

CCCCO System-wide Architecture Committee (SAC)

Meeting Minutes

Thursday June 22, 2017

Zoom Online Meeting

Attendees: Tim Calhoon, Bob Hughes, Daniel Borges, Dave Fuhrmann, Lou Delzompo, Joe Perret, Jorge Mata, Rico Bianchi, Alexander Jackl, Joe Moreau, Ben Seaberry, Ella Stetser, Bruce Racheter, and Caryn Albrecht.

Call to Order:

Tim Calhoon called the meeting to order at 1:32 pm and took attendance.

Minutes:

There were no additions or corrections to the minutes for May 25, 2017. The committee approved the minutes.

System Updates:

CENIC Update:

They are finally getting traction on 10Gig primary and secondary big circuits to centers and are also looking at taking over intra-district circuits. In 2017 they received funding to do that. They are buying routers by the ton. Thirty-seven circuits are completed, ninety-seven are in process, and there are about 186 candidates. Progress is now being made.

Tim and Gary had a meeting with CENIC and a consultant who specializes in acquiring dark fiber. Right now the CCCs lease from the telecommunication companies which light the fiber to the college. In this situation, the system would acquire dark fiber and CENIC would light it. Long term this would lower costs significantly. The goal is to do this while money is available to do it. They have a call out to all of the telecom companies looking for dark fiber near any of the college and center locations.

In addition, they are talking about doing special construction to some outlying colleges like Palo Verde, Lassen, etc. on the edges of the state.

There is also a \$50,000 per college mini-grant to assist in the purchase of 10Gig firewalls or to facilitate taking advantage of the 10Gig circuit. Colleges just need to explain what they plan to use the funding for and can contact Mike Tuccillo about that grant at mtuccillo@ccctechcenter.org

Technology Center Updates:

CCCApply:

The Technology Center is rolling toward the October update of CCCApply. At the same time they are getting complaints of too many fields and the application

CCCCO System-wide Architecture Committee (SAC)

Meeting Minutes

Thursday June 22, 2017

Zoom Online Meeting

being too long, they are also getting requests from Adult Education for more fields in CCCApply. That is a struggle. They are going to be meeting with the Chancellor's Office to look at doing something about non-credit. The problem is residency has to be done for non-credit and the only option might be to take IPEDS elements out and have the college follow up later with the student to get that information. The Technology Center did a study and found that basically every field on the application is needed. It is either required operationally for CCCApply or is required for residency, a federal or state statute, or MIS. Nothing seems to be optional; it all has to be gathered by the college.

EPI:

The MyPath portal has been released into production. There are six or so colleges standing that up to go live besides Santa Rosa. There are some changes being done for the Chancellor's Office version and it sounds like those will happen in July.

Hobsons has seven college live, nineteen more implementing Early Alert, fifteen implementing Degree Planner, and there are a number of others in the works.

C-ID and CO-CI are both production release by the end of June. CO-CI has had two releases so far in the last month and they are adding elements in. It is currently released to the colleges, with a full release by June 27th.

With E-transcript CA there was a test of the ability of the new EdExchange web services network to send transcripts between Ventura and Foothill-DeAnza. Lou reported they successfully demonstrated full functionality of that pilot. On the positive side, the integration with Parchment worked very well and data transfer did also. However, there were several questions not answered by the people participating in the demo from Foothill and Ventura that are still outstanding; Mark Cohen will follow up on those. They are related to where all the fields would go in Foothill's SIS when it comes in from Ventura. For example, do they want everything from the transcript in the SIS? The answer is generally no, but there is still some work to be done. There is also a question of how or if a pdf is delivered. The technical work is successfully completed.

That technical team has moved into building out extensions to the actual production Glue project now for release sometime in the fall. They are also going to spin up an effort to understand how E-transcript CA might be affected by this work, since that is still to be determined.

Tim reported the Budget Change Proposal for a request system to obtain high school transcripts is not in the state budget. The Technology Center is working with the EPI budget to see if more can be done with electronic transcripts.

OEI:

OEI is still looking toward 9/25 for deployment of Course Exchange 2.0. Lou reported they are on a good track for code freeze on 7/5. There are always the

CCCCO System-wide Architecture Committee (SAC)

Meeting Minutes

Thursday June 22, 2017

Zoom Online Meeting

standard questions of whether the pilot sites are ready to go. If they are not they would deploy into production anyway.

Canvas is steady at 107 colleges and the \$10M ongoing is still in the state budget to pay for Canvas.

The new CVC was delivered last month under the Laravel platform. They are working on a version that will operate under the MyPath portal. There is still some work to be done on that integration. Lou thought the release date was the same as the new MyPath release in July.

