Attendees:

Area	Name	Status	Area	Name	Status
Academic Affairs	John Frendreis	Absent	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	In Attendance
Finance	Bill Laird	Absent			

Minutes:

Welcome & Meeting Purpose
Susan Malisch reviewed the purpose for the meeting: *To introduce and discuss an executive process and structure for reviewing and prioritizing technology efforts.* The information being reviewed was a **draft proposal** and comments, improvements are welcomed to the process. Individual sessions will be held to cover the materials with Jon Heintzelman and Bill Laird who were not able to attend.

Framing
The top ten IT issues from the EDUCAUSE survey were reviewed. Susan reviewed the "IT Rings of Excellence" goals and projects noting their alignment with the issue list from EDUCAUSE. It was also noted that items 1-9 had active IT projects or activity within them and that for number10 we were at least talking about for future consideration.

Scorecards
Governance & Funding
The scorecard format was introduced and reviewed. Susan explained the "stop light" approach and use of colors as an indicator of health in conjunction with the healthy and unhealthy definitions within each row. The arrows indicate where activities within ITS are specifically contributing to moving the item to a "more green" or healthy state.

No changes were noted.

Academic and Faculty Support
Susan talked briefly about the items on the scorecard. Tom asked about Research Services, as an example, to get an understanding of why the measurement was red/yellow. Susan stated that the resulting color of the item or health was subjective at this point and based on perceptions of ITS and customer of the system as a whole (hardware, software, data, stability, support etc.). The rating is not representative of any departmental processes, procedures, usage or ownership.

A discussion regarding departmental labs and where they belonged ensued. John P. discussed the option of separating the labs into their own item. Detail items discussed were; representation of departmental & school support belong, missing the awareness & communication of what is available, not as many self service tools, people need to help them selves. *TASK: Consider departmental labs as its own item. Still need to define "unhealthy" to "healthy" qualifier.*

John P. also noted a natural relation of the Research Services item to the actual Research Office. He was not thinking about researching computing. Susan suggested changing the name of the item. John P. agreed noting a need to differentiate the office itself and services offered. *TASK: Adjust qualifier for research services to " Research Support Services/Research Computing". DONE*

H:\SHARED\PAQS\Marguerite\Governance Web Site\gov_itesc\Minutes\ITESC Minutes, 11-13-06.doc
Last Saved: 12/13/2006 12:30:00 AM

Page 1 of 4

Tom inquired if Learning Mgmt Services was Blackboard. Susan explained the item and why it was named such and that items should probably not be tool specific. Tom commented that he was still having some issue understanding whether points were departments or projects or areas. *TASK: Review item "names" to ensure that the representation is clear.*

No changes were noted regarding the health (color) of any item.

Administrative Technology
Susan noted that departments are listed on this scorecard and that the qualification was the technological support for each. Fr. Richard Salmi asked why there are arrows on some versus another. Susan clarified that the arrows represent where we have active efforts to improve the item's health. ITS planning is done in six month cycles. The ITESC would vet future strategic work that makes a difference at Loyola. There is a backlog of IT work and we want to schedule the appropriate work to be completed.

No changes were noted regarding the health (color) of any item.

Student Technology
General review of scorecard items was done. Tom asked if student email was better. Susan said she thought so; 6,000 on so far, with little complaint or incident. Fr. Richie said that those who use it said it was a better tool and that it was a good idea to put the freshman on. It will take some time for the others to make the switch but those who have gone to the new tool are happy with it. It was mentioned that ITS Student Focus Groups are scheduled in the fall and the spring as a feedback mechanism of the student's perspective on technology at Loyola. The fall meeting is scheduled next week.

A discussion on wireless connectivity then took place. The use of surveys was discussed in order to get input on further wireless implementations. Fr. Richie thought that the stepped approached was working well. Students love it! Fr. Richie added that students had positive thoughts regarding the progression with ITS services and to keep working on campus card. John P. asked about Peoplesoft integration opportunities exist with campus card. Susan discussed the Campus Card end of life and long term strategy. We will use Blackboard's online system for one year. This gives Loyola more time to decide on the long term solution.

No changes were noted regarding the health (color) of any item.

Infrastructure
The two scorecards slides were reviewed at a high level. Susan noted some underlying support categories that exist such as identity management, security etc. and noted that there were current efforts within the identity management category to move that item away from red. The concepts of technology refresh and standardization and BCDR details were also discussed. The BCDR discussion touched on items such as separation of systems, splitting termination points for web sites and GroupWise separation.

No changes were noted regarding the health (color) of any item.

Continuing Service Improvement
Multiple initiatives within ITS have been launched to improve service. The success of the Change Management process as well as some promising results from the early adoption of new project management principles were two examples discussed. It was also noted that the Enterprise Architecture/PMO team was now fully staffed and that several of the unhealthy items such as Research and Development and Architecture Planning would begin to move off of red.

No changes were noted regarding the health (color) of any item.

