Data Management Committee
Meeting minutes for Oct. 14, 2010, 2:00 – 3:30 p.m.
Suzzallo Library 5th Floor Conference Room


Recorder: Kerry Kuenzi (Office of Planning & Budgeting)

(Note: There were four handouts distributed at this meeting. These handouts have been scanned and are included at the end of these minutes, with handout designation number located in the upper right corner of the first page of each handout.)

Todd called the meeting to order shortly after 2:00 p.m. and began by inviting members around the table to introduce themselves, stating name and position.

Decision Support Services Update:

Anja introduced the first item on the agenda, providing an overview of the Decision Support Services group’s 2010 accomplishments, 2011 goals and objectives, and running metrics in graphical form (see Handout #1). As Anja spoke about UW hosting the Higher Education Data Warehousing conference (April 3-5, 2011), Todd inquired about whether UW’s DMC is considered “ahead of the curve” compared to peers. Anja replied that others consider us to have strengths in the areas of data access, controls and security, as well as data governance and policies.

Discussion around the Enterprise Data Warehouse (EDW) led to a request to include the EDW URL in the minutes: https://www.washington.edu/uwit/im/ds/mailto/access.html

As Anja reviewed the graphical metrics included on the second page of her handout, discussion was focused on the distribution of reports in production (those developed by Decision Support Services, those developed by Information Management, and those developed outside of UW IT). It was acknowledged that while there has been some distributed development, the vision is to achieve a much higher level of distributed report development. Dan inquired about the benefits to him at Bothell for contributing reports, given the related obligation to staff and support any contributed reports. This led to the acknowledgment that we need a more robust tiered support function complete with a central help desk.

Walt stated that the standards associated with operating a small data mart (such as the one developed for Advancement) are different, and the associated training component could not be understated. Todd inquired about the verification/data cleansing functions, and the response was that we are not yet sure where the data cleansing function will reside. Brandon emphasized the need to audit data quality out of the source system.

Anja spoke to the four additional staff members to be hired by December 2010 (technical data warehouse architect, metadata manager, test lead and design lead), and in response to Bill Y.’s recommendation that these positions be outward looking, stated that the meta data manager and test lead are definitely outward looking. Anja mentioned that three additional positions were identified but not yet funded (business intelligence engineer, data warehouse trainer and business analyst).

Todd invited us to take a moment to acknowledge what has been accomplished thus far, and to celebrate the successes, due in part to DMC.
Transfer Detail Report

Dinah introduced a new transfer detail reporting need, and shared the business case, data access considerations, and security considerations (see Handout #2). It was generally agreed that the security risks would be minimal, limited to the “student data only” population, and inclusive of data considered to be accessible via public records requests. In response to an inquiry from Walt, Dinah indicated that this report would provide significant efficiencies, allowing users to pull all transfers at once rather than drilling down one at a time. Dinah also pointed out that “once we get single sign on, this problem will go away.” Bill inquired about format, and Dinah replied that it was not pretty, adding that this expense transfer data set is small.

Anja invited the group to recognize that, though beneficial to many, this effort would leverage the data warehouse on a transactional level rather than on the business intelligence level, that approving this report investment would result in operational rather than analytical results.

Todd invited the group to reach a decision about allowing this development to proceed. Kirk recommended that the group support this transfer detail report effort, and the decision to support was unanimous.

Academic Advisory Group For Enterprise Reporting (AAG4ER) and Unit Resource Profile (URP):

The next topic addressed challenges associated with the “Multiple Org Code Association Problem” (see Handout #3). The sub team has prioritized financial data as the top priority, six new fields have been added to FAS, and the next efforts will go toward addressing the development of business rules for these fields. Dinah will analyze (with Carol’s help) existing rules in PNBDB, Mary Clark will work with department administrators to determine other contexts where we need multiple org codes, and eventually the proposed guidelines/scheme will be submitted to DMC for approval before changes are implemented.

Todd is working on the Unit Resource Profiles (URPs), and stated that he will be working to uncover inconsistencies, to align with Activity Based Budgeting efforts, to understand how URP processes differ from the methods academic units use to gather data, and to bring greater consistency in definitions/calculations used so as to improve the URP process.

Brandon asked if we could meet these ends outside of the FAS system. There was some discussion about the tradeoffs between effort going into FAS changes and the amount of dispersed effort going into addressing the multiple org code issue outside of FAS. There was a question raised about having a FAS representative included on the sub-team addressing this issue. The topic was closed with a statement that DMC will look forward to hearing reports back on this effort at future meetings.

DMC Education and Communications Task Force Proposal

Melissa shared a draft proposal calling for the formation of an Education and Communications Task Force to coordinate communications/educational efforts about the DMC, related task forces, and best practices for data management at UW (see Handout #4). The handout outlines the goal, objectives, phase 1 action plan, timeline, proposed team members, initial plan and immediate projects.

