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Agenda

• HSD Program Progress
  – A. Simmons

• Security Surveillance (Camera) Policy Draft
  – D. Vonder Heide

• 2012 Technology Briefing
  – S. Malisch
Key Shared Principles

- Emphasis - service and “end-user” experience
- Move toward shared services and away from shared employees
- Future State of LUHS and LUC: Sharing of computerized applications or infrastructure only where compelling financial benefits are justified
- Data is shared between LUHS and LUC only when required – and then data is secured, and
- Applications and technologies are generally classified as: Enterprise or HSD specific.
The Shared Services and Facilities Committee leads a set of processes for the unbundling shared services and facilities or the establishment of long term shared services; this is within the scope of the sale of LUHS to Trinity Health.

The Information Services Content Review Team (ISCRT) will identify and recommend services, cost reductions, structure and preparation steps that are required prior to a July 2012 transition, and will identify the projects and issues to be addressed by July 2012 and beyond. "Working teams" will be assembled as appropriate.

LUHS/LUC/HSD Program: Ann Simmons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Scope &amp; Governance</th>
<th>2-Communication</th>
<th>3-Identity &amp; Provisioning</th>
<th>4-HSD Desktop Requirements</th>
<th>5-Applications</th>
<th>6-Security &amp; Controls</th>
<th>7-Migration to Microsoft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ES: ISCRT</td>
<td>ES Bergfeld</td>
<td>ES Bergfeld, Kelly Krumrey</td>
<td>ES Malisch</td>
<td>ES: TBD (By Application)</td>
<td>ES Bergfeld</td>
<td>ES Malisch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malisch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Malisch</td>
<td>Malisch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Shared Services and Facilities Committee: Chair: S. Bergfeld, D. Halinski

Information Services Content Review Team (ISCRT): Chair: S. Malisch, A. Krumrey

Working Teams:
- **Application**
  - E: Bergfeld
  - Price

*ES: Executive Sponsor(s)
## Program Scope

### Near Term (2012)
- Program Scope and Governance for the LUHS/LUC/HSD Technology Program (1.0)
- Communications Subprogram:  
  - Email (2.1)
- Identity and Provisioning Subprogram:  
  - ID Provisioning (3.1)
  - System Access (3.2)
  - Firewall, IP Address range (3.3.1, 3.3.2)
- Applications Subprogram:  
  - ECM for HSD (5.1)
  - Advance Web including multi location support (5.7.1)
- Security and Internal Control Subprogram:  
  - Physical Access/Integration of Badging (6.1)
  - PII (6.2)
- Infrastructure and DRP/Business Continuity Subprogram:  
  - Support for current construction projects (8.1.1, 8.1.2)
- Nursing Evaluations Update and Redesign (10.0)
- Technology, Application and Service support for the Virtual Hospital (13.0)

### Medium Term (2013)
- Communications Subprogram: Phone Services (2.2)
- Identity and Provisioning Subprogram:  
  - Access to Statistical Software (3.2.5)
  - Access for HSD to external Internet (3.3.4)
- HSD Desktop Requirements Subprogram (4.0)
- Applications Subprogram:  
  - Salary Planning (5.9)
  - Budgeting for HSD (5.10)
  - Student Information System (5.12)
  - Cross Organization Access to Applications (5.13)
- Security and Internal Control Program:  
  - PCI (6.3)
  - Encryption (6.4)
  - HIPAA (6.5)
  - Third Party Security and Other Audit (6.6)
- Integration of HSD into the LUC Microsoft Migration Subprogram (7.0)
- Infrastructure and DRP/Business Continuity Subprogram:  
  - Research Building (New): (8.1.3)
  - Current “in place” infrastructure” (8.2)
- Support Services Subprogram:  
  - Help Desk (9.1)
  - Desktop Support (9.2)
  - Technology Purchases (9.3)
- Future Web Branding Strategy for SSOM and Nursing (11.0)
- Synchronization of IT Polices for LUC and HSD (12.0)