Along with Foothill-DeAnza, the Technology Center is working on a concept for "CVC Fast Track." The idea is to use some of the Course Exchange technology to allow a student in the CVC catalog to select an online course and use some of the Exchange technology to allow registration for that course.

CCCAssess:

The platform is moving forward for an on schedule September release. They are also moving forward with items for ESL and testing whether items are free of bias, etc.

The test validation and project schedule are currently paused for a thirty to ninety day review. This is to assess the validation package readiness for the assessment approval process.

McCann won the RFP for the English/ESL machine scored writing sample. They hope to use McCann's technology via an API from the CCCAssess testing platform to provide an integrated testing experience for students. Prompts will be presented, students will write their essays, and responses will be machine scored. Machine scoring will not be the only option; it is being fully built out to allow for faculty scoring as well. It will be possible to use local faculty scoring or machine scoring; that will be a local college decision.

They are continuing to work on acquiring the CalPASS data for placement. There are some legal issues they are working on.

Other:

There will be a \$1M RFP coming out to renew a contract for library materials. The current vendor is EBSCO and there are three or four vendors competing.

In the state budget there is \$6M for integrated statewide library services. This is similar to what was done for Canvas, but for library catalog systems. It looks like that will be funded and the RFP should go out within a year.

CCCApply had help desk services operated by Xerox which split off Conduent last year. Conduent has decided they want to get out of the higher education student support business. The Technology Center is running an RFP, going through the Board, getting everything done, contracting and getting new support

CCCCO System-wide Architecture Committee (SAC)

Meeting Minutes

Thursday June 22, 2017

Zoom Online Meeting

people trained, all in 120 days. They are going all out to get everything ready for the transition at the end of September from Conduent to a new vendor.

No Chancellor's Office update today.

Data Governance Initiative and Planning:

Alex Jackl provided his history in the area of data standards and data governance. Most recently he started working with clients like the state of Maine on data governance and on creating structures so complex systems and complex data ecosystems can be managed. He has also been working on building out policies, procedures, processes, and promising practices to support good decision making.

Eight weeks ago Alex started working with Tim, Lou, and the Technology Center on building out a data governance and data stewardship structure. He also likes working with data standards. Alex has done some work with community colleges and with higher education, but most of his experience is with K-12 and state education agencies that support both the K-12 and higher education areas.

The proposed governance administration structure includes three levels. One level would be at the Chancellor's Office and would involve policy. Another level would be the Data Governance Advisory Committee (DGAC) which would make recommendations to the Chancellor's Office and other executives and would align work done by stewards and colleges and act as a communication mechanism. The third level would be a Data Governance Office (DGO) which would include people doing data stewardship who are managing the data sets and would pool together recommendations both technical and policy wise. They would work with the various technical systems and data systems in the ecosystem. That would include both software systems but also possibly non-software systems in terms of the release of data, privacy policies, and release policies on data.

Reasons for data governance that Lou has covered in presentations were reviewed including master data management (MDM), legal policies or rules, and who gets to update data, etc. Those policies and rules have to in place so people can find them, along with structures so rules can be discovered or accessed. There are also broader questions about student privacy, data security, and who gets to hold the student's information, both very sensitive and not very sensitive. The rules for setting up the physical structures also need to be set by data governance and policy.

There needs to be system governance, but some of those structures may already be in place. SAC may have a role to play in advising the DGO and may play a role in advising the DGAC. Certainly someone from CISOA should be on the DGAC. Alex will need guidance at a technical level about who to contact and how

CCCCO System-wide Architecture Committee (SAC)

Meeting Minutes

Thursday June 22, 2017

Zoom Online Meeting

many people to include when organizing the DGO and data stewards around the system to build the data dictionary. He will reach out to SAC when appropriate.

Jorge Mata expressed concern that data governance structures weren't put in place sooner with all the work that has already happened on Glue. Lou confirmed Glue was originally built for OEI and the exchanges of data between systems using the Course Exchange are tightly controlled by the workflows implemented in the Course Exchange. As they look toward including Canvas in the Glue efforts and including other systems, Lou explained they recognized the importance of data governance and MDM quite a while ago. It did take some time for the Chancellor's Office to engage on this topic, but now that SAC and TTAC have added weight to its importance that could help with moving things along. It really isn't possible to build the data dictionary without DGAC being in place. Alex noted the good news is that even without the structures in place, it is clear the project leads did have the idea they would be operating in a system with data governance. It would have been better if those structures were built a year or two ago, but it is also timely now as systems are pulled together and projects move out of pilot mode into production mode.

The recommended structure includes the DGAC and the DGO but also recognizes that in most governance structures there is some kind of procurement or legal governance subcommittee or advisory group. It may not be a full committee, and may be ad hoc, but it is needed for advising on legal issues. In the CCC, the Foundation which leads a lot of procurement and the Chancellor's Office Legal Department would probably be most appropriate in that subcommittee or ad hoc role.

