

Attendees:

Area	Name	Status	Area	Name	Status
Academic Affairs	Christine Wiseman	In Attendance	ITS/Facilitator	Susan Malisch	In Attendance
Academic Affairs	John Pelissero	In Attendance	ITS	Jim Sibenaller	In Attendance
Advancement	Jon Heintzelman	In Attendance	Student Affairs	Fr. Richard Salmi	In Attendance
Facilities	Phil Kosiba	In Attendance	GUESTS:		
Finance	Bill Laird	In Attendance	Learning Tech.	Carol Scheidenhelm	In Attendance
Human Resources	Tom Kelly	In Attendance	ITS	Kevin Smith	In Attendance

Minutes:

Welcome, Meeting Purpose & Agenda

The meeting commenced at 1:07 PM. Carol Scheidenhelm attended via tele-conference. The April 20th, 2007 meeting minutes were approved as distributed. Susan also discussed an outstanding item from the minutes and confirmed encryption within GroupWise for internal email. Once email is sent outside of the University, encryption is lost. *Task: Ensure training and education is adequate to protect PII going out via email including a "how to" on the web site.*

A one-page flier of "good, better, best" PC recommendations and the updated quad-fold student technology brochure was distributed. One agenda item was added to discuss the Blackboard contract and pricing for BCDR services.

ATC Sub-Committee Report

Carol Scheidenhelm used Live Classroom via Blackboard to walk through the ATC materials. The ATC is meeting monthly and has gathered a prioritized list of items from the constituents. A list of 12 active projects was reviewed with near-term priorities that include a design for learning spaces and electronic course evaluations. Emergency communications is also being worked on with an increased focus due to recent events at VA Tech.

Other priorities include pedagogical concerns, the role of library, digital media (3 sub-committees) and copyright charges. In Q3-Q4, there will be additional focus on our direction with course management systems. Access has been acquired for Sakai, Angel and Desire To Learn to compare and contrast functionality with Blackboard. A goal of establishing a campus standard for clickers in the fall has been set after meeting with vendors currently on-site. Carol demonstrated a WIKI tool, PDWIKI, being used to facilitate the discussions and document sharing for these topics amongst the committee members. The short term plans for the group are to develop goals, projected outcomes and timelines for each initiative. The long term goal is to look at new technologies, making recommendations for teaching with technology.

John asked about the overall satisfaction with Blackboard. Carol thought it was generally positive. There are some frustrations as with any application but overall people are happy. Bill asked about whether there is adequate budget support for the ATC project list. Carol didn't think it was an issue except that the learning spaces initiative may be a challenge. Christine asked if there was a program in place to assist faculty with being more adept with technology. Carol said there are a number of training classes available. Last summer, basic Blackboard training, desktop/office training, and training for communications and assessments was offered. John added that some of the training was tied to the disaster plan. Over 200 faculty members were trained last year which increased Blackboard usage 50%. This summer there are more targeted workshops. Examples are PowerPoint for interactive teaching and learning objects training. He also noted that training is a collaborative effort with ITS and Academic Affairs. Response has been generally good this year but not as strong as last year. The quality of questions and interaction seems to be improved however. Carol thanked everyone for their time and left the meeting at 1:35 PM.

PRB Sub-Committee Report

Kevin Smith summarized the membership of the Project Review Board, its purpose and goals. He briefly went through the history of using the PSS system, reporting and project/data cleanup. The approach was to first review the high priority items, then pending, and finally the on-hold items. All "ongoing efforts" or routine items show as a low priority. The PRB does not discuss them and they are removed from the ITESC reports. The in-progress list distributed has been validated and is accurate.

There are 675 projects in total. Bill asked about the high number of canceled projects. Reasons for cancellation include that they didn't have proper approval, didn't make sense, couldn't be done, duplicate, part of another project, incomplete or significant repercussions or significant costs identified for the request. Kevin also reviewed the detailed data broken down by dept. Tom asked if there was any better way to roll-up projects by area. Kevin said there may be ways to improve and they are looking into enhancements for PSS.

Kevin then walked through a list of projects that have the highest impact and/or taking up the most resources giving a brief status of each. Bill asked how many of the projects were required to be completed before start of school. Kevin said only a few but none were on critical path as the existing systems were functional. Bill also asked about the ITESC involvement in large projects, budget review, milestones, value discussion, project approach, tasks, timeframes etc. Jon had a similar question referencing event management/registration and asked how would we know if other areas would benefit from such a system. Susan stated that we need requirements from all areas for enterprise projects such as this. John suggested that items such as these should be reviewed by the PRB. Susan added that after the PRB reviews projects they would come to the ITESC level. Bill responded that he was concerned about the control and monitoring of large projects and would like more detail on projects like the SIS upgrade. John said he would provide a detailed update at an upcoming meeting and that he had asked Clare Korinek for a plan and resource requirements. Susan concluded the conversation noting that reviewing larger and more strategic initiatives is part of the maturity plan of the ITESC and that time would be allocated in future meetings for project reviews. She also suggested that a review of the ITS PM processes may be appropriate. *Task: Schedule an overview of the Student Information System upgrade and of the ITS PMO processes.*

Wrap-Up/Future –PSS Tool enhancements and reporting improvement will be implemented within the next 120 days. Long-term items include continued vetting of new requests, monitoring in-progress projects and the improvement of the S/M/L estimator. No concerns were raised with the planning.

