LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO
Preparing people to lead extraordinary lives

Attendees:

Area	Name	Status	Area	Name	Status
Academic Affairs	Chris Wiseman	Absent	ITS	Jim Sibenaller	In Attendance
Academic Affairs	John Pelissero	In Attendance	Student Affairs	Fr. Richard Salmi	In Attendance
Advancement	Jon Heintzelman	Absent	**Guests:**		
Facilities	Phil Kosiba	In Attendance	Reg. & Records	Eric Pittenger	In Attendance
Finance	Bill Laird	Absent	Finance-A/P	Brian Slavinskas	In Attendance
Human Resources	Tom Kelly	In Attendance	Enrollment Ops	Tom Mathewson	In Attendance
ITS/Facilitator	Susan Malisch	In Attendance			

Welcome, Meeting Purpose & Agenda

The meeting commenced at 11:05 AM with a review of the agenda and introductions of guests.

Enterprise Content Management (ECM) Recommendation

Jim reviewed the goal of this proposal is to provide a common method to store, share, process and manage documents in an effective and efficient manner. There are opportunities to improve student services and build faster, more timely and secure single sources of information for faculty and administrative areas. The technology will also serve as a catalyst for process improvement. It will not replace any functionality within core systems but will assist with the capture and access of unstructured data in those systems.

Ten different core departments were involved with the analysis with assistance from IMERGE Consulting Inc., who specializes in ECM technology analysis within higher-ed. The primary review team consisted of Eric Pittenger-Registration and Records, Tom Mathewson-Enrollment Operations, Brian Slavinskas-Finance and Jim Sibenaller-ITS. The recommendation of the DocFinity product from Optical Image Technology was the result of approximately nine months of research and analysis.

The highlighted improvements included; enhanced management of records/paperwork, process improvements & efficiencies, increased records security & protection, reduction in physical storage space requirements, improved information collaboration & sharing, common language & transferable skills, annual operational savings and ongoing support of Loyola's "green" initiatives. A detailed findings document is available for review. A short discussion on compliance was held. Jim noted that a future requirement would be to review and detail the document retention policies at Loyola, both electronic and paper-based. A discussion on the security of the product also took place. The security access for the DocFinity product was reviewed by ITS and no concerns were noted. Security is robust and will tie closely to that of the corresponding sourcing system.

Three examples of process efficiencies, utilization of workflow and systems integration were discussed:
   Res. Life Key Replacement - Potential savings, reduction of turn around from more than 1 day to several hours.
   Registration & Records Requests - Potential savings, reduction of turn around from 5 days to 1-2 days or less.
   Check Requisitions - Potential savings equals reduction of document delivery from 4 days to instant access (6-10 days of savings with full workflow implemented.

The five year project cost is $915,000. Redirecting the existing approved maintenance budget for the current point solutions that would be shut down, the incremental investment is $400,000-$500,000. The five year maintenance savings over the existing point solutions is $215,000. A year one capital budget placeholder of $395,000 has been requested for the initial implementation of DocFinity. An operational FTE is required to manage systems administration, upgrades and assist with the process re-engineering. Funding for this position has been approved pending capital approval of the project. Detailed planning and validation of assumptions will be required as the initial step to product implementation. Conversion or back-scanning is currently not included in any of the estimates and will be the responsibility of departments to cover the expense.

The three point solutions that were previously implemented, Imagio, MHC and Paper Vision, were very good decisions, given the institutional need, maturity of imaging technology and financial state of the university at the time. Given the current environment it is now the right time to move forward with an enterprise approach to ECM. John requested support and endorsement from the ITESC to take forward to the BRT. All were in favor.

Implementation would be executed in stages based on department readiness. ECM will not be forced on departments or schools. A six stage process was reviewed based on discussions with 15 different departments. Response has been positive across these departments.

John Pelissero departed at 11:45.

Susan discussed that this is a strategic project to facilitate change in process and service across the university. Susan also noted that Loyola has considered an ECM solution three separate times previously but never this broadly across the institution with this depth of analysis and expected benefits. We'll likely be revisiting this in the future if it's not funded in FY09. It was suggested that a non-administrative workflow example be identified for the BRT presentation. *Task: Condense the slide deck for the BRT utilizing the Registration and Records Workflow example, improved budget explanation and focus on service improvements.*

Eric, Brian and Tom departed at 12:20.

Minutes and Action Items
The minutes from the February 7th meeting were reviewed and approved as written.

Student Information System Upgrade
The SIS project team provided a written status report. Susan asked the committee to review and comment back if required. A detailed review is scheduled for the next ITESC meeting on May 1st.

LUMC Update
Art Krumrey was unable to attend but sent an updated scorecard and some highlights regarding key activities.

Project Management Resources/New Projects
Susan reviewed new high priority projects that have recently been requested. Several of these are required projects. At this point, we have used internal funds to augment current staff with consulting resources to maintain our commitments on current projects and begin these new ones. This will likely impact the prioritization process in June/July as capacity is already allocated to these new projects. Jim reviewed the resource constraints and adjustments to staffing made to address the increased requirements specifically for project management skills.

Meeting Wrap-Up
Susan introduced the concept of future strategic and longer term technology planning topics to be discussed at upcoming meetings. *Task: Send background information on technology trends and technology in higher education to the committee members to read in preparation.*

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 PM.