Welcome, Meeting Purpose & Agenda
The meeting commenced at 11:05 AM with a review of the agenda and introductions of guests. The minutes from the January 17th meeting were approved as modified (correction of a grammatical error).

Student Information System Upgrade Project Review
Scope & Benefits – Clare reviewed the components of the upgrade. We will be upgrading every transaction module including the Oracle database. We will be moving from Student Administration 8.0 to Campus Solutions 9.0, PeopleTools from 8.21 to 8.48, Portal/(LOCUS) 8.0 to 8.9, Oracle database from 9i to 10g, and the reporting database (RDO) from Student Administration 8.0 view to the Campus Solutions 9.0 view. The primary benefit of the upgrade is the improved self service module. It contains a “shopping cart” mentality and is more efficient and easier to navigate within. Other benefits include the ability for faculty to email the entire class from the roster list – highly desirable by the Law School, improved flexibility for reports formatting via XML publisher and lastly, we avoid dropping support by staying on the upgrade path with Oracle.

Status & Project Health – At the project midpoint, all areas are reporting a healthy status except for student financials. The account summary view has some modifications regarding unapplied financial aid balances. These are not being shown properly and are somewhat misleading at the top level. A drill down is required for clarification of accuracy. Kevin said it is in a cautionary yellow status because there is not an agreed on solution to address this as of yet. Other schools have identified this issue as well.

Next 90 Days – Upcoming tasks will include assessment of the Services Center and Faculty Center functionality, a walkthrough of the project plan, reporting database work and continued functional testing. A training plan is also being worked on including focus group feedback. The next round of testing should be complete by March so that the focus groups and training can begin in April. Susan asked about how the focus groups would be populated. Clare said they were planning multiple methods; surveys, known student workers, networking with others etc.

Expenses – Kevin reviewed the project costs. Expenditures of ~$120,000 includes hardware memory expansion and ETL tool, consulting, and upgrade of the reporting database. A long term business intelligence solution will be needed in the future. John asked whether we needed functional consultants. Clare said this resource/skill was not really needed or planned yet but they could cover the cost if the resource is required. Susan asked about internal staff investment/time. Kevin said that approximately 7,000 hours of time to-date has been spent within ITS. This does not include functional resource time which has been significant as well. Kevin noted that Loyola has been able to utilize internal staff to complete this project because of the expertise gained in the original deployment and with subsequent upgrades, thus minimizing consulting costs required for this upgrade.

Issues – The biggest concern is that the R25 reservation system may not have an interface to CS 9.0 which would require Loyola to write an interface for room scheduling. This is still unknown. Nikoleta Rigas and Larry Adams are owning this. The only other item that needs more research is regarding some slow response times when testing. Walt Slazyk is
actively working on performance tuning and is in contact with other 9.0 schools who have said performance is a bit slower than their previous version.

Diane & Clare departed the meeting at 11:40.

**Personal Information Risk Group Policy Roll-out Review**

Status & Project Health – The PII policies have been reviewed by the ITESC, President’s Cabinet, SAUPC, and FAUPC for comments. Full disk encryption pilots have occurred within ITS. The training and awareness programs have been developed. The overall project health is yellow; this cautionary health is specifically due to the extended time required for FAUPC policy evaluation and the impact to the roll-out and risk to Loyola.

Policy Responses – Of the concerns raised, 21 of the 26 have been addressed. Items not pursued at this time include outsourcing the training, addition of a Compliance Office at each campus, changing the suggested “heavy handed” nature of the language, and the potential violation of “professional privacy” in academic units. The ITESC agreed that these items should remain unchanged. The final open item is to share the final format of LUC’s PII protection program with LUMC.  *Task: Confirm that LUMC is aware of the updated PII policies - Susan will follow-up with Art Krumrey once the policies are finalized.*

Joe asked about how to address the suggestion for a Corporate Compliance Officer from the SAUPC. Tom said that LUMC is more regulated and controlled than we are/need to be. It was suggested that the response to the request address where compliance accountability and responsibility resides at LUC for the regulations and standards that apply to us.  *Task: Joe to modify the response accordingly.* A discussion took place regarding removing the disciplinary references. John suggested that faculty language should be no different than staff in this case and that the appropriate handbooks are referenced in the policies. The group agreed that the text should remain as written.

Data Stewards – Joe reviewed the breakdown of departments and the suggested data steward assignments. As defined most departments will have two data stewards, one primary and one backup. As a whole the group thought the counts were somewhat high. Joe expressed the difficulty in obtaining good departmental breakdowns. A report from Kronos was utilized for the analysis. Tom suggested using the Position Control Reports to validate the department breakdown. All were in agreement.  *Task: Utilize the Position Control Reports in a joint meeting with Tom and John to reduce the number of data stewards allowing smaller departments to have only one.*  Joe walked through scenarios for data steward staffing. The options were discussed taking into account risk, cost and work load. The decision was to go forward with sourcing with internal staff from the departments pending the output of the data steward revisions with John and Tom. There was also a decision to add verbiage to the PII identification process to recommend running it every six months regardless of encryption. The department heads should desire this in order to protect their information and for overall awareness of usage.  *Task: Joe to add the verbiage to the appropriate policies and training materials.*

Current and Future Activity – The next steps will be to finalize the policy changes, complete the responses to all committees and present to the Cabinet in March. Following, the Sullivan Center will be the next pilot area. The training and awareness programs will follow in conjunction. Roll-out across the entire university is targeted to begin in April.

Future of PIRG – Joe reviewed the current charter for the PIRG and proposed two groups going forward, one with an institutional focus and one with a technical focus. Susan asked about having one group with all core areas instead of the two groups. Joe cited challenges in scheduling for a larger group and meeting frequency issues. Fr. Salmi suggested to involve the USGA in some way but that a student needn’t be part of the committee. All agreed that a proposal should be put together.  *Task: Propose the make-up and charter for the new committees as discussed.*

**Web Site**

Susan shared the ITS Governance site ([http://www.luc.edu/its/gov_home.shtml](http://www.luc.edu/its/gov_home.shtml)) where all agendas, minutes, and meeting materials are published.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 PM.