

**Attendees:**

Area	Name	Status	Area	Name	Status
Academic Affairs	Chris Wiseman	In Attendance	ITS	Jim Sibenaller	In Attendance
Academic Affairs	John Pelissero	In Attendance	Student Affairs	Fr. Richard Salmi	In Attendance
Advancement	Jon Heintzelman	In Attendance	<b>Guests:</b>		
Facilities	Phil Kosiba	Absent	Academic Affairs	Carol Scheidenhelm	In Attendance
Finance	Bill Laird	Absent	ITS	Bruce Montes	In Attendance
Human Resources	Tom Kelly	In Attendance	ITS	Kevin Smith	In Attendance
ITS/Facilitator	Susan Malisch	In Attendance	ITS	Joe Bazeley	In Attendance

**Welcome, Meeting Purpose & Agenda**

The meeting commenced at 1:35 PM with a review of the agenda and introductions of guests. The minutes from the July 24<sup>th</sup> meeting were reviewed and approved as written.

**Personal Information Risk Group (PIRG) Update**

Joe reviewed the membership of the PIRG. Several replacements are needed, including a few members from Finance and a contact for the Rome Center. Joe reviewed the progress of the PII roll-out. The goal is to have all higher-risk workstations at the university scanned and encrypted by the end of the calendar year. All data stewards have been identified and trained with 3 exceptions. Data stewards are needed for LUMA, Modern Languages and some miscellaneous areas within Student Affairs. After this initial effort we will assess the ability to encrypt all machines at Loyola to simplify the process and minimize any data risk. The future of the PIRG will be documented via a proposal to the ITESC sometime early in 2009. Joe departed at 1:55.

**Project Review Board (PRB) Update**

Kevin reviewed the membership of the PRB. He noted that the members are stable and that one backfill was needed for Admissions. Kevin shared that the group was functioning effectively and membership was valid. John concurred. Chris asked about ITS representation on the Undergraduate Review Board. John thought a designated resource identified to participate by topic/agenda item would be more appropriate, suggesting Kevin as the representative. All agreed.

**Academic Technology Committee (ATC) Update**

Carol reviewed the ATC charter and changes in membership. New members include David Pankratz for CAS, Jessica Horowitz for the Graduate School, Eileen Daily for IPS, and William Sellers for Research Services. Carol has asked the members for a "permanent alternate" so that the areas are always represented in any given meeting. She has also requested involvement from students (2). Filling this need is currently pending. Susan suggested adding representation from the School of Communication. All agreed. Carol also noted that they may need a 2<sup>nd</sup> member for the College of Arts and Sciences because of the size of the school. Chris suggested a discussion with the Deans of these schools.

Carol reviewed the 5 major items on the initiatives list with the group: 1) Review and recommendation of classroom response system (clickers), 2) Analysis of copyright for on-line content, 3) addressing concerns regarding online media (wiki's, blog's & streaming), 4) consideration of a proposed needs analysis for online learning and the creation of a quality program and materials, standards, and consistency, and 5) electronic Teacher Course Evaluations, especially for online courses. Two pilots were completed last year (fall/spring). SNAP is the recommendation. A decision by end of September is required to enable for online use at the end of the term. A \$5K one time fee is needed; Academic Affairs will cover this.

**Blackboard Sourcing and Blackboard Community System Solution**

A detailed analysis of our hosted Blackboard environment vs. moving this application in-house has concluded. The recommendation is that the system should remain with Blackboard in an outsourced service provider model. The primary reasons are costs, service level, system stability, custom support and fewer sunk costs in the future. Premium BCDR service would not be included. Susan was comfortable with the recommendation at this time. Chris and John concurred.

Analysis has been in progress regarding the Community System. Primary advantages include “non-standard” courses could utilize the system to manage their communications (including committees and student groups), and the ability to link the transaction system to the course management system (CMS). Licensing for Community System was required to utilize the transaction system for Rambler Bucks. The price was substantially discounted because of our minimal use of functionality, but the vendor didn’t restrict the software in any way, however, the transaction system and community system need to be hosted together (can’t communicate hosted to ASP and vice versa). Kevin is setting up access to what we own so that Carol and her team can validate the applicability of the functionality. There is a large cost difference to enable the integration with the CMS versus our current licensing, about \$50K annually. This may be netted against our existing \$28K expense but would force the students to go to a hosted site for use of the transaction functionality. Kevin also suggested that some of the community functionality could be built into the LOCUS portal pending discussion with Oracle. Susan asked for feedback on the priority for the research and analysis in order to commit resources to the effort. There was a consensus that a project should be created.

John brought up a concern that the ITESC never discussed IGNation and its use for faculty and academic purposes. Bruce clarified that the underlying technology tools could have a new “front end” on them for academic needs and a new review of iTunes could be incorporated into the discussion. *Task: A future discussion regarding IGNation and iTunes will be scheduled.* Carol, Kevin and Bruce departed at 3:10.

#### **FY10 Budget Submissions Draft Review**

Susan reviewed the ITS budget information for Capital, Operating, Assumptions and Absorbed items to validate proposed projects and assumptions.

Fr. Salmi supports the cell coverage improvement placeholder. *Task: Verify the coverage concern for cell phones.* The IPTV need was also validated and that it should be investigated further. The Peoplesoft server refresh was discussed. *Task: John will verify if there is funding in the Academic Affairs budget for the server refresh.* Jon asked about BSR moving to the web-based platform. *Task: Susan to speak with Stacey/Kevin.* John suggested leaving the Blackboard Community System funding in the ITS budget and that Academic Affairs will cover the costs for the course evaluation tool. Susan brought up for discussion the electronic transcripts address verification software and Time Trade. *Task: John to validate both inbound and outbound electronic transcript budgets. Academic Affairs will submit if required. He will also look at the address verification software and Time Trade as well.* Susan discussed the increased demand on media services due to the expansion of electronic classrooms. No FTE requests at this time but need to monitor.

Susan reviewed the refresh program spreadsheet for FY10-12, discussing what we can cover and where we are falling short. New refresh items have also been added. A program for wireless, the Information Commons and digital signage needs to be created. An increment of \$241K is needed in FY10. *Task: Susan to validate assumptions with Finance.*

The transition of capital requests to maintenance was discussed, how ongoing technology is funded and where the contracts are maintained. We do not manage things consistently currently. Susan proposed that ongoing maintenance for technology acquisitions and a copy of the contract be maintained in ITS. This would make budget benchmarking more accurate by continuing to capture ongoing costs in the centralized budget. *Task: Susan to come back with more information regarding an approach and process for this.*

Susan introduced the concept of technology fees and reviewed our current RESNET fee structure. Chris said that they had just completed a detailed fee analysis and to be cautious. Parents understand health fees and technology fees and she thought that the fee income should come back to ITS. Comparative analysis was presented on the presence of technology fees across AJCU, peer and aspirational institutions. The group agreed a broad-based technology fee would be more equitable at this time and suggested \$110 per semester for full time students was appropriate based on the analysis shared. *Task: Susan to construct the recommendation with Finance.*

The meeting adjourned at 3:51 PM.