### Long Term (2013+)
- Identity and Provisioning Subprogram:  
  - Long term IP strategy and implementation (3.3.3)
- Applications Subprogram:  
  - Kronos (5.2)
  - Marketplace (5.3)
  - Lawson: Purchasing (5.4)
  - Lawson: General Ledger (5.5)
  - Lawson: Human Resources and Payroll (5.6)
  - Advance (5.7.2, 5.7.3)
  - Compliance Training (5.8)
  - Health Science Portal (5.11)
- Infrastructure and Associated Services Subprogram:  
  - Integration of HSD and LUC Disaster Recovery Plan/Business Continuity Plan (8.3)
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FY12 Technology Briefing

March 2012
Resources

• Educause
  ✓ ELI Horizon Report
  ✓ ECAR Study of Undergraduate Students and IT
  ✓ Core Data Service
  ✓ Listservs

• Gartner
  ✓ IT Key Metrics Data
  ✓ Specialized Analysts and Reports

• Other
  ✓ AJCU Benchmarking
  ✓ The Campus Computing Project
  ✓ CDW-G 21st Century Campus Report
  ✓ Campus Technology
  ✓ Chronicle of Higher Education
  ✓ AIIM State of the ECM Industry
Top-Ten IT Issues, 2011

1. Funding IT
2. Administrative/ERP/Informatics
3. Teaching and Learning with Technology
4. Security
5. Mobile Technologies
6. Agility/Adaptability/Responsiveness
7. Governance, Portfolio/Project Management
8. Infrastructure/Cyberinfrastructure
9. Disaster Recovery / Business Continuity
10. Strategic Planning

Relevant Comment/Initiatives at Loyola:

1. Leverage Tech Fee; Reallocation; Targeted Outsourcing
2. Expanding use of SIS modules; Increased integration
3. Distance Learning Initiatives; iPad and LMS pilots; FOT
4. Action phases of security program; PII/PCI stable
5. Initial offering in place
6. Change and adaptability; Risk-taking – Do we do enough?
7. Prioritization; Scorecards; TAC’s; more to do
8. Novell migration; Active Directory; HSD collaborations; Refresh programs
9. BIA’s completed; BOT Audit initiative; needs more focus
10. Roadmap; Subcommittees; more opportunity here
Cloud Computing...

- Cloud vs. Hosted: What’s the difference?
- Only 4.4% of survey participants report their campus has moved or is converting to Cloud for ERP services; 27.8% for CRM services.
- “Many campus IT officers are not ready to migrate mission-critical data, resources and services to the Cloud Services offer by their IT providers.”
Dealing with Consumerization ...

Recommendations:

CIOs in higher education should work with other institutional senior staff to:

- **Build a formal BYOD strategy for the institutions.** In doing so, you will:
  - Gain a competitive advantage by offering "device allowance."
  - Control your device ecosystem at the standards level, not the device level. Use identifiers, formats and protocols (IFaPs) as a checklist for good standards, open as well as de facto.
  - Publish in your BYOD strategy the goal of "maximum safe use" of supported devices.

- Use consumerization metaphors like the App Store to ensure seamless adoption/user interface with students and faculty (to drive down support costs and meet expectations).

- Offer tools/services for moving content between the supported devices.

- Communicate clearly the standards and examples of devices that support the standard early in the faculty and student recruitment process.

- **Communicate clearly that you don't support devices that fail to adhere to standards.**

- Establish a "watch list" together with users to be prepared to include new devices and standards where it makes sense from a volume/popularity point of view.

- Set expectations with students, particularly online students, about the need for basic device and service capabilities — for example, bandwidth, screen size and apps (such as a PDF reader).

"Predicts 2012: Technology Fuels Education on the Move", Gartner, December 2011
**FY 12 Scorecard Summary**

### ITS FY12 Academic & Faculty Support Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology / Operation</th>
<th>Health Index</th>
<th>Current State</th>
<th>Healthy Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ITS FY12 Administrative Technology Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology / Operation</th>
<th>Health Index</th>
<th>Current State</th>
<th>Healthy Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ITS FY12 Continuous Service Improvement Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology / Operation</th>
<th>Health Index</th>
<th>Current State</th>
<th>Healthy Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ITS FY12 Student Technology Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology / Operation</th>
<th>Health Index</th>
<th>Current State</th>
<th>Healthy Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ITS FY12 Governance & Funding Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology / Operation</th>
<th>Health Index</th>
<th>Current State</th>
<th>Healthy Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENT TECHNOLOGY
Technology Ownership

