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LUMC Update

• Governance
  – IT Steering Committee reconstituted
  – Next meeting
    • Set FY 11 capital priorities
    • High level non-capital priorities
    • Support for research

• Epic upgrade to 2009 version
  – Two version upgrade
  – “Soup to nuts” testing
  – Optimization with upgraded environment
LUMC Update (continued)

• Epic community outreach
  – Improving letters to community MDs
  – Referring physician portal
  – Franchising Epic to community MDs (in consideration)
  – Health Information Exchange (in consideration)

• Supply chain cost reductions
  – Navigant project
  – 340b drug discount
LUMC Update (continued)

• Clinical documentation improvement

• Lawson
  – Absence management … this weekend
  – New production server; old one as DR; late summer

• Kronos
  – LUMC needs to upgrade clocks
  – Two versions behind
  – Staff scheduling

• Burr Ridge
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CMS Replacement - Reasons for Change

Season for Change

– In the late Summer of 2009, it became apparent that we needed to replace Serena Collage, our current web content management system for multiple reasons.

• Serena Corporation announced no new product development for Collage.

• Not sure how long current product would be supported.

• No support for latest browser technology, including I.E. 8 and Firefox.

• Significant ongoing intervention on our part for maintenance/support.

• Sluggish performance, no longer able to support size and complexity of Loyola web site.
Value to the University

- Use of the CMS is widespread across University departments who use the web to both market Loyola to prospective students and alumni donors, but also use the web as source of information for staff, faculty, and current students.
- Replacing the CMS affects stakeholders at every level of our community.
# Charter Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Bob Kraft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Function/Area</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Services</td>
<td>Maureen Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>George Thiruvathukal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Services</td>
<td>Patricia Trinco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Technologies, Office of the Provost</td>
<td>Sarah Dysart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>Marie Rosin-Dittmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>Mike Lonero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>Cliff Golz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>Fred Barnhart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Marketing &amp; Communication (UMC)</td>
<td>Christopher Abplanalp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Marketing &amp; Communication (UMC)</td>
<td>John Drevs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Marketing &amp; Communication (UMC)</td>
<td>Patrick Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Marketing &amp; Communication (UMC)</td>
<td>Lenzlee Ruiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture Consultant</td>
<td>Jim Sibenaller</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Beginning in September, 2009, work group began meeting every two weeks.
• Via group discussion and analysis, developed list of 132 overall CMS requirements.
• Grouped requirements in categories.
• Ranked requirements in level of importance, with some having higher value than others.
Researched Products & Vendors

- Gartner’s Magic Quadrant of leading CMS vendors.
- CMS Watch – company that tracks 45 top web vendors.
- Peer institutions: Northwestern, University of Chicago, Boston College, Gonzaga, Seattle University, St. Louis, Notre Dame, Creighton.
- University Web Developers Users Group
- Cost of Products
- Established list of 19 contenders, including open source options.
Request For Information

• Selected 30 most important value-weighted requirements for RFI.
• Sent RFI to 19 selected contenders, including two vendors that would act as consultants for open source solution, along with response deadline.
RFI Responses

• Received responses from 13 vendors.
• Reviewed RFIs over the course of several weeks, discussed and rated vendors.
• Determined that an enterprise-wide open source product was not a viable option for us at this time.
Four Finalists

• Selected four finalists based on evaluation scores.
  • Day Software
  • Hannon Hill
  • OmniUpdate
  • Terminal Four
RFP Responses

• Sent RFP with 132 requirements to the vendor finalists, with two week deadline to respond.
• Received responses from all four vendors.
• Evaluated responses based on full set of requirements.
• Top vendors in order of scoring:
  – OmniUpdate - 404
  – Terminal Four - 403.5
  – Hannon Hill - 390
  – Day Software - 378.5
Vendor Experience

• Demos - Vendors came to campus last two weeks of April, gave product demonstrations attended by work group, as well as members of Server & Database teams, and PMO office.

• Sandboxes Environments - All four vendors created sandbox environments with test IDs, allowing us to work in system. Work group members did extensive testing in the systems.