Members of DMC discussed elements of the proposal. Todd proposed Melissa be identified as chair (Kirk supported this), and Virjean agreed that she would support Matthew Saavedra’s involvement. Anja inquired about the
communications and training “boundaries” of this effort, and it was agreed these would be blurred to begin with and become increasingly clear over time. Melissa spoke to possible development of online training with quizzes, videos, etc. that would meet both communications and training objectives. Bill proposed that we invest in communicating about data management policy, security, privacy issues, etc.

Todd called to question the DMC’s willingness to endorse formation of this task force, and the group supported this unanimously.

**DMC Task Force Updates**

**Access and Roles:**

Rupert reported that they are implementing the latest matrix changes that had been approved, and are hoping to complete these by the end of October, with a schedule to implement after the upcoming student org change. They hope to delegate roles out via ASTRA during November.

**Enterprise Reporting Groups**

Student Enterprise Reporting Group announced that Carol Diem has joined the group, and the group is now working on student financial aid data. The group has identified roles/access to data fields, possible reports, and has begun to identify needs for metadata and data definitions. Carol emphasized that financial aid data is complicated and will require a strong educational effort.

DMC concluded at 3:27 p.m.

Please let me know if you have suggested modifications or additions to these minutes.

Thanks and regards,

Kerry

Kerry Kuenzi
206-616-0201
kkuenzi@uw.edu
(A) Decision Support Services FY 2010 Highlights

Program Planning & Execution
- Connect EDW Assessment report validates key DSS strategies and approaches
- iStrategy product assessment confirms robustness of in-house plans / solutions
- UW set to host Higher Education Data Warehousing conference April 3-5, 2011
- Introduced foundational functional roles / competencies according to SDLC

Information Infrastructure
- Doubled ETL job volume while daily total processing times remain same
- Released v2 security tools - making security metadata application more intuitive; back-end DBs faster; enabling metadata testing prior to release
- Upgraded full suite of BI tools to SQL Server 2008

Information Design
- Set the stage for analytical data warehouse design through enterprise architecture principles: (A) first conceptual data model across UW as a start on common UW terms, facts, rules; (B) central modeling tool for sharing data models across silos; (C) data modeling guidelines for consistency

Information Delivery
- Produced DS website as central point for access to UW discipline – user-friendly access to data warehouse, reports, information
- Tripled report volume, and produced two cubes – expanding BI strategy
- Increased data volume by about 25% - new Finance and Advancements marts

(B) Decision Support Services FY 2011 Objectives

Program Planning & Execution
- Staff up team by 4 FTE by December 2010 (+3 FTE by December 2011): Data Warehouse Technical Architect; Metadata Manager; ETL Lead; Test Lead

Information Design & Infrastructure
- Implement first integrated, dimensional data warehouse – by establish EDW as single source of information for Office of Planning & Budgeting

Information Delivery
- Support UWSDB Retirement project
- Support Enterprise Reporting
- Implement tiered production support (with UW IT Helpdesk and other units)
**Executive Summary**

This report displays the available detail associated with a transfer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>EID</th>
<th>Original Transaction</th>
<th>Original Amount</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Position Number</th>
<th>Account Code</th>
<th>Job Class</th>
<th>Earn Type</th>
<th>Pay Period End Date</th>
<th>Earned Pay Period End Date</th>
<th>Transaction Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Reason For Transfer:** Partial transfer of a phone and supply expense from one Financial Desktop project budget to another.

**Late Transfer Reason:** Transfer date is greater than 120 because the problem was not caught until the end of November and the RST process was on hold until Financial Desktop RST procedure was online.

**Benefit to Budget:** Salary for RA appointment working on ICT4D.

---

Report Information

Parameters: OrgCode: 2080507, BudgetTypes: 01-25, 05-16.

Error: Subreport could not be shown.
Business Case:

1. Users have expressed a business need to be able to drill to transfer detail from EDW reports for auditing purposes. (See attached prototype report.)
2. The ‘Reason for Transfer’, ‘Late Transfer Reason’, & ‘Benefit to Budget’ fields are necessary to be able to explain the business logic behind each transfer.

Data Access Considerations:

1. Existing Reports Use FDITrx Service Account
   Existing reports (FAS Batch Summary, MyFD Expense Transfer Volume Report) use a single service account for runtime access of data in the MyFD database. They access a separate instance of the FDITRX data to address fears of a negative performance impact on the MyFD backend.
2. Fields only Available in FDITRX, a non-EDW Data Source
   The ‘Reason for Transfer’, ‘Late Transfer Reason’, & ‘Benefit to Budget’ fields are only available in the FDITrx database.
3. The New Report would use Single Data Source
   The Transfer Detail report would exclusively use the FDITrx database for reporting. Combining the EDW data with the FDITrx data is not necessary to produce this report and will keep the Report logic and access logic straight forward.

