Minutes from the January 2021 meeting were reviewed and approved.

This meeting was a presentation of the proposed revisions to our data governance charter, changes to the structure and roles of the functional data governance committees, and how activities around committee meetings would change followed by a discussion on these proposed changes. No voting was held on these changes or materials.

**Presentation of data governance charter revisions**
Rosemaria Martinelli and Charlie McMahon are recognized as the executive sponsors of the data governance.

**Changes to scope**
Our executive sponsors recommended expanding the scope of our data governance charter from the initial scope of PeopleSoft and the data warehouse to include all “administrative enterprise data”. Administrative data does not include scientific research data systems and patient data from the hospital. A formal definition of administrative data will be forthcoming. Other data assets on our inventory would become part of the scope of data governance. It does not mean that access to these data systems opens up, it means that these systems would need to show that they follow data governance practices such as having and sharing a data dictionary.

**Changes to Data governance functional committee structures.**
Stony Brook data governance has been structured with two functional data governance committees for academic data and another for finance/HR data. In place of these structures, we would identify “domain” data stewards and “area” data stewards. Area data stewards are those people who are housed in an administrative area specific to a college or school, for ex., Melissa Jordan is an area data steward in The Graduate School. This change to the structure is a shift from the Stanford (Plotkin) model similar to what we had to a model that Wisconsin uses which incorporates domain data stewards.

**Discussion.**
Would expansion of scope lead to more resources for data governance? It may. We may need to purchase larger systems to manage multiple systems. We may need to purchase a Master Data Management (MDM) system for cleansing and standardization. Additional people or a formal DG office can be requested.

There is general concern that we don’t have enough resources, especially people, to cover the scope that we have now. If we are told to expand the scope with no indications of what additional resources would become available is a challenge and a concern. A data governance position would coordinate data steward activities, managing who they are, who grants access, involvement in meetings about issues dealing with data process, data definition or data maintenance, and managing data dictionaries.
Changes to the FDGC structures would change the meeting frequency and participation. Instead of monthly FDGC meetings, we would pull together the domain and area data stewards needed for specific topics. This would help to deliver on topics that have been more difficult or complex to tackle.

Next steps, we will communicate back to our executive sponsors: there is general agreement to expand the scope, but we would need to have additional resources to support it.

Other business relevant to the Council – No other business discussed.

The next monthly meeting is scheduled for May 13, 2021 2-3 pm on zoom.
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