Attendees:

Area	Name	Status	Area	Name	Status
Academic Affairs	John Frendreis	In Attendance	Human Resources	Tom Kelly	In Attendance
Academic Affairs	John Pelissero	In Attendance	ITS/Facilitator	Susan Malisch	In Attendance
Advancement	Jon Heintzelman	In Attendance	ITS	Jim Sibenaller	In Attendance
Facilities	Phil Kosiba	Absent	Student Affairs	Fr. Richard Salmi	In Attendance
Finance	Bill Laird	In Attendance	ITS-Presenter	Kevin Smith	In Attendance

Minutes:

Welcome & Meeting Purpose

The meeting commenced at 2:35 PM. The November 13, 2006 meeting minutes were reviewed and approved as published. Jim validated that the minutes were being documented at an appropriate level of detail. The primary purpose for this meeting was to review the information contained within the Project Status System (PSS) and to further discuss the LUMC scorecard. Susan clarified further that PSS was not a fully-featured project tracking system and that we would eventually be looking for a better long term solution.

PSS Review

Kevin Smith began discussing PSS with a brief overview and noted that access and reports are available on-line. He gave the history of the tool; that it had started as a spreadsheet and that Kevin's team then built something with a bit more substance to address the increasing need to catalog requests for projects. He reiterated Susan's early comment that the product is not complete or final, but functional. He added that it is also not a complete historical list of all projects and that its use had increased over time. He then reviewed the data available within the reports highlighting work types and status. He concluded the overview stating that PSS was not designed to be a project management or portfolio tool but did include an overall status and highlighted high level milestones and dates.

Tom asked about capturing scope & effort within the tool. Kevin stated that the tool does have that type of detail. Susan added that this is where Kevin himself adds value to the current process. It is part of his job to manage the scope and effort and to match that with the appropriate skills and availability of his staff. Bill asked about prioritization and also about who makes the requests for projects. Kevin explained that the requests come in from the Directors and Functional Leaders within the university. Varying methods are utilized to request projects but a request form is used to capture the project definition and is then entered into PSS by ITS staff after review & validation. Once the concept is validated, he went on to add that not many requests get "turned down". Almost all are discussed and validated beforehand and a few are turned into a different request or split or combined after some clarification and discussion with the requestor.

John F. asked about items like internal audit or compliance requests that might flow through. Susan stated that projects deemed mandatory or compliance-based don't flow through this process and are factored in with the PSS workload, and some may have firm due-dates. Kevin added that he has to manage the activities within his team so that those types of projects can be handled when they come in and at the same time ensure his people are not idle. John F. also asked if there was some type of "reconnection or revalidation" process to assure projects are still needed, required or add the proper value. He used the Research/Community of Science area as an example. Kevin stated he has regular conversations with the requestors as to value and charges the project managers with updating status, need and change. Bill asked who the data lists are distributed to. Kevin responded that some requests are broken down into several items on the PSS so that they can be aligned directly with people or function. Reports are not distributed but are available on-line. Recently Kevin has been reviewing and auditing the lists so that the data can be used as a "master" list for each area to discuss with their leaders on an ongoing basis.

H:\SHARED\PAQS\Marguerite\Governance Web Site\gov_itesc\Minutes\ITESC Minutes, 01-17-07.doc
Last Saved: 3/2/2007 4:40:00 PM

Page 1 of 3

John P. asked about Project 378, Wellness Report Improvement, as an example. He asked "What occurs when there is a current process or system in place, say a work around, but someone wants a better way to complete a task? Who makes that type of decision?". Kevin stated that those types of items are discussed with the requestor to validate the need and value versus the effort required to make the change. He added that we don't want to duplicate what may exist but it may make sense to make the change based on factors such as nature of data, length of run, impact on production etc.

Bill commented about requestor and functional owner. They are often times different and each should be made aware of requests/changes that may impact areas for which they are responsible for. He asked if others had the same need or concern. He stated he would review his entire list with his team. Kevin stated that he has routine ongoing meetings with the "big players". Others are reviewed on an "on-request" basis. John F. stated that all key users or subject matter experts of an application outside of the functional ownership department should be consulted before any change occurs. Kevin assured all that he is doing this as part of the current process. It is why Directors sign off on requests. Regular PRB meetings will assist with facilitating that this communication occurs. Susan added that the new process will ensure an opportunity for others to communicate if they could also benefit from a particular enhancement as well. Kevin also added that it will be easier to facilitate when all people are in the room at the same time. It should speed up some dependency type questions as well.

John F. asked & Bill concurred that the original concern was to ensure the data was being reviewed and that the proper people were involved. Kevin says it is happening informally, as part of his job requirements, but not formally as in the proposed structure. John F. asked that given the people defined for the PRB, are any areas missing to properly represent the whole. John F. asked about Student Affairs. Father Salmi validated that Warren was the correct person. John F. also asked about Facilities. Kevin said that Facilities rarely have project requests of this nature. Bill asked about Human Resources. Susan stated that the HR systems don't reside within LUC. They are at LUMC so most HR requests are on the LUMC work list. Tom confirmed. Kevin stated that when HR or Facilities items appear he would discuss them with the appropriate person from the department. John F. added that John P. would best be able to concentrate on opportunities in Academic Advising and would like John P. to represent this area on the PRB at the present time.