• Webinar Training - We requested and received one-hour webinar training to give us further experience with the products.

• Reference Checks - Colleges currently using products
Conclusion and Recommendation

• Determined all four vendors offered good to excellent products.

• Reached unanimous work group decision that Terminal Four was the best product for our needs.
  – Matched all of our critical product requirements.
  – Roadmap for product looks good, along with a specialization in higher ed.
  – Vendor appears eager to work with us and was responsive to potential product enhancements.
  – Cost for product and training was in line with other vendors.
## Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>License</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Annual Support</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Software</td>
<td>200 Named Users</td>
<td>$147,500</td>
<td>$26,550</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$234,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannon Hill</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omni</td>
<td>200 Named Users</td>
<td>$38,900</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$17,750</td>
<td>$64,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Four</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>$40,491</td>
<td>$8,908</td>
<td>$26,481 *</td>
<td>$75,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*Sure Start - 17 days of professional services and 4 days of Administrator and Developer Training.*)
Next Steps

• Contract negotiations
• Create roll-out work group with colleagues in University Marketing & Communication
• High level planning
• Identify implementation timeline & dependencies (potential Fall 2010 implementation).
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Data Governance Committee

Progress report

Prepared by Rick Hurst and Conrad Vanek

Office of Institutional Research & Information Technology Services
May 27, 2010
Establishment of Roles and Responsibilities

This committee is charged with the management of the University’s valuable asset – *data*. The management of this asset will focus on:

- Identifying/defining authoritative sources of data
- Data integration
- Data security and accessibility
- Data quality
- Data education

The creation of data definitions for a data dictionary
Identified Functional Data Guardians

Functional Data Guardians from key functional data areas will be responsible for providing the following:

Define and help document what the data really means.

Be responsible for establishing quality expectations.

Be responsible for setting policies concerning data quality.

Identify and document caveats and special cases where the data presents problems.

Help others to properly use and interpret the data itself.

Be aware of interactions with and dependencies on the data.

Work across the organization to consolidate processes and share data.
Current Committee Membership

- **Data Governance Committee (DGC)**
  - Rick Hurst, Institutional Research (Co-chair)
  - Conrad Vanek, ITS, Data Architecture (Co-chair)
  - Becky Gomez, Finance
  - Carol McCormack, Human Resources
  - Charlotte Pullen, ITS, Enterprise Databases
  - Clare Korinek, Registration and Records
  - Tim Heuer, Enrollment Management
  - Tom Catania, Student Financials

- Floating Membership (as needed)
Master Data Strategy Adopted

- **Application method (LUC Typical)**
  - Limited focus on a pressing institutional problem
  - Tends towards data silos across the institution

- **Platform method (DGC adopted)**
  - is data driven
  - Builds a detailed guide to where data is sourced from
  - How various systems organize it
  - Grows out a single initial institution solution
Adoption of Data Quality Strategy

• Based on the target, not the source of data

• Data Profiling
  - Identifies the problem
  - Provides snapshots of data quality and measures over time
  - Determine data improvement and/or degradation

• Data Cleansing
  - Corrects incomplete/inconsistent data by cross-checking against source databases
  - Improves data by providing value-add information
Data Governance Roadmap Plotted

- Identify high-value data
- Build data rules
- Define workflow for invalid data
- Establish audit and control
- Implement the process
Outline Data Governance Problems Facing Loyola

• Undefined/Inconsistent Term Usage (FTE, faculty, course, department, etc.)

• Unidentified Source(s) of needed data

• Humpty Dumpty data

• Unidentified data flow and data silos

• No reporting standards

• Data quality issues

• Towards a Data Warehouse Solution
Typical Report Generation Process

Peoplesoft

ETL Tool
Extract Transform Load
Vanilla Data Governance

RDS
Reporting Database Service

WEBFOCUS TOOL

NO DATA Governance

REPORT 5
REPORT 2
REPORT 1
REPORT 4
REPORT 5
Initial Project: Faculty Data Governance