Scorecard Wrap-Up

H:\SHARED\PAQS\Marguerite\Governance Web Site\gov_itesc\Minutes\ITESC Minutes, 11-13-06.doc
Last Saved: 12/13/2006 12:30:00 AM

Page 2 of 4

Tom asked about where to plug in work with the Loyola University Medical Center (LUMC). He used employee self service as an example and asked; How do we capture those type of items? Should we? Where would the Lawson upgrade get reported? LDAP was another example of a service improvement that should be reported on. Tom said imaging was another example and that Bill had a project ongoing with MHC. He suggested that maybe a new section or scorecard altogether would need to be added for LUMC. A detailed discussion ensued on whether to include LUMC services in this type of process. Susan noted that we don't know what governance process or scorecard reporting existed within LUMC. The benefit would be a more complete view of technology services consumed by Loyola. Susan needs Tom and Bill's assistance to qualify the list and solicit participation from LUMC. *TASK-Determine an appropriate and agreeable method of reporting on the health of IT services the University utilizes from the Medical Center.*

Susan asked if the scorecard information was at the appropriate level. Phil said he liked the structure but acknowledged the there was quite a bit of detail. Fr. Richie agreed. Tom thought maybe we could group some categories in several of the scorecards. Susan restated that many things haven't been discussed for quite some time and there was benefit in going through it in detail. All were in agreement. *TASK-Review the possibility of combining items within the scorecards.*

Steering Committee Structure
Susan walked through the committee chart detailing the flow of ideas. She discussed the concept of sub-committees and how they would pass strategic initiatives to the committee for prioritization and approval. The four sub-committees were briefly touched on. It was noted that a large backlog of work exists and needs prioritization. The University Coordinating Committee (UCC) would be leveraged for review and approval of policies and other items as appropriate.

The need to be able to handle external and/or extremely urgent requests was discussed and that not all requests would be funneled through the sub-committees. Items such as specific technology requests, compliance, emergencies, and Office of the President requests would not likely come through the sub-committees.

The charter specifics were then presented. Phil asked if BRT submissions would go through the ITESC. Susan said yes. Tom asked about adding Deans on the ITESC. John said he didn't feel there was a need to add Deans on the ITESC and that they would be properly represented by Provost. No changes to the detailed charter were noted during the discussion.

The meeting frequency will be monthly initially then moving to quarterly some time in early 2007. All were in agreement. *TASK: Finalize charter and ITESC membership at next meeting.*

Sub-Committees
Academic Technology Committee
Acceptance and agreement on need for the sub-committee was obvious. A subsequent discussion followed regarding the chair. John suggested Carol Schiedenhelm. All were in agreement.

Fr. Richie said he wanted students represented but wasn't sure that they should be directly on the committee. Could we find a better way to engage them about technology? He was also concerned that there was typically only a small group of students that "do everything" and was concerned about spreading them too thin. Fr. Richie also suggested that this might be handled best by a student technology committee. *Task: Fr. Richie determine how students should be represented in the ATC.*

John asked about why the Academic Affairs UPC was represented. It was the only instance of putting a policy committee member on the sub-committee. Do we need it? The feeling was that this would not be a representative group and we don't want the UPCs to think this works for all. All were in agreement that no UPCs should be represented. Fr. Richie asked John's opinion on Faculty Council and whether it is was needed; John was not sure. Susan said it was up to John and John Frendreis. Tom asked about schools and was a faculty member to be selected or was it Dean? If it is faculty

then maybe we don't need Faculty Council? Tom noted if we show faculty council do we need to add staff council as well? John proposed we don't need the at large people, Faculty Council or Academic Affairs UPC. All agreed.

Project Review Board
Susan proposed Kevin Smith serve as chair given that his role currently brokers this process informally. No concerns were brought forth. John P. discussed that maybe April & Eric were too similar, asked to add himself, and suggested adding Terry Richards and Paul Roberts to represent their areas. Tom noted that the list seemed very Peoplesoft centric. What about other areas? Susan explained that with other areas there wasn't core system to support. Tom asked if John Campbell was the right person. John P. wanted Registration & Records represented but suggested possibly that Clare Korinek be moved to the ARB and that possibly Diane Hollinger take her place on the PRB. *TASK: Finalize membership on the PRB.*

Architecture Review Board
John wanted Academic Affairs involved and also noted that Learning Management was missing and should Bruce Montes be included. Tom added a comment that maybe this was where we connect with LUMC. Susan thought that maybe we could extend out to LUMC as an invitation versus membership and that maybe that would work the same for Research & Records and Learning Management. *TASK: Finalize membership on the ARB.*

Personal Information Risk Group
A discussion regarding the size of the group took place noting departments with multiple and redundant representation. John commented as to whether or not we needed Rome represented via Christine Marciasini? He suggested this person be replaced or the representation removed and that he would provide a name. Jim thought this person was there as a communication liaison only and not a true member. *TASK: John provide JFRC member. Finalize membership on the PIRG.*

Scorecard
A proposed scoring model was reviewed. Susan also brought up the possibility of weighting certain questions. This was left for future consideration. The exception process was also noted. The question arose as to how the sub-committees would prioritize their work. Susan said that the ITESC prioritization technique might work at the sub-committee level and that it should be discussed within the groups. *TASK: Finalize revisions to the questions and tool for prioritization.*

Prioritization Opportunities
A partial list of projects that would be good candidates for prioritization was included, and discussed new items received (green) and potential items to go to the ATC (maroon). Susan noted the critical relationship of developing a LMS and pod-casting strategy to an executable BCDR plan.

Next Steps
Susan walked through the Next Steps slide. She talked to the concept of membership being assignments. John didn't think a one year turnover made sense and suggested some stability. Feedback from group was that the overall foundation for the ITESC, sub-committees and scorecards was solid and the technology review at Loyola was long overdue. A meeting in Dec will be set as a follow-up to finalize the process.

The meeting was adjourned about 15 minutes over time.