Preparing people to lead extraordinary lives

Attendees:

Area	Name	Status	Area	Name	Status
Academic Affairs	John Frendreis	In Attendance	Human Resources	Tom Kelly	Absent
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	LUMC-Guest	Arthur Krumrey	In Attendance

Minutes:

Welcome & Meeting Purpose
The meeting commenced at 10:02 AM. The agenda was reviewed. Susan noted that the majority of time would be spent reviewing and discussing the LUMC scorecard. The structure of the meeting was changed slightly due to the late arrival of the printed meeting minutes and that Bill was running a few minutes late.

Subcommittees
Susan reviewed the details from the slide noting that all sub-committees have now met.

PIRG – Once the PIRG policies are complete, it's been recommended that reviews occur by Internal Audit (SMART), the ITESC, UCC, and General Counsel. John F. suggested that Counsel be consulted sooner and that the UCC review should be last. Fr. Salmi agreed. These adjustments will be made to the review process. *Task: Jim to have the policies ready for review by the next ITESC meeting.*

PRB – Monthly meetings are now scheduled and additional cleanup of the data continues. Projects with a priority of HIGH will be discussed in detail at the next meeting.

ATC – Monthly meetings are being scheduled and members are to bring their priorities to the next meeting. John F. noted the considerable investment Loyola is making in academic space and asked that this group look at classroom renovations and design priorities for future academic space. John F. favors banked classrooms, no desks, and rooms with configurable tables/chairs. Related, Susan recently purchased an EDUCAUSE book on designing academic space and gave a copy to Bruce Montes & Carol Scheidenhelm. *Task: Susan will ensure this concern gets to the sub-committee via a discussion with Bruce and Carol.*

ARB – The committee recently had its kickoff and twice monthly meetings were being scheduled. The kickoff was centered on defining enterprise architecture and the process for creating a technology roadmap for the university.

LUMC Scorecard
Susan welcomed Art to the meeting. Art began the review of the LUMC scorecard. He said it was a representation of a "self assessment" regarding the health of each item and that no specific measurements were in place. He added that the scorecard was centered on services stemming from Lawson and Kronos. He said that generally at LUMC they were looking for areas to improve on and how to make information more accessible.

Lawson – Art began by stating that version 9 is coming up this Summer/Fall. It is a big change centered on making information more accessible; not a typical upgrade. The project needs quite a bit of collaboration amongst all parties to be successful. Bill concurred, commenting on the importance of the interfaces. Bill added that we need to ensure that PeopleSoft, Campus Card & other feeds into Lawson are appropriately planned for and validated. John F. asked how long Art thought the project would take and who would be involved. Art said it was slated for FY08 and likely a ~6 month project, but a detailed project plan is yet to be developed. We would need several levels of staff at both locations to be involved with testing. Bill then commented on reporting. He asked if we would still need Web Focus given the upgrade. Art said that we would need to review this and that verifying functionality like that would be part of the testing plan. Art also said that the hardware is being replaced as a first step (generic UNIX/Oracle) and that the current infrastructure is about 6 years old. John F. asked about outages during the upgrade process. Art said they would be minimal, if any. Susan talked about the necessary coordination given the PeopleSoft upgrade and resource requirements. Bill thought the functionality should be reviewed for any add-ons or new capabilities that could be available. Art thought the project would be run similar to upgrades in the past with HR and Finance teams involved. *Task: Art to update the group with details on the project as they come available.*

H:\SHARED\PAQS\Marguerite\Governance Web Site\gov_itesc\Minutes\ITESC Minutes, 03-05-07.doc
Last Saved: 4/30/2007 7:49:00 AM

Page 1 of 3

<u>Student System</u> – John F. started the conversation noting that graduate students use PeopleSoft and the MD students do not. John F. and Bill shared concerns cited by auditors over the use of multiple student systems, including regulatory and reporting issues, use of School as a Lender Program, and separation of Billing and Collecting functions. John F. noted that there was a meeting planned with Fr. Garanzini, Paul Welton, Bill, and himself where this would be discussed. John F. mentioned they were going to suggest that the MD's use PeopleSoft. Bill added because we were using multiple systems that we were missing financial aid numbers and added that he thought a single system made sense from a financial standpoint. Art commented he wasn't sure why the old mainframe feed to PeopleSoft wasn't functioning as it used to. John F. added that no fit/gap analysis has been completed and a key issue would be if historical data would transfer/fit. He reminded everyone that this was an issue when PeopleSoft went live and that we need to be cautious. John F. asked Art if he thought there would be any resistance given the regulatory and financial reporting issues which were documented. Art commented that this would really be a Ron Price/SSOM Dean conversation. Art went on to say that minimally we need to integrate data but that the Dean would really need to be the one making that decision. John F. suggested the health on the scorecard should reflect more to the left (unhealthier) given the general lack of data integration stated. Art agreed and said he would review. *Task: Art & Susan to determine why the student systems are not passing data as they used to and adjust the scorecard rating to the left.*

<u>SSOM Employee Self-Service</u> – Art commented that they would be following the lead that LUC HR has taken regarding improved self service.