- Critical Data Needed for Management of Faculty Resources
- No Standard Definitions
- No Clear Source Data
- Recent Decision to Purchase Faculty Insight
- Immediate Benefits to IR Research
- Clear Path to Other Data Governance Projects
Proposed Working Definition of Faculty

- Faculty are persons identified by the institution as such and typically those whose initial assignments are made for the purpose of conducting instruction, research or public service as a principal activity (or activities). They may hold academic rank titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, lecturer or the equivalent of any of those academic ranks. Faculty may also include the president, provost, vice provosts, deans, directors or the equivalent, as well as associate deans, assistant deans and executive officers of academic departments (chairpersons, heads or the equivalent) if their principal activity is instruction combined with research and/or public service.

- The designation as "faculty" is separate from the activities to which they may be currently assigned. For example, a newly appointed president of an institution may also be appointed as a faculty member. Graduate assistants, teaching assistants, research assistants, and student assistants who are at the University for the principal purpose of being graduate students are not included.
Current Procedure for Faculty Data Assembly

Peoplesoft

ETL Tool
Extract Transform Load
Vanilla Data Governance

RDS
Reporting Database Service

WEBFOCUS TOOL

NO DATA Governance

COURSE LEVEL DATA

Lawson

LUWARE

NO DATA Governance

FIS

Rosetta

NO DATA Governance

DATA RECONCILIATION AND CLEANSING
Identification of Faculty Data Sources and Elements

**Faculty Definition**
- Teaching
- Research
- Service

**The Elements**
- Unique ID
- Name
- Current Status
- Primary Role
- Appointment Date
- Rank
- Department
- School
- Rank Appointment Date
- Tenure Status
- Base Salary
- Supplementary Salary
- Term
- Date
- Administrator Type
- Administrator Code
- FTE
- Education
- Terminal Degree
- Gender
- Race/Ethnicity
- Citizenship
- Birthdate
- Service Type
- Service Code
- Termination Date
- Budget Position
- Campus

**Identified Sources**
- Human Resources–Lawson
- Faculty Information System (FIS)
- PS Locus
- SSOM
**Faculty Definition and Data Sources**

- **Faculty Definition**
  - Teaching
  - Research
  - Service

- **Identified by the Institution (Loyola)**
  - Persons Identified as Faculty

- **Human Resources as Source of Truth**
  - Compensated Employee Data
  - Faculty Data: a subset of Employee Data

- **Minor Problem**
  - Uncompensated Faculty Excluded
  - Rome Center Italians
  - Beijing Faculty
  - Other

- **LAWSON**
  - University Employees
  - Faculty Employees
  - Staff Employees
  - Student Employees

- **Non-Affiliated Faculty Database**
  - Faculty Administration
Initially Defining a Faculty Typology

**Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty:**
- Those faculty who are designated by the university as tenured/tenure-track.

**Non-Tenure Track Faculty:**
- Begin with the base definition of faculty and exclude those faculty members who meet the above definition for tenured/tenure-track faculty. Full-time/part-time designation is fully dependent on the FTE associated with the appointment.

**Research Faculty:**
- Research faculty is limited to individuals who are exclusively conducting research and are the principal investigator (PI) or co-PI and who supervise students or other professional level assistants who are collaborating on or assisting with such research (such as post-doctoral scholars. Full-time/part-time designation is fully dependent on the FTE associated with the appointment.

**Instructional Faculty:**
- Begin with the base definition and exclude research faculty, the president, provost, executive vice president, vice presidents, associate vice presidents, vice provosts, and deans. Full-time/part-time designation is fully dependent on the FTE associated with the appointment.

