

Attendees:

Area	Name	Status	Area	Name	Status
Academic Affairs	Chris Wiseman	In Attendance	ITS/Facilitator	Susan Malisch	In Attendance
Academic Affairs	John Pelissero	Absent	ITS	Jim Sibenaller	In Attendance
Advancement	Jon Heintzelman	Absent	Student Affairs	Fr. Richard Salmi	Absent
Facilities	Phil Kosiba	In Attendance	GUESTS:		
Finance	Bill Laird	In Attendance	LUMC	Art Krumrey	In Attendance
Human Resources	Tom Kelly	In Attendance	ITS	Jim Roberts	In Attendance

Minutes:

Welcome, Meeting Purpose & Agenda

The meeting commenced at 1:13 PM due to traffic issues with the air show. Susan began with a review of the agenda and welcomed the guests. She then reviewed the security incident noting calls (about 200) and credit reporting enrollment statistics (31%). She also noted the additional planning and action items to continue to remediate concerns going forward.

LUMC Update

Art began the discussion with an update of the LUMC scorecard noting few changes in health but much activity within. Lawson Upgrade – The project will entail 2 phases, underlying technology first, then a second phase to take advantage of new functionality and interfaces. The project is showing as a full fiscal year of activity with benefits not realized until sometime time next year. The re-work of processes should begin sometime in January. Tom asked if any financial concerns had been identified. Art said only consulting but a modest amount, less than \$100K per party. Roger is planning this out in detail. Art said he would share detailed plans when they become available.

SSOM Student Info System – Art noted that they were waiting for the SIS upgrade to proceed with working on integration for SSOM. A short discussion ensued regarding timings and dependencies of the two efforts. Art asked about how the SSOM would pay for system usage. Bill responded that we would most likely use the student counts/ratios for payment.

SSOM Employee Self Service – The Shared Source of Truth project is a dependency to offer online open enrollment to SSOM employees in November. Art is looking forward to leveraging the single source of truth solution for other projects. Susan distributed the executive update report for the project. The project health has moved to orange (increased risk) based on resource constraints and start of school efforts. Susan is addressing this with Dan and Kevin Smith. Art added that there are 100-115 ids that need to change due to duplicates as part of that initiative. Delivery of employee self service for the SSOM is dependent on completion of this project.

Intercampus connectivity – Art commented that the GroupWise integration is working well. Susan also mentioned that having cross-reference links to the online directories for LUC and LUMC on the websites was a quick fix.

Video Conferencing – Funding is approved for LUMC for the initiative. Susan commented that LUC had delayed a final purchase to observe vendor selection underway at LUMC; distinct requirements exist at LUMC. Art said the need for “high def” in the board room, compatibility with the existing Crestron controls, and a new bridge for video conferencing are additional requirements for their efforts. He added that remote/traveling video services will also be available. Art concluded that compatibility with LUC would be ensured.

Pre Award Research – Art asked about LUC activity in this area. No-one was aware of any. Art said that a contract is about to be signed by LUMC for a medical research system but that it was not an awards system. Bill and Chris said they were unaware of any activity but would double check with their staff, Nancy Tuchman was suggested as a point person. Art said that Rich Kennedy is the owner at LUMC. This item will not be tracked on the scorecard.

Space Management – Art asked for a status from LUC. Bill noted the need to involve quite a few functional areas to properly implement a space system. He said it would be a very big project and that we need to think about how to approach this given the other items in the work queue. Art said LUMC's current outsourced system is more of a floor plan system. Phil mentioned they were really looking for a replacement of their scheduling system right now. Chris expressed interest in a common basis for information on classroom management and that she was concerned about faculty that move from campus to campus. The conclusion was that a space management system was something that would be part of the five year plan for LUC.

Credit Card Processing – Bill's area is very concerned about the security and protection of credit card data. They are in the final stages of completing an audit via 3rd party relating to regulations set forth by the Payment Card Industry (PCI). This has a due date of the end of September. The goal is to have a secure system and process that everyone will utilize in Touchnet MarketPlace. We need to be PCI compliant, agree on policies and ensure they are followed.

General LUMC Specific Projects – Art talked about the EPIC project which pertains to electronic medical records rolled out to all clinics. LUMC is currently validating productivity and optimization of the use of the software by each clinic. They are looking to achieve a 100% paperless status. The biggest challenge is the retention of images. Art also talked about Vista and asked if LUC was doing testing or validation. He said that LUMC is doing nothing at this time. Susan said that LUC would offer limited availability in labs only and testing of all university applications had not been completed yet.