The role of the DGAC would be to send recommendations to executive management. It would be a persistent committee that meets on a regular schedule. It would be composed of senior leaders, not those at the DBA level. This group would be made up of people who understand the value of data and they would be defining policies, standards, requirements, guidelines, and definitions. They would empower the DGO, the "on the ground data people," to do the work of making recommendations to DGAC and exploring what is actually needed on the ground, in terms of both the policies impacting the reality and what the reality is needing from DGAC in terms of guidance. Alex also provided some early ideas about some of the people/roles that should be included on DGAC.

The DGO would focus on PII data including: what is private and what is not, what data is appropriate to move between systems, what rules need to be applied across the entire ecosystem, and which rules need to be applied to specific data exchanges. Some rules might hold for the entire system. However, for example, if data was being moved between Canvas and Colleague at the same college, exchange of more private data might be allowed. It is necessary to determine what data policies and procedure need to be adopted by the Technology Center and the CCC in order to support the whole ecosystem. However, the DGO would

CCCCO System-wide Architecture Committee (SAC)

Meeting Minutes

Thursday June 22, 2017

Zoom Online Meeting

not be a decision making body. It would make recommendations to DGAC for policy and it might be that the DGO publishes promising practice guides or that kind of artifact as a result of its work. The DGO would be composed of contributors, official data stewards or chief data experts from the institutions and from the projects in the eco-system, working together. It would also meet regularly and would coordinate and facilitate the work of individual projects.

Alex expects the first thing the DGO will focus on as a deliverable is the data dictionary. They will leverage work already done on data dictionaries, and will want to guide the evolution of data dictionaries to create a coherent data view of the CCC data ecosystem. Tim thought major elements would be the MIS data dictionary and the CCCApply data dictionary. Lou thought most of the things that will be connected apart from the SISs, already have data dictionaries. A lot of the work may be in consolidating different dictionaries into something standardized.

The presentation included a list of sample roles from various projects and actual data stewards from institutions that will make up the DGO. As they expand the preliminary list, Alex and Lou may contact SAC members asking for input and advice about the right people from various projects and institutions. They may start with groups that already exist like OEI Course Exchange participants, and various projects like Glue, Course Exchange, and the new data warehouse effort, to get people who are committed and decision makers who have a stake in it. The first task will probably be to define the size and scope of what the DGO needs to address, and one of its first artifacts will be defining a roadmap of what to tackle the first year. That would then be reviewed by DGAC and maybe SAC to determine if those are the right things to do.

The Legal Procurement advisory group will want to work together on RFP language because one way to get ahead on data governance is asking vendors to agree to have standards align to a particular way of doing things.

Finally, Alex presented a rough initial project plan for data governance. It began with starting the formulation of the DGAC and completion of the charter for that group at the beginning of July. The intent was to get the draft charter circulated and reviewed by the appropriate members to try to have a Beta charter ready by the end of summer. The aim would be toward having the charter in place in early September. Then it would be possible to start convening appropriate members, scheduling a meeting, etc. Simultaneously, work would be moving forward for the DGO, but that group wouldn't be fully executed until there was approval of the DGO charter and feedback. That would probably come from the DGAC. After the DGO started meeting and executing what it was working on, it would develop timelines for things like a written environmental scan, a roadmap for the data ecosystems, and other deliverables. The DGO would probably start moving forward in October.

The Data Dictionary Consolidation Project will probably be guided by the DGO with the goal of having a final build tentatively pushed out in January or February

CCCCO System-wide Architecture Committee (SAC)

Meeting Minutes

Thursday June 22, 2017

Zoom Online Meeting

of 2018. That would hopefully include a fairly large subset of the existing dictionaries. The Data Warehouse Project will be likely to drive priorities for which data sets are consolidated first, because it will probably be based on what will be going into the data warehouse first. Lou explained the Technology Center has been authorized to build out a data warehouse for Canvas data in support of the OEI. It is for a basic level Canvas data dictionary. There is also a desire to store CCCApply and other data in there. However, that can't be done without the data governance piece in place. Tim thought in order to do learning analytics and retention analytics there will need to be some MIS outcomes data. The project should be aware of that and how to message the need for some portion of outcomes data from MIS.

Action Item:

Joe Perret will let the Academic Senate know that the DGAC will probably be requesting a representative from that group. SAC members should also think about whether or not they are interested in representing CISOA on the DGAC.

Tim asked for vendor suggestions for the next meeting. Lou thought Hobsons might want to introduce their new release, approach, and corporate view. However, the timing might not work for the next meeting.

Next Meeting:

The next SAC meeting will be on July 27, 2017 at 1:30pm.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 2:43 pm.