**Figure 1. Undergraduate Student Technology Ownership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Loyola University Chicago (based on May 2010 ITS survey of all students and Feb 2011 “Pulse” follow-up)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laptop</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVD player</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USB thumb drive</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi-Fi*</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary gaming device</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPod</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDTV</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smartphone</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital camera</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webcam</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop computer</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handheld gaming device</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netbook</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPad</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Likely interpreted by students as having access to Wi-Fi

**Technology Ownership**

Most students come to campus with multiple technology devices—a majority of students own about a dozen—and they use these devices for a broad assortment of activities, both personal and academic. Students have a clear preference for smart, mobile devices (nearly nine in 10 students own laptops, more than half own smartphones, and one in 10 owns an iPad or other tablet), but a majority of students are still attached to “standard issue” technology, such as printers and desktop computers, as well.
Loyola’s Students ...

- Students are active computer users with three-quarters of them using their own personal computers daily.
- 64% also use library/Information Commons computers although much less frequently.
- 57% make use of computer lab equipment.
- Laptop computers are the dominant form of technology in use by respondents.
- Traditional cell phones continue to be the phone choice for 60% of respondents while an additional 24% use an iPhone.
- Use of Tablets is nearly non-existent and few plan to purchase one in the next six months.
- Tablets are not viewed as viable alternatives for laptop computers as students need/want access to keyboards, more extensive memory capacity, and the software solutions not available for Tablets.

Some Findings from the February 2011 Student Technology Survey administered by ITS and “The Pulse”

Note: Based on the opt-in nature of the survey, results should be considered qualitative and directional and not projectable to the entire student body. (557 participating undergraduates)
Loyola Student Views ...

• First and foremost, respondents do not want to trade in their keyboard for a touch screen:

  ✓ “People I see using iPads also carry around a keyboard with them because it is easier to type on a keyboard than by touch screen. It seems like a pain to use a table instead of a laptop and not necessary.”

  ✓ “I enjoy the convenience of having a keyboard I can traditionally type on (I am a very quick typist). I am also not one for massive changes in technology, although I do have an iPhone. Plus I am not willing to put out the money to purchase a Tablet.”

  ✓ “So far, I haven't seen a tablet that is both in my budget and of adequate use to my needs. I find touch screen technologies to be obtuse and difficult to use. Furthermore, if a system does not have a full keyboard, its functionality is virtually nonexistent.”

• Students feel that the limited memory associated with Tablets is an issue

  ✓ “A tablet is not as practical as owning a real laptop. Tablets holds less memory and are not as capable as laptops. Tablets are more of a status symbol, really.”

  ✓ “My roommate has an iPad and I have a Macbook, my Macbook has a much more powerful processor, a way better wireless card, and can store exponentially more information. Also I like typing on a keyboard much more than on that little screen.”

Some Findings from the February 2011 Student Technology Survey administered by ITS and “The Pulse”

Note: Based on the opt-in nature of the survey, results should be considered qualitative and directional and not projectable to the entire student body. (557 participating undergraduates)
Loyola University Chicago  
(Feb 2011 “Pulse” Survey)

Among students who would like to see new Loyola apps developed, Groupwise e-mail and more robust Blackboard and LOCUS apps are the highest priorities. An events app, shuttle schedules and apps for Blackberries are secondary priorities.
ACADEMIC AND CLASSROOM TECHNOLOGY
E-Textbooks ...

• About 44% of the students have had an opportunity to purchase an electronic version of the textbook for some of their classes and only about 14% of those students did actually purchase the e-version of the textbook when it was an option. Reasons for not purchasing the e-versions when available varied from the e-version being too expensive, to e-texts providing online opportunities for distraction, to simply a preference of a paper version over the e-version.

• When asked more specifically about costs, students seemed to indicate that they would tend to buy the least expensive version of the text and in cases where the price was the same, the students tended to prefer purchasing the print version over the e-version.

• When asked about device preferences for e-textbooks, most students indicated a preference of laptop computers over other devices for reading e-textbooks. Students acknowledged that most students own a laptop and would therefore not consider access to devices a significant barrier to buying e-textbooks.
Learning Management Systems ...

- Campuses are beginning to embrace open-source Learning Management Systems (LMS) as viable delivery system. Loyola is currently piloting Moodle and Sakai.