**Librarians:**
- All those with the librarian designator in their title. Full-time/part-time designation is fully dependent on the FTE associated with the appointment.
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Current State - Summary

• **Green**, project has been on track since inception
• Data Governance Committee launched, Strategy, Technical Assessment, and RFP completed
• Potential Vendors Identified
From June 2009 - Next Steps

• Confirm decision
• Create DW/BI Program Management structure and data governance teams
• Investigate and evaluate technical alternatives
  – Custom
  – Hybrid
  – Package
• Select 1\textsuperscript{st} business opportunity
• Define and launch the first DW/BI project
# Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project approval at ITESC</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management and Data Governance Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Develop Charter/Missions</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Membership Selection</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise DW/BI Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Develop RFP</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Vendor Response</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Evaluate Vendor Responses</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Strategy Decision</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Project Selection</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define and Launch Program</td>
<td>Launched June 09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategy

To this…

- Extract Transform & Load System: Prepare the Data
- Data Warehouse: Data Organized to Support the University
- Business Intelligence: Access & Use of Data

LOCUS
Lawson
Recruitment Plus

Current Challenges:
- Data not easily accessible.
- Need data from multiple systems
- No history or point in time snapshots (i.e., 10th Day Reporting)

Business Intelligence: Access & Use of Data
Strategy

Focus on functional areas:

– Research and document opportunities and requirements for each area

– Document available data warehouse architectures and solutions in preparation for a technology selection
# Faculty Load Report*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>% of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indv</td>
<td>Lab/Disc</td>
<td>Lect/Sem</td>
<td>Indv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>% of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indv</td>
<td>Lab/Disc</td>
<td>Lect/Sem</td>
<td>Indv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Core Indv</th>
<th>Core Lab/Disc</th>
<th>Core Lect/Sem</th>
<th>Total Indv</th>
<th>Total Lab/Disc</th>
<th>Total Lect/Sem</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>% of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mock Report*
Data Governance Committee

- Launched in November 2009
- Project managed by Charlotte Pullen
- Co-chairs are Rick Hurst from IR and Conrad Vanek from ITS
- Focused on reviewing source data, data policies, and data definitions
- Held 4 meetings since inception
- Currently meetings are bi-monthly
Technical Assessment

• Hybrid Solution
  – Use vendor higher-ed experience
  – Use LUC owned tools: Oracle, Cognos, WebFocus
  – Customizable

• Contacting schools confirmed Hybrid decision:
  – University of Delaware
  – Arizona State
  – George Washington University
  – Northwestern University
  – Boise State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LUC Build</th>
<th>Hybrid Build</th>
<th>Off the Shelf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>114.0</td>
<td>123.5</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of 48 questions
RFP

- Built from PAQS template used in the Campus Card and ECM projects, reviewed by Gartner

- To be sent to “Hybrid” vendors
  - Ciber
  - Creative Computing
  - iStrategy
  - Phytorion
  - Resilient Business Solutions
  - Sntial
  - SPR
**RFP cont’d**

### Proposed RFP Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Proposed Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Send RFP to selected vendors</td>
<td>6/1/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor RFP submission deadline</td>
<td>6/21/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor selection and notification</td>
<td>8/31/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin vendor engagement</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

- Submit RFP to selected vendors
- Evaluate RFP responses and select vendor
- Determine first opportunity to address:
  - Recruiting
  - Student Retention
  - Student Financial Analysis
  - Course Enrollment Management (Faculty Information)
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## FY10 Q3-Q4 POR Tracking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POR Activity</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>T-Shirt Sizing Breakdown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original FY10 Q3-Q4 POR</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>X-Large: 6, Large: 37, Medium: 58, Small: 42, X-Small: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Projects</td>
<td>(137)</td>
<td>X-Large: 4, Large: 21, Medium: 54, Small: 49, X-Small: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate/ Canceled</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>X-Large: 1, Large: 1, Medium: 1, Small: 2, X-Small: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Projects not Started</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>X-Large: 1, Large: 2, Medium: 10, Small: 9, X-Small: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11 Q1-Q2 POR (Draft)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>X-Large: 7, Large: 33, Medium: 61, Small: 35, X-Small: 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITS Project Portfolio Comparison

ITS Project Portfolio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY08 Q1-Q2</th>
<th>FY08 Q3-Q4</th>
<th>FY09 Q1-Q2</th>
<th>FY09 Q3-Q4</th>
<th>FY10 Q1-Q2</th>
<th>FY10 Q3-Q4</th>
<th>FY11 Q1-Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Projects</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg.</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>This Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY10 Q3-Q4 Completed Projects

