are analyzed and the performance measures are aggregated, we will want to review each group to determine if additional sort characteristics are required for performance measures within each group. <p>ACTION 8/14/02: Jayna will talk to the DBAs about details of Oracle security. Unnecessary. The Data Stewards will set security in the Data Warehouse.</p> <p>ACTION 8/14/02: Jayna will ask the DBAs if they have talked to any benchmarks about DW security.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9/11/02 Mike Carter is surveying our benchmarks, so Jayna and Kathy Hamperian can make a recommendation to the Data Stewards at their 9/24/02 meeting. • Completed 9/17/02. We have only received four responses. <p>ACTION 8/14/02: Jayna will ask Connie Ray about the timing of uploads to HRS for data from the faculty databases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed 8/16/02: Connie agreed these needed to be more frequent. She has a committee exploring the possibility of using the MC Faculty Database campus-wide. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ACTION 8/16/02: Connie will decide how to improve the data quality in the interim period. This relates to the timing of uploads to HRS for data from the faculty databases. <p>ACTION 8/14/02 Jayna will talk to Connie Ray about the timing of the Facilities inventory survey done by Plant Assets Inventory.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8/16/02: Connie agreed this is a concern. She agreed we should pursue using the classrooms as a pilot project for the campus-wide use of the MC Space and Equipment Systems. She suggested Jayna talk to Marc Mathews about this possibility. At the 8/20/02 Data Stewards' meeting, Don Witt and others supported this

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>recommendation, and Marc Mathews told Jayna to talk to Tony Day about the pilot.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9/11/02 Phyllis said the timing of Plant Assets Inventory is tied to CPE reporting dates. The system is shut down for about 3 months, so Courtney Higdon and Patrick Ballard can run various reports, analyze them and re-run as needed. • 9/11/02 Jayna asked Phyllis if she would talk to Tony Day about using classrooms as a pilot in the MC Space database. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ACTION 9/11/02: Phyllis will talk to Tony Day about using classrooms as a pilot in the MC Space database, and ask if he thinks any modifications will need to be made to the MC Space Inventory system or if he foresees any problems. • 9/11/02 Phyllis said she believes UKRF is next in line for having equipment (bar) coded and being added to the MC Equipment database. Wayne Ritchey would be able to verify this. The Medical Center is supposed to have their equipment bar-coded by September 2003. Phyllis indicated there is no reason information for Space inventory can't be collected and started on. • 9/11/02 Suzanne said the individual MC colleges maintain the data. Jayna said a recommendation for a central office to maintain the data has been made by another committee. • 9/11/02 Rooms coded 110 and 210 are bar-coded on the door threshold or hinge. Jayna said a physical inventory of the rooms will need to be undertaken to determine if the room use codes are correct. • 9/11/02 Suzanne indicated about 25% of classes are not taught in traditional classrooms. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ACTION 9/11/02: Jayna will set up a meeting with Nancy Hammond, Hugo Hempel, Phyllis Cooper and Brian (Phyllis's office) to discuss timing of the Facilities Inventory survey and extracts from the system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 9/18/02 Email sent to Alice Portefield asking her to schedule this meeting. ○ ACTION 9/11/02: Jayna will update Connie regarding Space Inventory. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 9/18/02 Completed. <p>ACTION 8/14/02 Nick will see if the version of the PPD classroom file on their web site is the most recent and let Jayna know.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9/11/02 The web site indicates this data has not been updated since 10/97. Jayna has received more recent information from other sources. • 9/11/02 Nick said the information on the web site was a means for PPD to capture snapshots for their own purposes and this is not an official site. Currently the data is being inventoried and entered in a database to replace the static web pages. He will let Jayna know of any updates. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ACTION 9/11/02: Nick will let Jayna know when the version of the PPD classroom file on the web site is updated. <p>ACTION 8/14/02 Jayna will talk to Stores about the smart classroom packages available and what people are currently buying.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed 8/15/02. Deb Claunch talked to Clay Sturgeon at the Computer Store about the smart classroom configurations they are supposed to have for sale. About two years ago there was a 'suggested' handout for a gold, silver and bronze SC configuration. What they found is no one fits these recommendations and they all end up being custom. Various vendor consultants have been used in the past with varying results. Currently, there is a contract with MCSI (Media Consultant System Integrators, local office in Louisville) and the only one Computer Stores will recommend. When someone requests information about a smart classroom purchase, they are referred to this vendor, who comes on site for a quote, and then an order is placed through Computer Store. If a projector is ordered, it is usually ordered separately from another contract for better pricing. MCSI can do

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>everything to get the room set up except installing power. This must be provided by PPD.</p> <p>ACTION 8/14/02 Jayna will talk with Connie Ray about establishing a smart classroom database.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed 8/16/02. Connie approved Data Administration working with others on campus to compile and cleanse this data for the CMDM. This data will subsequently be maintained by a unit designated with that responsibility. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ACTION 8/16/02: Deb Claunch will develop a database for compiling smart classroom information. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 9/11/02 Deb is in the process of reviewing the existing database and comparing other spreadsheets and documents in order to standardize the data, determine what is required and what's nice to have, etc. As more and more rooms become centralized, standards on room conditions, equipment conditions and classifications will be required. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • POLICY DEFINITIONS 9/11/02: Define room conditions, equipment conditions, room classifications and equipment classifications.