<u>Connectivity/Network</u> – Art commented that the GroupWise integration was working quite well and that we are working together on a common directory structure. Susan clarified that this was related to the identity management project. This will help with moving towards common authentication support. John F. asked about web presence. He had heard that LUMC was executing an RFP and could they consider the tool LUC was utilizing, Serena. He also asked Art if he thought there were benefits of utilizing a common tool. Art responded yes but that Marketing owns the initiative and thought that they just signed a contract for a content management vendor. Susan & Art both commented that website interoperability and better integration should be added as a new item for the scorecard. Components of this should include look and feel and access points. John F. also said that the digital signage project was another example of where LUC & LUMC might collaborate. Art added that he thought LUC was going to utilize the tool LUMC had selected. Susan added that LUC's rating and ranking sheet has an architectural fit component which will assist with the group's collaboration as its use at LUC is expanded and enforced by the ARB. *Task: Art & Susan to work out adding Website Interoperability (or such) to the LUMC scorecard.*

<u>Intercampus Video Conferencing</u> – John F. noted some questionable quality with delayed movements in the video and that the audio was not consistently synced up with the picture. Art commented that the technology in use is about 10 years old and that requirements should be reviewed. Susan commented that we had a team looking into it and that a member of LUMC IT was involved. John F. said there are administrative and academic needs. Primary clients would include Paul Welton, Faculty Council, UCC, School of Nursing, Deans Rosen and Attoh, and others with joint responsibilities. He also added that many new joint programs were being created with LUMC that would require improved technology for communications. Jon H. asked about Rome. Susan said the three Chicagoland campus locations were the current focus and Rome and Beijing would be addressed in a later phase of the project. Art asked about what locations currently exist. Susan reviewed the current locations and that Fr. Garanzini was looking for several permanent locations to accommodate meetings for up to ~15 people and a larger auditorium/town hall venue. John P. added that improvements regarding our current solution include limited panning, lighting, and the setup of rooms. John F. concluded that the educational/teaching opportunities are coming upon us sooner rather than later and should be considered when looking at a solution. Fr. Salmi also added that student government would benefit from these improvements as that group rotates meeting locations. *Task: Art and Susan will ensure proper coordination amongst the various teams and locations occurs for this project.*

<u>Learning Management</u> - John F. asked about learning management. Art commented LUMC utilizes LUMEN (Loyola Univ Medical Education Network). LUMEN pre-dates BlackBoard, links to other medical schools, and is restricted to the ~460 MD students. John P. commented that BlackBoard is available, but is only used by Bio-Ethics currently.

<u>General Discussion</u>
- John F. asked about a space planning/utilization system. LUMC uses an outsourced solution. Art added that the upfront work is substantial to set this type of solution up properly as it requires digitizing blueprints (6-digit project itself) and a "layered" approach was best. The missing piece for LUMC is the annual space inventory that still must be done manually.

Bill said LUC is not ready for this yet. Bill said we need a large formal project and that Facilities needs to be onboard. He suggested looking at what other universities are doing and looking for a Peoplesoft partner in this space. Our needs include calculating overhead, classroom management, and conference services. John F. suggested having a clear scope defined before we begin.

- Bill asked about credit cards, auditing practices and federal standards. Art said they re-enter the credit card number each time and don't store this type of data to avoid these concerns.
- John F. asked about joint purchasing agreements. Art said he and Susan already collaborate on purchases noting the Dell collaboration already in place.
- Jim asked about datacenter fail-over capabilities. Art said they have a separate on-campus data center location that handles some of the critical services like Lawson, Payroll, Kronos, but not all of them. Art talked about improvements and expansion of their general recovery capabilities.
- John F. said we should review the SSOM BCDR planning since they are part of the university. Susan agreed. Art thought a 3rd datacenter provided some SSOM services and that their main data center did some backup servicing. He said he would follow-up. *Task: Art and Susan will review the SSOM BCDR planning and LUMC current capabilities to ensure adequate recovery of services are in place. Additionally, add BSR as a separate component of the LUMC scorecard.*

Father Salmi departed early at 11:20 due to a prior commitment.

All agreed there is value to reviewing the LUMC plan with Art on a quarterly basis at the ITESC meetings going forward. Art summarized his takeaways and departed at 11:25 after the review of his scorecard was complete.

Minutes
The January 17th, 2007 meeting minutes were reviewed and approved as published.

POR
Susan reviewed the newly published ITS Plan of Record (POR) for Q3-Q4 FY07 highlighting several changes to the structure of the POR, including the topical alignment with the IT service rings versus specific IT departments, and the addition of PSS numbers to help tie initiatives to sub-committee work. Minor Q&A ensued. No outstanding issues.

Budget
Susan presented in a separate attachment the items that ITS was considering for submission during upcoming budget meetings. The intent is to give the ITESC insight regarding current requests and to solicit feedback/questions prior to Budget Hearings. Page 1 of the hand-out went through Round 1 already. Page 2 represents the new items that we have new requests for (since original submission in Sep 2006). She noted the priority column and that several items, highlighted in yellow, have estimates pending. These are primarily Peoplesoft products that were just released related to the coming upgrade sponsored by Academic Affairs. Susan explained several items in detail to heighten the group's awareness. Susan also reviewed the Information Commons Support Model handout. Considerable discussion took place regarding the staffing requirements for the Information Commons and how to validate how much, if any, incremental staff will be required. Jon H. noted that given that it's a new facility we don't really know what the support requirements will be. *Task: Susan committed to 1) review student staffing dollars, 2) present a view of support moving from other areas to the IC, and 3) validate the IC support models from Bob Seal and from ITS so the coverage can be more easily understood.*

Susan thanked all for attending. The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 PM.

_____

H:\SHARED\PAQS\Marguerite\Governance Web Site\gov_itesc\Minutes\ITESC Minutes, 03-05-07.doc
Last Saved: 4/30/2007 7:49:00 AM

Page 3 of 3