Security Considerations:

1. Hidden Sub-Report
   The report will be a hidden sub-report, not a top-level report so a user would have to have a role which gave them access to financial data in order to be able to drill to it from the results of a top-level report (e.g. Expense and Revenue Transfer Report).
2. Hidden Parameters
   Even if the report were to be accessed by viewing the hidden reports, the report will be parameterized such that a user couldn’t run the report directly from the menu system – there is no way they could just run the hidden sub-report.
3. Parameterized URL Execution
   To run the report as a parameterized URL, the user (at this point, hacker) would have to know the names of and values for each parameter. The names are internal to the report, and not known to the user.
Overview

Sub Team (Tom Sparks, Mary Clark, Dinah Millikin & Todd Mildon) met to discuss moving the Multiple Orgcode Associations project forward. The team reached the following consensus:

1. The Multiple Org Code Association Problem affects most data domains, not just Finance.
2. The Subject areas can be prioritized:
   a. Financial (work is underway)
   b. Student data,
   c. HR
   d. Then the others, such as Space etc.
3. The AAG4ER will begin work on these other subject areas in concert with data custodians.

Financial Data

1. New Fields Added to FAS - DONE
   There are 6 new fields that have been added to FAS during the last re-org:

   • ALT-ORG-CODE-1 X(10)
   • ALT-ORG-CODE-2 X(10)
   • ALT-ORG-CODE-3 X(10)
   • ALT-ORG-1-CONTEXT X(1)
   • ALT-ORG-2-CONTEXT X(1)
   • ALT-ORG-3-CONTEXT X(1)

2. Business Rules for Use of New Fields
   In order to move forward on the work to populate these columns, and make them visible in the screens, we need business rules to define:
   • Appropriate Use of Multiple Org Code Associations
   • Who can update fields
   • What values can be put in fields
   • Input validation functionality, if any

3. Steps to Developing Business Rules
   A. Analysis of current multiple Org Code assignment in P and B database to determine current existing relationship contexts such as
      • Interdisciplinary programs (e.g. Bioengineering)
      • UWEOO
         • Degree Granting Programs
         • Non-Degree Granting Programs
         • Credit Certifications
         • Non-Credit Certifications
         • Summer Quarter
AAG4ER and the URP

- Advancement Budgets for payment of advancement people

B. Validation by P and B of contexts
C. Query of Dept Administrators to determine if there are any Others
D. Sub team will meet again to draft suggested guidelines and context coding scheme
E. Submit to DMC for approval
F. Move for prioritizing the work for FAS/FIN screen changes and Data Warehouse changes
G. Plan and schedule reporting tool consumption of data
Proposal for the DMC Education and Communications Task Force  
October 13, 2010  
DRAFT

**Goal:** Coordination of communication and education efforts about the DMC and related task forces and best practices for data management at the UW

**Objectives:**

Facilitate education and awareness about the efforts of the DMC

Develop and support implementation of communications plan for data users and system owners to keep them apprised of ongoing efforts of the DMC (e.g., Guideline documents, Standards document)

Work with Information Assurances Liaisons in UW departments to keep data users apprised of best practices and new developments regarding data management

Assist in development and maintenance of an online education training program for specific audiences

Collaborate with individuals and units that maintain online data management resources, such as the DMC website and decision support websites, to ensure consistency and coordination of messages

Increase awareness of best practices and appropriate use for public, restricted, and confidential data

**Action Plan (Phase 1):**

Identify appropriate channels of communication for data management education, training, and awareness

Identify target audiences, topics, and methods of communication

Assist in identifying Information Assurance Liaisons in departments and units to create a communications “map” for disseminating communications and training materials

Collect and coordinate feedback from custodians and other user groups for determining future educational materials
Timeline:

DMC approval – Oct. 14th (or 28th)
First meeting – early November
Meetings on a bi-monthly basis

Proposed Team Members:
Melissa Albin, Security and Privacy Learning Specialist - Lead
Matthew Saavedra, Learning Manager, Registrar’s Office
Technical documentation specialist or technical writer
An academic department advisor
An academic department administrator
A decision support team member (e.g., IM-DSS, FM-DSS)
Payroll Office representative

Initial Plan:

1. Set scope
2. Assist with immediate projects (see below)
3. Collect examples from other schools
4. Identify target audiences, topics, and methods of communication
5. Bring education and communications plan to DMC for evaluation

Immediate Projects:

Send link to existing online Custodian Training to Data Custodians

Work with the AVP of Institutional Data Management to communicate about delegated EDW access