- Like moves to open-source, learning management systems are “early adopters” with entering the “Cloud”. Loyola has been using a “Cloud” solution for its LMS for many years now. The alternative LMS systems Loyola is piloting are also hosted in the Cloud.
Learning Management Systems...

- No Plans: 43%
- Evaluating: 29%
- Changing: 9%
- Planning: 5%
- No Response: 14%

Moodle, Sakai, Instructure Canvas, Pearson OpenClass under consideration

AJCU CITM 2011 Benchmarking Data – Shared Services Section
Technology in the Classrooms ...

- Loyola’s classrooms provide full support for all technologies in the upper right quadrant with the single exception of interactive whiteboards, which is increasing in demand.

- Loyola began to pilot multiple forms of interactive white boards and lecture capture technologies in the fall of 2011.
Lecture Capture ...

Loyola University Chicago

• Lecture Capture is Available in a Handful of Spaces
  ✓ Information Commons Classrooms
  ✓ Some Classrooms in Mundelein, Corboy
  ✓ All HSD Classrooms
  ✓ A Small Number of Loyola Instructors Have Tried Lecture Capture
  ✓ Demand from Loyola Faculty is Low
• Adobe Connect Recordings Gaining Some Interest

Other Institutions

• Student Demand is High in Universities that Begin Capture Initiatives
• Successful Implementations at Universities:
  ✓ Limit Actions Required of Instructor
  ✓ Provide Instructor with “opt-in” rather than “automatic”
Online Programs ...

**Online Education is Critical to the Long-term Strategy of My Institution by Institutional Control - Fall 2006 to Fall 2011**

*Going the Distance Online Education in the United States, November 2011*
Loyola University Chicago

• Summer “online” courses filled to capacity (20 students) and training program for faculty was established to support measured approach to getting faculty prepared for teaching online

• Consensus among all LUC “J-Term” focus groups was that the experience was definitely academically challenging and similar to that of a traditional semester-long course. Most felt the students performed as well or better than students in the longer iterations of the course.

“Face-to-face (F2F) context is still very powerful and meaningful for students. Online learning environments are evolving, for the better, to accommodate students as social beings. For example, there is an emergence of more effective presentation of material, and of better ways to facilitate discussion and collaborative work.”

Managing Online Education, 2010
WCET Campus Computing Project
STRATEGIC PROGRAMS AND INVESTMENTS

- Electronic Content Management (ECM)
- Data Warehouse/Business Intelligence (Decision Support)
Enterprise Content Management...

2011 Reasons for Adopting ECM Technologies

- Improve efficiency
- Optimize business processes
- Compliance
- Reduce costs
- Mitigate risk
- Enable collaboration
- Improve customer service
- Faster turnaround/Improved response
- Competitive advantage

*Loyola Program Realized Value

*AllM - Association for Information and Image Management
State of the ECM Industry 2011
ECM Enterprise Adoption...

**Widespread Use**

Only one teaching and learning technology, document management tools, is broadly deployed in as many as half (51%) of institutions.

*Educause Core Data Survey 2011*

**AJCU ECM Maturity**

- 63% ECM implemented on an enterprise level
- 16% ECM implemented on a departmental basis
- 11% No implementations but program being developed
- 10% No program but creating an ECM strategy
- 4% Not interested in ECM at this time

*AJCU-CITM Benchmarking Survey FY12*

**AllM-Association for Information and Image Management State of the ECM Industry 2011**

- Completed an enterprise scale ECM capability, 16%
- Plans in the next 12 months, 11%
- Integrating DM/RM projects across departments, 19%
- One or more DM/RM projects at the departmental level, 22%
- Implementing an enterprise scale ECM capability, 29%
- No plans, 4%
ECM Results...

• Live for 3 years
  • 1st client in Feb 2009
  • 36 major deployments
  • 23 unique departments
  • Across 3 campuses
• Repository:
  • 3M documents
  • 800 document types
• 700 faculty and staff have access
• Single click access to documents within Campus Solutions/Peoplesoft
• Metrics:
  • 75% average process improvement on key metrics
  • 5800+ hours of annual effort savings (3.0 FTE equivalent)
  • $45,000+ of annual cost reductions (maintenance only)
• Portfolio: 15 active projects, 25+ in the queue

Award Nominee:
• AIIM – 2012 Carl E. Nelson Best Practices Award, Large Companies
• University Business/Higher One – 2012 Models of Efficiency, Spring
• Campus Technology – 2012 Innovator Award

ECM Results...
Business Intelligence...

