



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	Absent	ITS	Jim Sibenaller	In Attendance
Facilities	Phil Kosiba	In Attendance	Student Affairs	Fr. Richard Salmi	Absent
Finance	Bill Laird	In Attendance			

Minutes:

Welcome & Meeting Purpose

The November 13, 2006 meeting minutes were reviewed and approved as published. The purpose for this meeting was to refine and finalize membership and charters of committees in expectation of ramping up each group in early January.

Scorecards

No changes were noted regarding the health (color) of any item on any of the scorecards. The specific scorecards reviewed in detail where changes to content or process were discussed are as follows:

Academic and Faculty Support

Departmental Labs – Susan led the discussion regarding the healthy/unhealthy definitions for the item (open task from last meeting) noting the difficulty we were having defining due to the minimal involvement and support of some of the labs. The unsupported labs were discussed and a detailed list of known labs was shown and reviewed. John P. added the Physics lab in Cudahy Science. Bill inquired as to why some labs are supported and some are not. Some departments want this by design and choice based on the software and configuration within each lab. John P suggested to look at having ITS support the labs in Sullivan but under control of the people in Sullivan; similar to 25 E Pearson setup. John F proposed all labs should be supported by ITS in some manner and couldn't think of an academic reason why they shouldn't be part of the refresh program etc. All agreed in concept. If this is the case, then ITS can should be able to define the unhealthy/healthy definition. *TASK: ITS to complete a full inventory of labs and relevant support and to create a health definition for the line item.*

Administrative Technology

Not discussed.

Student Technology

The ratings were briefly discussed by Susan noting Campus Card as an example to address Bill's inquiries regarding the current health definition. She defined some of the challenges such as old hardware, no test platform, no fail over plans and that we were still utilizing SSN within the application. Bill asked how we got into this situation. John F. explained that it began as a "security only thing" originally, then quickly transformed into other things. He believes it was just a bi-product of old times, personnel losses, no real owner etc. The system was involved with resolving a series of questions and concerns over time with no complete strategy. It was discussed that BlackBoard no longer supports the product. As a short-term measure, migration to BlackBoard's new solution buys us time to research our long-term strategy for this area in the coming year. John F. asked about functional ownership. Bill said that Tim McGuriman was the current owner. John F. questioned if that made sense given the multi-functional nature of the product. Bill didn't necessarily disagree and added that we should have a single owner of the product. It could be Tim or it could be someone else. Bill asked for a review of the project approach at the next meeting. Bill said he was now more comfortable with the current health definition. All were in agreement. *TASK: Determine the business owner and ITS support staff for the Campus Card product.*

Infrastructure

Not discussed.

Continuing Service Improvement

Not discussed.

Governance & Funding

Not discussed.

LUC/LUMC

Susan introduced a draft scorecard and concept to capture technology services provided to LUC from LUMC. Bill would like increased/improved communication to be aware of changes that may possibly affect LUC. He used upgrade and interface changes as examples. Tom agreed and cited a recent Kronos interface change as an example. John F. asked if there were regular meetings between the ITS departments. Susan said yes, with Art, but most have been focused on Advancement issues in 2006. Meetings at director and technical levels are occurring more frequently on targeted topics as needed. Rather than regular membership, Susan proposed it may be more appropriate to invite Art and Ron as guests to review planning every 6 months or so. John F. added that the new CEO may have a different/improved view of technology integration and use of academic systems. *TASK: Susan will take a second pass at the LUC/LUMC scorecard with Art Krumrey. Revisit the scorecard in the next meeting and continue to discuss integration options and information sharing with Information Technology at LUMC. Suggested additions for scorecard: Student Systems (John F.), Pre-Award Research, Space Systems, Credit Card Processing (Bill), Learning Management System (John P.). Need to review this for level of detail desired.*

Steering Committee Structure

Membership – Bill asked if there should be an ITESC type setup for LUMC, briefing session etc. Susan asked that we take the topic off-line. All agreed.

ITESC – The question was posed to consider adding Wayne Madgiargz and/or Nancy Tuchman to the committee? It was agreed that Nancy is a better fit for the Academic Technology Committee, and that all key customer groups are currently represented so this may not be the best use of Wayne's time.

Sub-Committees

Academic Technology Committee

Research is to be added with Nancy as the committee member. *TASK: Add Research and John P. will send message to Deans to secure membership from each school.*

Project Review Board

There was an extensive discussion of subcommittee membership, name, charter, and process. In an effort to keep the process and planning cycles on-track, it was agreed that this group would review the current backlog of projects in the Project Status System (PSS) to gain a better understanding of the types of requests, scope of work, and general priority of proposed projects. While Bill does an ITS prioritization review with his staff, Academic Affairs wants to be sure the appropriate prioritization representation is made at these meetings. Once the PSS review is complete, the structure and composition of this group can be finalized. It was noted in the current structure that ITESC does the final vetting of priorities and has the opportunity to make adjustments. *TASK: Distribute the current project list and schedule a January meeting to review. Kevin Smith will be added to this discussion.*

John F. & John P. left for a Dean's meeting.

Bill suggested his people may change based on what projects and type of work was on the list, and proposed Kana Wibbenmeyer as a member. Phil agreed. This addition and further changes will be discussed at the January review meeting when membership is finalized.

Architecture Review Board

Jim did a quick overview of enterprise architecture and the roles the members of the review board would be playing. He noted that it would be important to keep the group technical and that the initial time requirement is up to 10% a week in the initial months of operation. Susan asked the group to consider prior recommendations for non-technical or peripheral staff such as Clare Korinek, a Learning Management System Subject Matter Expert and a representative from LUMC to be invited guests at topically appropriate meetings rather than regular members. Computer Science could be a good addition due to the technical nature of the conversations and provide a useful link to this department. Bill suggested moving Clare back to the Project Review Board. All in attendance agreed. *TASK: Verify changes to the ARB with John F. and John P.*

Phil had to depart due to meeting running over time.

Personal Information Risk Group

The membership of the PIRG was reviewed. Susan acknowledged that the scope of this group has grown considerably beyond the purview of ITS, and that we should review the project definition and consider outsourcing some of this activity. Bill proposed that Deloitte may be an alternative resource to handle some of the assessment activities over SMART. Membership and composition of this group could change, particularly for Finance and HR, if a sub or advising committee were created. Further review of the group's activities is required. *TASK: Bill will send contact information from Deloitte to consider outsourcing some of these risk assessment activities. Susan and Bill: Verify involvement of SMART and outsourcing of work outside of ITS.*

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 AM.