



Data Governance Committee Minutes

October 3, 2019

Attendance: Brandon Ray, Wendy Hall, Matt Quirk, Angie Rogers, Marisa Geier, Theresa Stalick, Dani Trimble, Byron Ford, Desiree Gamble, Nichole Seroshek

Discussion

- 1) Revisions to committee membership and proposed co-chair. Wendy explained the two proposed revisions:
 - a. Revise committee membership to include all institutional research associates.
 - b. Propose to have IT Director (or designee) co-chair committee with VP of Effectiveness & College Relations (or designee).

Theresa moved. Byron seconded. Motion passed.

- 2) Data Governance Policy. Wendy shared the proposed policy and explained the need for a policy in place prior to ctclink Go Live.

Dani motioned with the group's changes to the last sentence in the Description section. Theresa seconded. Motion passed.

- 3) Use of Academic Subplan in PeopleSoft
 - a. Nichole explained history of Academic Subplan. It was initially deemed not needed (prior to Guided Pathways). The functionality exists, but not using it in current configuration. Subplans would help us put concentrations in the AA-DTA on the application instead of waiting for advising appointment. If we go with milestones (current configurations), students wouldn't be able to run a "what if" report. If we turn on subplans, then students can run "what if" reports. A con is the concentration would show up on students' transcripts, instead of just saying AA-DTA.
 - b. Dani, thinks it won't be an issue. The only issue is one that currently exists, which is making sure students know what the concentrations mean (it's an advising piece).
 - c. No concerns from the committee about turning on Academic Subplan
 - d. A question from Dani: How difficult is it for students to change their subplan after they've filled out the application? Are there any challenges with changing it? Nichole said it won't be any more cumbersome than changing a student's program.
 - e. Wendy explained that students are not penalized by Financial Aid if moving concentrations within the AA-DTA, and Marisa confirmed that students have never been penalized for changing concentrations in the AA-DTA.

- f. We probably won't have this immediately when we go live, but will eventually. It will enhance the academic advisement piece for students.
 - g. Wendy motioned we recommend that LCC configures academic subplans to be AA-DTA concentrations if given the option. Nichole recommended to include AS-T track 1/track 2, etc. Brandon motioned. Theresa seconded. Motion passed.
- 4) Directory Information in ctclink
- a. Brandon explained this proposal should be in the final stages. They're getting commission feedback and sending a recommendation to the ctclink Steering Committee.
 - b. Brandon served on small state workgroup, and came to majority consensus on seven items as directory information (student's name, major field of study, enrollment status, dates of attendance, participation in recognized sports, degrees, and honors).
 - c. With ctclink, we're on a shared system now; so a standard definition of FERPA directory information is needed. For example, if a student attended two colleges and they had different definitions of Directory Information, one college might release more information that the student would like to have released.
 - d. PeopleSoft allows the ability to put on a FERPA block. The recommendation from the taskforce is to allow either blocking all information or no information (instead of specific items). When the time comes, Brandon mentioned it should be easy to display the FERPA block in Navigate. Until this policy is formally adopted, students can select what pieces of information they want blocked (which is difficult for colleges to manage).
- 5) Data Security
- a. Brandon was in a meeting that discussed recommending having a standard statewide security training, including data security principles. There's discussion around standardizing those practices and making people conscious about the data they use. Brandon thought our group can come up with a best practices list for LCC. Angie put a draft best practices document in the team Google drive for others to contribute. The green highlights are items from Peninsula College and may not apply to LCC.
 - b. Wendy suggested we make a longer best practices document, and then a shorter procedure with the most critical things to do and not to do.
 - c. Desiree explained we need a secure way to communicate. Marisa shared that we need encrypted email that can exchange files.
 - d. Brandon explained that one of the reasons why we're lagging in this a bit is because of the lack of alternative tools.
 - e. Brandon will look into subscription options for LCC having a secure portal. It may be \$2-3 dollars per employee per month. Committee members said a secure portal could save employees a lot of time (eliminating current workarounds), and protect the college from additional liability if hacked/breached.
 - f. Wendy could see different procedures under the Data Governance Policy
 - i. Email
 - ii. Downloading identifiable data
 - iii. Separating them out by function may be a good way to go, so people can find what they need when they need it (instead of going through a long best practices document).

- g. Dani shared that with Navigate you can look at student information wherever you can access a device. People need this information sooner than later.
- h. Wendy stated it would be great if we could get an information exchange system in place before we go live, to help with the transition between systems. Brandon said we should talk more about it. IT is working hard on how to share files with people off campus.
- i. Dani asked, "How do we deal with it as a campus when you receive confidential information from outside the college?" Marisa suggested to set up an automatic reply on all external emails that say something like "Thank you for your email. As a reminder, do not send personal information over email...."
- j. In ctcLink, students will be able to upload documents/attachments.
- k. Brandon: The EU GDPR passed legislation which included the "right to be forgotten." This applies only to business within the EU, but California passed a similar law recently for California citizens. It won't be long before other states, and maybe the federal government, pass similar laws. For example, if someone wants to be removed from the system (email account), we would need to remove it. However, certain records such as academic, criminal, and financial records would still need to be maintained. Generally, we should only keep information we need. The one that concerns Brandon the most is the Food Pantry (all the information collected, how long it's kept, etc.). Dani explained they're keeping it for tracking purposes. Brandon said he's concerned that that's not the information we should be keeping. Brandon: If a student says they want their information removed, ideally we need a process in place that proves we've removed it. Brandon: What are the archival requirement for items? We need a process in place to remove things after the archival requirement has been met. Marisa stated that it's a huge liability to have more than what's required if LCC gets hacked.

Action Items

- 1) We will try to have a short meeting earlier in winter quarter. We can do some of the other exploration on email.
- 2) Brandon will follow up on the directory information and FERPA block discussion.
- 3) Brandon will report back on options for a secure email portal.

Parking Lot

Dani explained that she's on a statewide data governance workgroup that's discussing how to collect sexual orientation and gender identity questions in ctcLink. She will keep us informed. The workgroup is meeting regularly for a couple months to come up with a recommendation. It won't be in place for LCC at Go Live. Nichole said our current data is being converted over as service indicators.