84% of AJCU Institutions have a data warehouse or a demand for one

Loyola University Data Warehouse under construction
Most institutions with data warehouse initiatives are in early stages of adoption. Usage will likely increase over time as programs mature.
Faculty Teaching Load Old View ...
Faculty Teaching Load Dashboard ...

Dashboard provides interactive analysis with drill down to detail.
Student Debt/GPA View ...

Student Debt Breakout

Student GPA Breakout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emplid</th>
<th>GPA Rg</th>
<th>Debt Rg</th>
<th>Payment $</th>
<th>Loan $</th>
<th>Stdn Cost</th>
<th>LUC Aid</th>
<th>Tot Cost</th>
<th># D</th>
<th>#CH MJ</th>
<th>#Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.5</td>
<td>G:150-175K</td>
<td>110,207</td>
<td>151,445</td>
<td>261,652</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>269,152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5-3.0</td>
<td>H:175-200K</td>
<td>7,057</td>
<td>182,655</td>
<td>189,711</td>
<td>70,016</td>
<td>259,727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.5</td>
<td>E:100-125K</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>103,608</td>
<td>107,168</td>
<td>139,918</td>
<td>247,085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,987</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,987</td>
<td>229,304</td>
<td>235,291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2.5</td>
<td>B:25-50K</td>
<td>5,146</td>
<td>34,730</td>
<td>39,876</td>
<td>193,470</td>
<td>233,345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2.5</td>
<td>E:100-125K</td>
<td>5,523</td>
<td>111,208</td>
<td>116,731</td>
<td>116,422</td>
<td>233,153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5+</td>
<td>F:125-150K</td>
<td>15,246</td>
<td>138,737</td>
<td>153,983</td>
<td>77,746</td>
<td>231,729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2.5</td>
<td>E:100-125K</td>
<td>15,461</td>
<td>113,092</td>
<td>122,343</td>
<td>103,144</td>
<td>225,477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Debt Ranges/Loan Types ...

Sample Under Construction
“Institutional” Value Category Decision Tree...

- **Is It Revolutionary?**
  - **For Everyone?**
    - There is potential for new markets or industries, or displacement or elimination of existing industries.
  - **For the Client?**
    - There is potential to move the client’s business into entirely new markets or industries.
  - **Transform the Business**
    - Yes

- **Does It Keep the Lights On?**
  - The situation is about supporting or improving essential, nondifferentiated business functions that do not directly produce revenue.
  - **Run the Business**
    - Yes

- **Does It Make Money?**
  - The situation is about enhancing, extending, or differentiating existing business capabilities related to products, services, or markets.
  - **Grow the Business**
    - Yes

Source: Gartner (January 2011)

- **74%** Run
- **15%** Grow
- **11%** Transform

Source: Gartner IT Key Metrics Data (December 2011)
Higher Ed IT Spend as a Percent of Operating Expense

![Higher Ed IT Spend as a Percent of Operating Expense](image)

Source: Gartner IT Key Metrics Data (December 2011)

Table 2. Education: IT Spending as a Percent of Operational Expense: by Revenue Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Range</th>
<th>IT Spend as a Percent of Operating Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$250M in Revenue</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250M- $500M in Revenue</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500M- $1B in Revenue</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1B- $10B in Revenue</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10B+ in Revenue</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Gartner IT Key Metrics Data (December 2011)
LUC ITS Operating Budget Benchmark ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>LUC Expense Budget</th>
<th>ITS BUDGET</th>
<th>ITS as % of LUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$154.8</td>
<td>$9.9</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$144.5</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
<td>6.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$142.2</td>
<td>$6.7</td>
<td>4.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$163.8</td>
<td>$8.8</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$208.0</td>
<td>$9.1</td>
<td>4.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$249.7</td>
<td>$10.2</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$297.5</td>
<td>$11.2</td>
<td>3.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$313.8</td>
<td>$12.5</td>
<td>3.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$327.4</td>
<td>$13.5</td>
<td>4.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$337.0</td>
<td>$14.4</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$351.0</td>
<td>$14.7</td>
<td>4.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13 Estimate</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$15.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITS % of Total LUC Budget