137 projects completed

Portfolio Completion Pct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio Completion Pct</th>
<th>FY08 Q1-Q2</th>
<th>FY08 Q3-Q4</th>
<th>FY09 Q1-Q2</th>
<th>FY09 Q3-Q4</th>
<th>FY10 Q1-Q2</th>
<th>FY10 Q3-Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Pct.</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>This Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY10 Q3-Q4 Completed Projects

FY10 Q3-Q4 Completed Projects by Strategic Alignment

- Infrastructure, 34, 25%
- Continuous Service Development, 15, 11%
- Administrative Initiatives, 49, 36%
- Academic & Faculty Support, 30, 22%
- Student Technology Support, 9, 6%

Data as of 5/25/2010
260 Projects

FY10 Q3-Q4 Projects by Strategic Alignment

- Infrastructure, 55, 25%
- Continuous Service Development, 37, 14%
- Administrative Initiatives, 84, 32%
- Academic & Faculty Support, 27, 11%
- Student Technology Support, 27, 11%

Projected Data as of 5/25/2010
137 Projects

Strategic Category | Completed Count | Completed Percent | Portfolio Percent | Net Difference
------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|
Academic & Faculty Support | 30 | 22% | 18% | 4%
Administrative Initiatives | 49 | 36% | 32% | 3%
Continuous Service Development | 15 | 11% | 14% | -3%
Infrastructure | 34 | 25% | 25% | 0%
Student Technology Support | 9 | 7% | 10% | -4%

Total | 137 |
FY11 Q1-Q2 Plan of Record

**FY11 Q1-Q2 Projects by Priority (Draft)**

- **M-Must Do**: 13, 9%
- **A-High**: 41, 25%
- **C-Low**: 35, 25%
- **B-Medium**: 53, 37%

Data as of 5/25/2010

142 Projects

**FY11 Q1-Q2 Projects by Strategic Alignment (Draft)**

- **Administrative Initiatives**: 46
- **Student Technology Support**: 22
- **Continuous Service Development**: 24
- **Infrastructure**: 31
- **Academic & Faculty Support**: 19
- **Administrative Initiatives**: 46
- **Continuous Service Development**: 24

Data as of 5/25/2010

142 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Alignment</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic &amp; Faculty Support</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Initiatives</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Service Development</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Technology Support</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priority**

- **A-High**: 41
- **B-Medium**: 53
- **C-Low**: 35
- **M-Must Do**: 142

142 Projects
# FY10-FY11 ITESC Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 16, 2009</td>
<td>- LUHS/LUMC Update&lt;br&gt;- Student Email Review&lt;br&gt;- Project Portfolio Prioritization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 25, 2010</td>
<td>- Payment Plan Demo&lt;br&gt;- Prioritization Results/Finalize POR&lt;br&gt;- ISAC Risk Assessment Update&lt;br&gt;- ECM Update&lt;br&gt;- Gmail Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 2010</td>
<td>- ATC Proposal - Blackboard Upgrade&lt;br&gt;- Mobile Application Update&lt;br&gt;- Tech Fee Review&lt;br&gt;- Proposed Revisions to Quarterly ITS Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 27, 2010</td>
<td>- LUMC Update&lt;br&gt;- Web Content Recommendation&lt;br&gt;- Data Governance Subcommittee Update&lt;br&gt;- DW/BI Program Update&lt;br&gt;- Project Portfolio Prioritization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15, 2010</td>
<td>- Prioritization Results/Finalize POR&lt;br&gt;- Selective Subcommittee Updates&lt;br&gt;- FY11 Technology-Related Budget Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 26, 2010</td>
<td>- Subcommittee Reports&lt;br&gt;- FY11 Budget Submissions Review&lt;br&gt;- FY11 Budget Input from Subcommittees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7, 2010</td>
<td>- Major Projects Status Reviews&lt;br&gt;- LUMC Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 18, 2010</td>
<td>- Technology Briefing &amp; Scorecards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December - Date/Time TBD</td>
<td>- Subcommittee Reports&lt;br&gt;- Project Portfolio Prioritization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>