<p>Review of issues from the 8/20/02 Data Stewards Meeting</p>	<p><u>Support for recommendations of Ad Hoc Space and Classroom Utilization Committee</u></p> <p><u>Need to attach data quality programming requests to original CMDM PRF</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jayna said the Data Stewards do not want a new PRF for additional programming requests for CMDM, but they do want be able to view and monitor any new requests and costs. • ACTION 9/11/02: Deb will determine the best way to track and convey programming requests for the original CMDM PRF. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Completed 9/13/02. Word documents or email converted to word will be assigned an addendum number and named accordingly. This addendum number and document date will be tracked in the PRF database. The word document(s) will be posted on the web site along with the PRF. <p><u>DW Security</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See above. <p><u>Data on condition of classrooms</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9/11/02 Jayna said Courtney indicated there are condition codes for buildings, but not for rooms. There is a Strategic Indicator to improve classroom conditions, and a large number of classrooms were identified to be analyzed over a period of time. Room condition codes were developed for this purpose only. • Phyllis said the codes are Good, Fair and Poor. • Suzanne said she uses these codes for reports for which she is responsible. (9/12/02 Suzanne sent a memorandum on Classroom and Class Lab Conditions containing the room condition codes, along with spreadsheets for tracking conditions and costs in MC classrooms and labs. Codes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1. Poor – Needs immediate action ○ 2. Fair – Needs upgrade ○ 3. Good – Needs cosmetic work ○ 4. Excellent – Needs nothing • Nick indicated PPD tracks two codes for building conditions and they are different. A subsequent phone call on 9/19/02 to Brian Privett (Plant Assets), confirmed there are two codes in the Space Building Master File. The Building Condition code is used and input by UK. The Building Condition code is the physical status and quality of the building at the time of inventory. The codes are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1. Satisfactory – suitable for continued use with normal maintenance. This code is used for all new buildings entered in the system. ○ 2. Remodeling A – requires restoration but the estimated cost is not greater than 25% of the estimated replacement cost of the building.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3. Remodeling B – requires major update or remodeling and the estimated cost is greater than 25% but less than 50% of the estimated replacement cost of the building. ○ 4. Remodeling C – requires major remodel and total replacement of building systems. The estimated cost is greater than 50% of the estimated replacement cost of the building. ○ 5. Demolition – building should be demolished or abandoned because it is unsafe or structurally unsound. ○ 6. Termination – planned termination of the building or relinquished occupancy of the building for reasons other than un-safeness or soundness. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Maintenance Renovation Code is a formula calculated by CPE based on the Building Condition code. It has been over two years since any data has been received by CPE. • The Building Condition codes are not up-to-date. Plant Assets has no way to tell the condition of the buildings. They rely on other departments to give them the information. Usually this information is supplied by PPD via phone or email. There is no annual reporting required. • ACTION 9/11/02: Deb will check the CPMD web site for room improvement costs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Completed 9/13/02. There is no room improvement costs on the web site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ACTION 9/13/02: Deb talked with Dall Clark in CPMD and will be meeting with Wayne Cowan on September 24th to go over the list of classrooms CPMD has been involved in renovating over the last two and a half years. Discussions will focus on room, seating, infrastructure and equipment conditions and associated costs. • Bill said there was a recommendation from SACS relating to room conditions, but it was worded very broadly and he didn't think there was anything specific enough to use for CMDM. <p><u>Classrooms as pilot project for Provost use of MS Space and Equipment Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See above discussion. <p><u>Email ID Requirement Implementation Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jayna talked about the Email ID Requirement Committee and their purpose. The Data Stewards have recommended that email be required for each faculty member and student. This would help facilitate electronic communication. There are questions as to whether or not this should be implemented at the point of registration or point of admission for students. Once the process is determined, it would become automatic. • Jayna has been asked to put together an Implementation Committee to determine if a procedure(s) can be put in place by January 2003. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Meeting scheduled for 9/30/02. • The Stewards would like to see an uky.edu address, so everyone associated with the University has the same email identifier. Individuals would be permitted to forward email from this account to another account if they choose. • For creation of email lists, the directory would have to identify if a person is a student, faculty member, or staff. • Jayna said this is not entirely a technology issue, but involves process and implementation. People will have to be notified with public relations campaigns and also trained in the new procedures. • Bill said this would help with enrollment in the Blackboard Course Management system. • Jacquie indicated SIS has room for an email ID, but they find students change them too often to keep them updated in the system. Having an official UK email ID would allow them to enter it in the system and use it for communication. • Tonya said to get email lists now, Wanda Dixon or Brenda McCool have to provide a list of students in a course and match it against the current email directory.
Focus on Top 20 Report and SACS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jayna said she talked with Connie, who said to focus on the Top 20 Report and SACS recommendations for any metrics or data that may be pertinent for CMDM. We don't need to worry about the Strategic Indicators at this time.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
recommendations	
Review IV Chain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Measures 63 through 80 were added from Jayna's review of the College Profile Reports. Others will be added as the analysis continues. • POLICY DEFINITION 9/11/02: Define Regular full-time faculty (instruction, research, etc.) • Bill said the Faculty database in the Medical Center has the data for #73-76.
Review Data Sort/Aggregation Spreadsheet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jayna said she added some new sort criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ By Academic Year ○ By Course Activity Type ○ By Meeting Pattern ○ By Meeting Pattern Type <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ACTION 9/11/02: Jayna has asked each committee member to review the data sort/aggregate spreadsheet and let Deb know of any changes that need to be made.
Updates from sub-committees:	<p>Data Needs – no update. Data Quality – no update. Policy/Definitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bill said the issue of cross-listed classes and double counts is not proving as bad as originally thought. • Gary said there are about 300 cross-listed courses. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • POLICY DEFINITION 9/11/02: Definition of enrollment. • ACTION 9/11/02: Jayna will check her notes for PF #75 and 76 to see if 'enrollment' should be changed to 'credit hours'. • Completed 9/23/02. • Reports – not meeting yet.
Review element lists and domain values from SIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
	Meeting adjourned 4.30
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NEXT MEETING: September 25, 2002, 149 ASTeCC