- 2002-2009 ITS Budget Includes ITS Operating Budget
- 2009-2012 ITS Budget Includes ITS and Technology Fee Operating Budget
## LUC ITS Operating and Refresh Budget Benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUC Expense Budget</strong></td>
<td>$154.8</td>
<td>$144.5</td>
<td>$142.2</td>
<td>$163.8</td>
<td>$208.0</td>
<td>$249.7</td>
<td>$297.5</td>
<td>$313.8</td>
<td>$327.4</td>
<td>$337.0</td>
<td>$351.0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITS Budget</strong></td>
<td>$10.3</td>
<td>$9.9</td>
<td>$7.3</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
<td>$10.3</td>
<td>$11.5</td>
<td>$12.5</td>
<td>$14.1</td>
<td>$15.3</td>
<td>$16.5</td>
<td>$16.7</td>
<td>$16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITS as % of LUC</strong></td>
<td>6.65%</td>
<td>6.83%</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>4.94%</td>
<td>4.62%</td>
<td>4.21%</td>
<td>4.49%</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
<td>4.89%</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ITS % of total LUC Budget

- 2002-2009 ITS Budget includes ITS Operating Budget and University funded Technology refresh programs
- 2009-2012 ITS Budget includes ITS Operating Budget, Technology Fee Operating Budget and University and Technology Fee Funded Refresh Programs
Another View: LUC ITS Budget Change Tracking ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>FY13 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITS BUDGET</td>
<td>$10.3</td>
<td>$9.9</td>
<td>$7.3</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
<td>$10.3</td>
<td>$11.5</td>
<td>$12.5</td>
<td>$14.1</td>
<td>$14.1</td>
<td>$14.4</td>
<td>$14.7</td>
<td>$15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-4.17%</td>
<td>-25.63%</td>
<td>29.43%</td>
<td>8.21%</td>
<td>12.16%</td>
<td>8.67%</td>
<td>12.53%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>2.72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY12 Projected Tech. Fee Category Breakdown ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>$1,425,000</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>$445,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special/Capital Projects</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,770,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Subcategory</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>$960,000</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special/Capital Projects</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,770,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*IT IN SUPPORT OF STUDENTS (n ranges from 149 to 161)*

- $238 Annualized student technology fee (n = 84)
- 65% Institutions with a designated student technology fee

*EDUCAUSE Core Data Service Almanac, October 2011*
FY12 Technology Briefing

March 2012
FY12-FY13 ITESC Schedule

• Sept. 22, 2011 - Thursday, 1:30-3:30 PM
  – Major Projects Status Reviews
  – FY13 Budget Submissions
  – Upcoming Priorities

• Nov. 10, 2011 - Thursday, 1:30-3:30 PM
  – Subcommittee Reports (ATC & ARB)
  – Technology Scorecards
  – Tech Fee Review

• Jan. 26, 2012 - Thursday, 1:30-3:30 PM
  – R+ Replacement
  – Student Dev. Tech Fee Request
  – Security Camera Update
  – Bus. Impact Analysis Status
  – Project Portfolio Prioritization Results
  – LUHS/LUC/HSD Program Status

• Mar. 8, 2012 - Thursday, 1:30-3:30 PM
  – HSD Program Progress
  – Security Surveillance (Camera) Policy
  – 2012 Technology Briefing

• Apr. 26, 2012 - Thursday, 1:30-3:30 PM
  – Subcommittee Reports
  – Major Projects Status Reviews

• Jun. 7, 2012 - Thursday, 1:30-3:30 PM
  – Project Portfolio Prioritization

• Jul. 26, 2012 - Thursday, 1:30-3:30 PM
  – Project Portfolio Prioritization Results

• Sept. 13, 2012 - Thursday, 1:30-3:30 PM
  – Subcommittee Reports
  – Major Projects Status Reviews

• Oct. 25, 2012 - Thursday, 1:30-3:30 PM
  – Subcommittee Reports
  – Major Projects Status Reviews

• Dec. 11, 2012 - Tuesday, 1:30-3:30 PM
  – Technology Scorecards
  – Project Portfolio Prioritization