With the adjustment to Academic Advising representation, John F. agreed with the membership and charter for the PRB. Kevin added he agrees with the need for process around the PRB and to add value to what he is currently doing with the existing group. Bill would like to see the lists from time to time at the ITESC. John F. suggested a listing sorted by priority, like high, medium & low. Father Salmi suggested a view by department or date, etc. may be helpful as a supplemental deliverable. Susan added that we could add additional fields where needed, or buy an appropriate tool if we see fit. *Task: Determine the additional views to be created for ITESC member review.*

He then reviewed the steps to run the Web Focus reports on-line via the Powerpoint presentation. Kevin asked if the in-progress items needed to be reviewed. Susan suggested that we let the PRB have its initial meeting and then subsequently have a current list come back to the ITESC with. Kevin said he would go back and execute further updates within PSS to prepare for a meeting. Given the discussion in the meeting there was concurrence to have the PRB move forward as defined. Jon asked about whether guidelines were needed to assist with determining priority. Father Salmi was concerned as well. Kevin said he would provide guidance. John F. stated that if "work-arounds" exist or the impact on university business is low then requests shouldn't be categorized as "high". Kevin said he considers that type of information when setting priorities. John P. asked if the ITESC would confirm the appropriateness of projects. He used 376, Evoke request, as an example. All agreed that the ITESC should validate and modify priority or need where it made sense. He also concurred that the list be cleaned up further before the first PRB meets. Susan concluded that we will cleanup data and schedule the first PRB as soon as possible, and that this will push out the final compilation of the ITS plan of record for Q3/Q4. *Task: Cleanup the PSS data further and schedule/hold the first PRB.*

Other Sub-Committee Review
Architecture Review Board –Konstantin Laufer was added. Members approved as documented.

Academic Technology Committee – John P. confirmed that he has an open task to solicit Deans for appropriate members. Father Salmi said the he requested Unified Student Government to look at this and that names are forthcoming. Representatives would be "technical" and appropriate. Father Salmi also noted that he is addressing the continuity concern hoping for third year students. *Task: Finalize membership of ATC.*

Personal information Risk Group – John F. asked about Rome. Susan said we wanted to engage someone so that they are informed. John F. said due to some potential changes to not assign a name at this time. He suggested coordinating via Tim O'Connell or Eric Pittenger. Susan gave a brief status for the PIRG. Multiple policies (7-10) will be submitted for review but several others have come up that are out of scope (like clean desk policy). The group was considering a third party to review and/or complete the gaps. Susan also talked about on-going reviews, awareness and training. The need for auditing the process on an ongoing basis was also discussed. John F. asked if we could do audit internally, and if so who should do it? Bill asked about Research and people that handle credit cards. John F. was concerned about laptops and the data within. Jim responded that these types of things were being addressed, noting the new disk encryption subcommittee. Bill then quoted the top 10 risk areas as noted in a recent E&Y presentation. Susan said that the work of the PIRG has expanded and we need to find the appropriate parties to address all of the issues being identified. She thought that some might be better suited for a third party. John F. suggested adding someone from Research. Bill asked about Stritch School of Medicine. Susan asked about Institutional Research. Bottom line is we need to validate the areas covered. All agreed that policies and appropriate awareness is needed. John F. then asked about penetration testing. Susan said we faired pretty well on the testing conducted last June and we will vary our security testing focus annually. Jim brought up social engineering as another example of items to consider for the future. The Admissions and Graduation Admissions area may also need to be represented. *Task: Verify that the proper areas within LUC are being represented on PIRG.*

LUMC Scorecards

Susan provided an update on the LUC/LUMC services scorecard and had reviewed the approach with Art Krumrey. He has talked to Roger Russell and Ron Price and a draft self-assessment was to be delivered and reviewed with this group. Comparatively, Art indicated to Susan that while LUMC had a steering committee structure, the EPIC sub-committee had been more active in recent times due to their focus on the EPIC implementation. Both LUC & LUMC want to understand where they could be impacted by the other. Communicating via the scorecard approach could begin to facilitate those discussions. Several examples were noted by Bill, John F. and Tom of the need for communication between the IT groups. John F. suggested Advancement be added to the scorecard. Susan thought the original intent was to provide a holistic view of technology services consumed by LUC. Other examples were also discussed resulting in the question, "Is the scorecard for those items that are not supported by LUC?". It was noted that the LUMC scorecard was a bit confusing because it also addresses items managed by Stritch. John F. clarified noting that the scorecard is representing those items where people at LUC are utilizing systems located and/or supported by LUMC. Bill suggested communicating with Cindy Gonya from Stritch to get input to the scorecard. Susan suggested we invite Art and Ron to the February meeting and continue to review what the final scorecard will contain. *Task: Validate items represented on the scorecard.* *Task: Complete the first pass of the LUMC scorecard with Art.*

Next Steps

In the next meeting we will review the prioritizations defined, entertain any new enterprise level requests and invite Art to review the LUMC scorecard. John F. suggested that if any large financial project is pending it should be talked about during the next ITESC to ensure this group could review and understand before the budget review meetings commence. Susan then quickly reviewed the POR special-request projects that will be built into the upcoming plan, some with costs to-be-determined.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 PM.

H:\SHARED\PAQS\Marguerite\Governance Web Site\gov_itesc\Minutes\ITESC Minutes, 01-17-07.doc
Last Saved: 3/2/2007 4:40:00 PM

Page 3 of 3