Art departed at 2:01 pm. The July 10th, 2007 meeting minutes were reviewed and approved as distributed. Susan also shared this year's *Technology for Faculty and Staff* brochure. Additional brochures are available for anyone wanting some for their office or other locations on campus.

PMO Overview

Jim Roberts, Senior Project Manager, reviewed the history of the project management processes at LUC. Susan noted that we currently have two full time project managers but requirements exceed capacity so we use a mentoring/training format to train other staff members on PM tools and methods. Jim R. introduced the definition of a Project Management Office (PMO). Three types of PMO's exist; directive, supportive and controlling. We are currently performing as a directive and supportive service with a future goal towards introducing further aspects of control. Jim stated that implementing the project management processes has been challenging from a cultural perspective. The group identified that clarity of roles and responsibilities of the technology and business functional staff is clearly important and needed. Jim R. also added that executive sponsor participation along with multiple communication mechanisms are critical and key to project success. All agreed.

Jim R. reviewed several slides pertaining to project improvements and benefits of having a project management methodology. Highlighted items included improved planning, clarity of executive support and user involvement, communication and clarification of project goals and objectives. The project management lifecycle, which is based on PMI best practices, was then reviewed. Jim R. highlighted areas where the business functional members and sponsors are engaged in the process. Susan talked to the budgeting process for projects and that budgets established early in the process are often "plug numbers" or a best guess based on the information available. She highlighted that having sponsor involvement up-front combined with improved documentation could avoid confusion over established numbers and what they mean (used Wellness servers as an example). Jim R. reviewed system testing and the criticality for business involvement. All were in agreement that we need to reinforce this with the business functional staff engaged on projects. Jim R. mentioned that all projects don't follow every step and every deliverable; we can fast-track projects based on size and risk. Samples of several key deliverables were made available as handouts. Jim R. concluded the discussion with known challenges and next steps. He added that there is no uniform recipe or silver bullet for project management. It needs to fit the culture and fit the commitment level of the institution. Tom asked about project documentation and where it was kept. The group was pleased with the presentation and noted the work completed to date.

Prioritization Exercise

Susan introduced the Plan of Record (POR) spreadsheet as a representation of LUC's ITS portfolio of projects. The list does not include operational or break/fix items and shows current priority as designated by the Project Review Board. Each ITESC member (or area) will rank their top 20 projects and a combined view will drive the discussion at the next meeting. Tom asked about how to determine the size of the projects. Susan said that her teams were working on detailing estimates in the future and noted two placeholder columns on the sheet, "T-shirt Sizing" and "Effort in Hours". Susan then introduced two charts which represented a breakdown of the projects by priority and by strategic alignment to the ITS Rings of Excellence. She said these and other similar charts and data would begin to be provided as the portfolio management discipline takes shape within ITS. *Task: Susan will send an electronic copy of the prioritization worksheet to all ITESC members with instructions for completion.*

ITS Capacity Estimates

The ITS Capacity Estimate chart is a first pass at documenting the breakdown of ITS resource capacity. Capacity is defined in three broad categories: staff, support and project time. Susan noted that after time is taken out for staff and support activities the remaining time is available for project work. Current ITS breakdowns show 23% committed to staff, 49% committed to support and 28% left for project work. Jim S. noted industry standards of 18%-40% of staff time. Skillsets and other dependencies need to be considered before taking this as a pure capacity number for projects. As we refine our prioritization list, the group will review options for how to map supply and demand for resources to better understand capacity.

ITS Benchmarking

Susan introduced some budget benchmarking information and analysis indicating that the metric for analyzing higher-ed is to measure IT budget as a percentage of the institutional budget. The chart shows a declining percentage over the last 3-4 years. Given the growth at LUC and the increased demand for technology across the campus during this time, the trend suggests that LUC ITS is getting more efficient/productive (doing more with less) and that we are probably getting good benefits out of the technologies deployed. Tom thought some of the declining trend at the five year mark may have to do with the change in scope with the medical center support, staff reduction and of the removal of the mainframe. Tom asked about ITS folks in other departments within LUC. While we know there is some IT support outside of ITS, LUC has spent considerable effort over the last several years to centralize as much as possible and we are on the "more centralized" spectrum compared to our peer and aspirational groups. The variance of centralization and structure make it difficult to do this analysis against comparable institutions, but Susan is exploring this possibility with the AJCU community. A slide from Gartner showed industry benchmarks for centralized IT budgets to demonstrate expected ranges and where LUC fits in this range. Further scrubbing of this data will be shared going forward.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:22 PM.