ARB Sub-Committee Report

Jim reviewed the current state of the sub-committee highlighting the creation of architecture principles and their usage. He also discussed that a formal communication plan was being created to ensure that all stakeholders were in-sync with the ARB activities. Jim requested that faculty and staff should be involved in the next stages of the ARB, creation of the Common Requirements Vision (CRV) document. All agreed with the involvement and Jim was asked by the group to solicit participation ideas via email. The next steps of the ARB also include regular updates and communication to the ITESC as well as an inventory of existing technologies. Tom asked if the principles and CRV would assist with governing items such as what has occurred with events registration software. Jim and Susan both responded that if the ARB continues as planned the answer would be resoundingly yes. All agreed that the direction and planning was accurate.

Task: Jim to solicit for names of participants to assist with the creation of the CRV.

PIRG Sub-Committee Report

Jim reviewed the state of the committee noting that Ron Price was added as a guest participant. The 8 policies which were previously approved by the ITESC are in second review with General Counsel. There is also a sub-team that is working on awareness, processes and training for execution of the policies. It was noted that Human Resources was involved at a detail level with the efforts. Three items were requested, establishment of a compliance lead, roll out of PII identification software and implementation of disk encryption technology.

Compliance Lead - Each compliance lead should handle between 25-50 people but no more than 50. We should designate at the school/department level where appropriate and for larger areas a more finite breakdown. Each new hire would sign a new form regarding protecting PII. This form would be re-signed at scanning time or during annual reviews. Details of the Compliance Leads specific tasks will be documented with the upcoming procedures and training. All were in agreement.

SPIDER Software – The approach is to pilot the PII identification software, called SPIDER, in ITS and then within the Sullivan Center. We will work closely with John in coordinating efforts for the Sullivan Center as many groups within the building span beyond Academic Affairs. Tom agreed, and the Bursar's office was suggested as a potential first candidate. Once the pilot phases are complete, the rest of the university will be engaged. All agreed to support the plan.

Disk Encryption – The implementation of the disk encryption software, SafeGuard Easy was reviewed. The timing would be sometime within Q2 of FY08 after the implementation of the SPIDER tool. No concerns were noted regarding the plan.

Bill said it would be a good idea to inform our internal audit group of the new procedures so that they could validate that the scans were being completed and signatures acquired. Jim responded that Sue Kilby was already in the loop as a guest member of the PIRG and that he would keep her informed on the final outcome of the work processes.

Task: Identify and create a detailed plan for piloting the PII software applications within the Sullivan Center.

FY07 POR Status & FY08 POR Draft

Susan walked through the plan of record (POR) for FY07 & FY08 noting the carryover items (highlighted). Susan also distributed the POR worksheet as a work in progress noting that this was the basis for the POR and the beginnings of an enterprise portfolio view of projects. No concerns were raised regarding the draft plan.

Blackboard – Contract Review and Pricing

Susan reviewed the current financial commitment with Blackboard and noted that we are moving the contractual terms to a July-June cycle. Loyola is in the top 50-100 of over 500 schools hosted by Blackboard. New costs for a second application server and larger storage requirements due to usage increases were highlighted, as well as the addition of a Complex Hosting Manager Service which would be piloted for six months in efforts to improve our service level, reporting and knowledge of the system. The committee reviewed Blackboard's proposal for BCDR coverage – full redundancy and failover in the event of a disaster at their data center. The service is very expensive and Blackboard was unwilling to increase their penalty clauses significantly if they failed to meet Recovery Time Objectives. As part of the analysis of the business continuity offering decision we consulted with DePaul, Loyola New Orleans & Santa Clara. (Jon left at 3:10 pm and Phil left at 3:15 due to prior commitments.) Blackboard acknowledged that they only have 10 clients subscribing to BCDR service currently and John and Susan shared that confidence with Blackboard as a whole is low. John recommended that we should allow the ATC to further study learning management system options and also consider moving Blackboard in-house. Christine asked what Loyola New Orleans was doing. Susan explained that they are using the hosted service as part of their pandemic plan. Agreement from the group was not to move forward with the additional purchase of BCDR coverage from Blackboard at this time.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 PM.