



**Attendees:**

Area	Name	Status	Area	Name	Status
Academic Affairs	Chris Wiseman	Absent	ITS/Facilitator	Susan Malisch	In Attendance
Academic Affairs	John Pelissero	In Attendance	ITS	Jim Sibenaller	In Attendance
Advancement	Jon Heintzelman	In Attendance	Student Affairs	Rob Kelly	In Attendance
Facilities	Phil Kosiba	Absent	<b>Guests:</b>		
Finance	Bill Laird	Absent	ITS	Walt Slazyk	In Attendance
Human Resources	Tom Kelly	In Attendance	ITS	Kevin Smith	In Attendance
			ITS	Larry Adams	In Attendance

**Welcome, Meeting Purpose & Agenda**

The meeting commenced at 1:35 PM with a review of the agenda and introduction of guests. The minutes from the September 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting were reviewed and approved as written.

**Mobile LOCUS Student Pilot**

Mobile applications usage is currently on the rise. The ITS team has created a proof of concept application which allows access through multiple types of mobile devices to three LOCUS features: View my grades, view my schedule and view my holds. Walt began the demo by walking through the logon process and access via a test student account. The proposal is to make this available to students in early December as a pilot to test more thoroughly and to gauge interest from students. Depending on feedback a budget placeholder and/or use of the Blackboard product can be vetted. Currently many schools are piloting and interested in mobile technology. Other applications (other than Locus/PeopleSoft) are possible but have not been piloted or tested as of yet. The group discussed the potential for other applications of this technology and welcomed the start of the pilot. *Task: Susan to report back on the pilot results.*

**LUMC Persons into LUWare Project Status**

Kevin Smith gave an overview of the efforts to date and current project. This project began as a way to speed up the process for provision and deprovisioning of university (login) ids. It has worked well for LUC. The next step was to share ids and passwords with LUMC. The architectures between the two groups are dissimilar which makes integration difficult. A project was created to improve the integration and reduce multiple ids. The initial solution was more of a "one-off" solution versus an enterprise approach. Each solution was at the application level versus a single solution making it cumbersome as additional applications were added and exceptions identified. The current project is to correct this situation. The project is in a "red" state at the time of this report due to miscommunication on timing and deliverables with sponsor, Tom Kelly, resource constraints within LUC ITS, and the additional risk the technical complexities add to the project. Deliverable date is February 1<sup>st</sup>. The future long term approach is to review a federated identity management approach to enable shared ids across institutions, partners etc. *Task: Kevin and Susan to keep the ITESC informed of the project health and activities.*

**Technology Briefing**

This presentation summarized some industry and technology trends we are tracking as well as the various tools and resources that are used to plan and vet technology investment and strategic direction.

FY09 Summary - Susan introduced the FY09 Summary Report for ITS which is a snapshot of FY09 activities within ITS. The document highlights operational and support statistics, project based initiatives, FY09 facts and previews FY10 planned initiatives.

Scorecards – The annual technology scorecard results were shared. Trending data is now available for four years which represents a subjective health assessment of the major technologies in use at Loyola. The health rating is provided to foster discussions regarding where to invest in technology and/or process improvements. The core technologies identified in the Technology Roadmap have been cross-referenced to the scorecard items to show correlation (ITS

---

services items are not mapped). Year over year the scorecards show a cumulative 9% improvement, with a 24% over the past four years. Several changes to health assessments were highlighted including: *Learning Management Systems* moved back from 5 to 4.5 due to the expectations from students for increased faculty use; *Accessibility of Specialized Technologies* health declined due to the increased demand for new/expanded technology, *Research Support* health declined as well due to increased demands; opportunities to improve the *Budget submission* process exist; the *Maxxess* item was newly added - audit results are pending; *Wellness* was added as a new item; an increased demand on the *network* has occurred; *Identity Management* has moved down due to previously noted concerns; *WTC Data Center* has improved but still has an opportunity for future improvements. Kevin will review with the scorecards with the Project Review Board and Susan with the Cabinet before finalizing and posting. The committee concurred that *Room & Event Scheduling* should be downgraded from yellow to orange due to noted recent process concerns. *Task: Further review is encouraged; additional comments or proposed changes should be sent to Susan.*

Industry Trends – Loyola uses multiple sources for researching technology best practices and trending analysis including Educause, Gartner, and AJCU/peer schools. Sample findings included in the report include ECAR findings highlighting the changes in technology and expectations from students. Expectations of seniors are much higher now than when they were freshman. Almost 50% of students have internet capable devices; text messaging and social network communication are steadily increasing. The student use of a learning management system is 70%. CDW-G's 21<sup>st</sup> Century Campus survey reports that campus technology is important to students; 81% use technology every day. Faculty and students don't always see eye to eye on the use of technology and students generally feel that faculty need more training on technology. Susan noted that this broad based feedback is consistent with feedback received from student focus groups at Loyola.

Top Issues – The Educause Top 10 Issues survey is focus specifically on higher education technology. There is good synergy with the survey results and the issues relevant to Loyola. The Gartner CIO Top Priorities are broader in nature and a little less specific to higher education, however, still show good alignment with Loyola's technology initiatives.

Budget – A Gartner higher education study showed on average 55% of higher education budgets have increased and 31% are flat. Loyola's ITS budget as a percentage of Loyola's overall budget has dropped consistently since 2005. We are currently at 3.53% versus 4.21% in 2008 and 5.8% in 2005. Gartner also reports that approximately 72% of the average IT budget is applied to running the business (operating costs) and only 15% of the average IT budget to transformational projects.

Hype Cycles – Gartner Hype Cycles divide technology maturity into 5 phases that serve as a frame of reference to assist with how to assess the maturity of technology elements within higher education. Susan reviewed the higher education hype cycle noting several items Loyola is focused on and where those technologies were represented within the cycle.

FY10 Planned Initiatives – Susan demonstrated how some of the planned FY10 ITS initiatives are mapped to the strategic plan items and tactics.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 pm.