

Attendees:

Area	Name	Status	Area	Name	Status
Academic Affairs	Chris Wiseman	Absent	Human Resources	Tom Kelly	In Attendance
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	Robert Kelly	In Attendance
Finance	Bill Laird	In Attendance			

Welcome, Meeting Purpose & Agenda

The meeting commenced at 1:40 PM. The minutes from the June 11th meeting were reviewed and approved as written.

FY10 Q1-Q2 – Plan of Record and Prioritization Review

The prioritization results were reviewed. Eleven new items were added to the top “20” list. Approximately 25 items in total were ranked in total. Two items, Repeat Course Reporting and Request Enrollment Function will be added to the LOCUS enhancements program group and will not be ranked individually. John asked about ITS resources and effects on project timelines. Jim commented that resource adjustments are made on a consistent basis depending on the support load/requests and the priority of projects. The result is evident in the number of date changes on the report. A question arose regarding the scope of work and timing regarding the Emergency Response Website. *Task: F/U on Emergency Response Website project status.*

Audit Briefing

Three separate technology-related audits have been launched over the summer. No major findings were reported in both the annual Deloitte financial audit and inspection of information systems controls and the annual security assessment focused on data and network protection completed by Halock Systems. The reports cited a number of best practices in place at Loyola; several exceptions and observations were noted in both reports to tighten our security position. A risk review and corresponding action plan will be executed for any of these items needing attention. The third review is an application audit in progress by SMART & Associates. This year’s audit is concentrating on the Housing, Building Access, and Advancement systems. A final report is expected in the coming months. Tom was interested in the details on the Maxxess findings. Susan concurred commenting on the Deloitte finding where people were re-granted access to the Data Center without ITS approval. We should develop a more robust process or alert mechanism for access changes. Jon asked about SmartCall and to what level it would be reviewed. Susan wasn’t sure SmartCall was in-scope but thought that part of the review would be based on follow-up from prior year’s findings. Jon asked for a review of SmartCall from a process and use perspective. *Task: Susan to inquire with SMART to review the SmartCall application as part of the Audit.*

Technology Roadmap

Susan introduced the technology roadmap as a tool developed by the Architecture Review Board to define the strategy and direction for technology. It provides a method to how we approach new technology acquisitions and assess technology changes in a planful and thoughtful manner. The application diagram shows what we are running and how data is shared between technologies; the roadmap helps document current state to future state changes in technology.

The roadmap is split into three levels; solutions, software and hardware and are dependent upon each other, like building blocks. Technology components will go through various stages in their lifetime: Emerging, Tactical, Strategic, Containment, Retirement. Items in the Containment stage will normally have a corresponding item in the Emerging category to offset. Core Technologies are our technology foundation and defined as the essential technology components which we build upon. Changes to Core items are more difficult due to financial and skillset investment or impact to the university. Jim noted there are over 350 total technology components in existence at Loyola. The roadmap accounts for what is critical to University operations. John asked about Macintosh and if it were possible to make it a standard given the IC setup. Susan explained the large testing effort required for all University applications to adopt the Macintosh platform as a standard option beyond curriculum requirements. Further discussion on whether or not to make

Macintosh a standard long term would be needed. All agreed to table this for now. *Task: Change the abbreviated Mac to Macintosh on the roadmap.* Additional clarifications arose regarding the appearance of Maxient, Simplicity NACElink and the Learning Center and Research systems on the application diagram. *Task: Research and modify the application diagram accordingly.*

FY11 Technology Related Budget Planning

A draft list of ITS budget items for FY11 was shared. Feedback and input from the committee members was requested to plan funding for FY11 projects appropriately. Bill inquired about how ITS could secure additional funding from grants or third party monies to assist with funding of technology items. A short discussion occurred regarding stimulus finding, approaches and experiences. Bill recommended that Bill Sellers come to the next meeting to discuss further. Tom suggested Alicia Martin attend as well. *Task: Invite Bill and Alicia to the next meeting to share their experiences and potential options.*

Meeting Wrap-Up

The next meeting is 9/3. The meeting adjourned at 3:15 PM.