



Attendees:

| Area | Name | Status | Area | Name | Status | |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Academic Affairs | Chris Wiseman | Absent | Guests: | | | |
| Academic Affairs | John Pelissero | In Attendance | | Research Services | Bill Sellers | In Attendance |
| Advancement | Jon Heintzleman | Absent | | Research Services | Kelly Fust | In Attendance |
| Facilities | Phil Kosiba | In Attendance | | ITS | Bruce Montes | In Attendance |
| Finance | Bill Laird | Absent | | ITS | Kevin Smith | In Attendance |
| Human Resources | Tom Kelly | In Attendance | | ITS | Leilani Lauger | In Attendance |
| ITS/Facilitator | Susan Malisch | In Attendance | | ITS | Conrad Vanek | In Attendance |
| ITS | Jim Sibenaller | In Attendance | | ITS | Yolanda Neal | In Attendance |
| Student Affairs | Rob Kelly | In Attendance | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Welcome, Meeting Purpose & Agenda

The meeting commenced at 1:30 PM with a review of the agenda and introduction of guests. The minutes from the July 23rd meeting were reviewed and approved as written.

Grant Funding Opportunities for Technology

Bill Sellers and Kelly Fust gave an overview of their processes. Primarily they are providing support for faculty but work with all groups on campus. It is important to always have a principle investigator to own the research/project. They also own the tracking and coordination of the proposal and administration of the program once it is accepted. Various types of grants include federal, state and private. They focus on federal & state opportunities and network with other schools to learn how they are getting funding. Kelly said they have access to a database of funding/grant sources. When a funding source is identified the turnaround is often very quick so we need to be prepared. Susan suggested the following to explore funding opportunities: broader BCDR program, teaching technologies related to distance/on-line education, research computing data center/facilities, general infrastructure improvements, cell service coverage, projects that would provide technology links between the LUC and LUMC, and emerging technology use/trials (i.e. Kindles, etc.) *Task: Kelly and Yolanda to collaborate on opportunities and report back in a future meeting.*

Sub-Committee Changes

Susan reviewed the two committee changes. The first was PIRG's transition to ISAC. The revamped committee is now specifically focused on longer term security needs versus the shorter-term initiatives to protect PII. The second was the addition of the Data Governance Committee to ensure that data is represented in a consistent manner via appropriate data definitions and controls. All were in agreement with the changes.

Sub-Committee Reports

Academic Technology Committee (ATC) – Bruce Montes represented Carol Scheidenhelm at the meeting. The ATC normally meets monthly. There were three main outcomes from the group; enterprise clicker standard, Blackboard community system purchase and expanded digital media services. Ten areas have adopted the new clicker standard so far. Pricing competition between Follett (highest), Becks and Amazon is an issue. *Task: Rob to follow-up with Tim McGuriman regarding the prices.* The Blackboard Community system was analyzed, agreed on, and installed on 7/1. Currently, 20 communities are enabled and in use. Students can utilize the technology but need sponsorship. The ATC foresees “unsponsored” student group requests (like study groups) to come quickly. Rob added that more learning communities will most likely come as part of a standard mode of operations. iTunes University is currently being implemented and a pilot is coming this fall focused on media consumption. It should be ready for use by start of next semester. Two new undergraduate students have recently been added to ATC membership and Carol is filling a few open school positions as well. Rob asked that the students were connected back to student government and to have Dawn Overstreet added to the ATC in support of the movement towards learning communities. *Task: Bruce to follow-up with Carol on these two requests.* Currently, six priorities include HLC requirement for verification of online student

identity, definitions of online and hybrid courses, articulation of Blackboard policies and procedures, copyright (ongoing), electronic course evaluations (ongoing) and streaming media (ongoing). Challenges for the group include; 1) online hybrid courses as finite course definitions do not exist and vary across schools, 2) Blackboard policy and procedures that are not easy to find and/or out of date and 3) establishing guidelines for copyright at. There is a need to coordinate several campus agencies and standardize the web content.

Data Governance Committee (DGC) – Conrad reported that the planning team has been meeting on a regular basis and has produced four core deliverables relating to the DGC; project strategy, charter, roles and responsibilities and the membership list. Only the baseline data definition list is currently pending. One of the key deliverables from the committee is to make clear to university constituents the need for consistent and uniform processes for how data is handled or governed. The committee would create data definitions, write policies regarding data analysis and reporting, define a strategy for data education, and identify the specific data to be included within the data warehouse. Data quality, integrity and security concerns will also be governed by this group. Key members have been identified as the core group of people who understand their data and how that data flows across the university from an enterprise perspective. A few other departments, such as Advancement and Student Affairs, will be involved from a data consumer point of reference. Future activities include the committee kickoff, establishment of baseline data definitions and to create a data dictionary for use by the data warehouse and business intelligence programs. All were in agreement with the membership and addition of the DGC as the fifth subcommittee for the ITESC. PSS #981 will subsequently be closed.

Project Review Board (PRB) – Kevin reviewed three changes to membership; Tim Heuer and Cliff Golz have been added representing Enrollment Management and Student Affairs. John Pelissero was subsequently dropped from the committee due to adequate coverage of Academic Affairs by other current members and his involvement with the ITESC. The PRB meets monthly to review project requests and to discuss solutions which match the need, enterprise affects of change and potential alternatives. Kevin then reviewed the process the PRB follows for requests, sizing of efforts and prioritization. The committee continues to operate in a functional and effective manner. The conversations have proven to be very effective to increase awareness and understanding of efforts both newly requested and currently active.

Information Security Advisory Council (ISAC) – Leilani reviewed the kickoff of the ISAC which included existing membership, objectives and an overview of the information security program. The group will have a broader focus on information security, risk management and compliance. The specific goal of the council are to 1) maintain confidentiality, availability and integrity of information, 2) protect Loyola's reputation, 3) provide a safe computing environment and 4) provide guidance on risk management and information security issues. Project requests and needs will be presented back to the ITESC. Leilani then reported on the PII program. Only two departments remain, about 8 computers in total. Each department had scheduled meetings in place to close out the remaining devices.

Architecture Review Board (ARB) – Jim provided a review of the completed activities for the ARB which includes creating a technology inventory (*over 350 items*), updating the Technology Current State diagram, establishing the enterprise architecture (EA) process flow, completing the *Strategic Roadmap for Technology*. It is proposed the ARB review technology recommendations for proper alignment to the overall technology direction of the University prior to going to the ITESC. This will be accomplished via Technology Advisory Committees, or TAC's. Each TAC is responsible for the research, analysis and proposal for technical change. The TAC membership is open but must have an ARB sponsor. A current example of an existing TAC is the workgroup current researching the replacement for Serena. The ARB membership includes the four ITS Directors and the CIO. The documented EA process flow will provide the overall governance for the revised ARB structure and corresponding TAC's. Future activities include enhancing the EA toolkit & templates, defining the *Technology Future State* diagram, completing the inventory of active/needed TAC's. No concerns were noted regarding the committee structure, process or deliverables.

FY11 ITS Budget Planning

Susan reviewed a list of proposed technology requests for FY11 at a high level identifying the corresponding university impact, priority and cost for each. Additions were requested.



The meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm.