Data Management Committee
Meeting minutes for Nov. 15, 2010, 3:00 – 4:30 p.m.
UW Tower T-22 Board Room


Recorder: Kerry Kuenzi (Office of Planning & Budgeting)

There were no meeting handouts other than the agenda.

Proposed Agenda:

Administrative (All)
- Review/approve minutes
- Announcements
AAG4ER Update (Tom)
Metrics and definitions update (Todd)
PNBDB migration update (Todd)
Subcommittee and Task Force Updates (Chairs)
  - AA4GER
  - Access and Roles
  - Enterprise Reporting Groups
  - Education and Communications Task Force

Meeting Summary

Todd called the meeting to order shortly after 3:00 p.m. We approved the minutes as written for the 10-28-10 meeting. Todd invited Tom to address us first, as he was limited in the time he could stay at DMC.

AAG4ER Update:

Tom reported that AAG4ER had met, and then met with Paul Jenny and had discussed Paul’s intent to make program review/metrics data more interactive. Carol Diem and Todd Mildon are working with Marisa Nickle (2y2d) to collaborate here.

Tom mentioned the interest in sorting out the multiple org code situation. There are different circumstances that make it challenging to address with one solution. In some cases, the multiple org codes span state funded efforts, in others they straddle programs with UWEO. A meeting of Todd, Bill, Mary Clark, Dinah, Tom and perhaps others was recommended.

Metrics and Definitions Update:

Todd opened the update by acknowledging that a great deal of work had been underway in defining and refining institutional metrics on the academic side via the program review efforts (in a number of cases building upon prior ABB
work). Todd shared that Kerry Kuenzi had accepted a 50% project manager role in Mary Lidstrom’s Organizational Effectiveness Initiative with Ruth Johnston as the lead, and asked Kerry to comment on progress in the area of administrative metrics. Kerry reported that the topic of administrative metrics had been raised but not yet fully explored….certainly an area of interest for the OEI group as it sought to measure impact of improvement efforts.

Discussion turned to consideration of Enterprise Risk Management risk measures (operational risk, compliance risk, financial risk, strategic risk) for administrative areas, as Kirk had suggested during the prior DMC meeting. Ann described how she and Kirk had mapped their 13 areas of work back to these 4 areas of risk, identifying those where they had control of outcomes/did NOT have control of outcomes, and were using the results to drive initiatives in their office.

Conversation flowed to many related concepts here:

- Interest in ensuring that whatever the metrics/measures, we apply them consistently
- Interest in being open to both qualitative and quantitative measures
- Interest in creating baseline measures, in order to assess improvement
- Interest in seeking benchmark information to allow us to measure UW performance vs. other institutions of higher education or other “best in class” organizations
- Recognition that the identification of metrics/measures is very important, given that “you will get what you measure”
- Acknowledgement that our student population is using metrics/measures to assess program quality and to make decisions about where to apply/enroll
- Recognition that we need both the data/metrics and the corresponding narrative (Brandon mentioned his work on the affirmative action plan and the value of the quantitative and qualitative perspectives)
- Bill mentioned Ann’s “spiderweb updates” as a helpful way to quickly assess ups/downs across multiple measures.
- The expectation that we’ll have central numbers reported across all units, and we’ll expect unit specific information as well. Looking at Unit dollars spent will not be sufficient in and of itself.

Conversation circled back to the possibilities offered by looking at organizational objectives through a risk lens….identifying goals, identifying organizational capability to achieve these goals, and identifying the threats related to achieving objectives. Bob mentioned the value of having a consistent set of institutional goals identified and quantified with measures.

Todd asked Bill to contemplate how DMC’s governance might play a role in the issues related to institutional metrics/measures. Bill suggested that, once a framework is in place, DMC could serve to achieve agreement on common definitions (perhaps based upon proposals from Todd’s group). John suggested that DMC could undertake the assessment of data quality for measures/metrics identified.

It was then suggested that DMC refer back to its charge letter, look at the recent DMC assessment, and develop plans from here forward for DMC’s objectives.

Jim inquired about how this issue of metrics and definitions updates related to the former “Unit Resource Profiles” or URP reports that the Office of Planning & Budgeting has been publishing in recent years. Todd acknowledged that the work he and Carol have been doing on definitions/metrics would eventually “replace” the former URP reports, and it was for this reason that Todd wants the definitions and metrics to be shared with DMC soon. Dan commented on the related challenges, sharing as an example the specification of Faculty FTE. Todd shared that the definition of Faculty FTE had the subject of an active conversation the weekend prior to our meeting!

A number of challenges associated with identifying appropriate measures were shared (qualitative vs. quantitative issues, employee resistance to measurement, inability to measure “A, B and C” so we measure “D and E,”
costs/processes required to capture data so that you can measure something, etc. ) John shared the challenges he experienced when the NRC attempted to identify metrics (the effort took 6 years).

**PNBDB migration update (Todd/Anja)**

Anja shared that two CONNECT consultants will be on campus a large percentage of the next three to four months, addressing data modeling/data design and the physical data architecture related to the migration. Brandon inquired about whether their effort will result in a repeatable process.....I understood Anja to reply that this effort will test the model of development.

**DMC Subcommittee and Task Force Updates**

**AAG4ER** – (Tom shared at the beginning of the meeting)

**Access and Roles:** Rupert stated that he would like to have said they’d finished the access/roles matrix, but this wasn’t yet true. He mentioned the need to hold a conversation, after which 500-600 tables needed to be updated in the Student Data domain (hoping to provide automation support). He hopes to complete this by December.

**Education and Communications Task Force:** Melissa shared progress, including the still evolving list of committee members. The committee is assessing what training/communications efforts have occurred, where the opportunities exist, and next steps.

**Enterprise Reporting Groups:** (No formal report made from the existing groups)

**Standards and Policies:** Ann mentioned some of the work being done on administrative policy statements. We agreed this should be a meeting topic at the next DMC.

**Decision Support Hiring Update:** Anja indicated that recruitment of the metadata position had started approximately two weeks earlier, and they had received a wide variety of applicants. Total applications received was lower than past recruitments at a similar point in time, and there was talk of casting a wider net for applicant.

(As an aside, Ann announced there would be a communication piece regarding working remotely during the upcoming Nov. 18 mid-week football game and related security considerations.)

The meeting was adjourned shortly after 4:30 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