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Resources

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

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

• Other
  ✓ The Campus Computing Project
INDUSTRY ISSUES AND PRIORITIES
Gartner: Top Strategic Technologies You Expect to Focus On 2012 - 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>CIO Technology Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Mobile technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Cloud computing (SaaS, PaaS, IaaS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Analytics and business intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Virtualization desktop, server and storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>IT mgmt. technologies (program, project mgmt., governance, change mgmt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Collaboration technologies (e.g., workflow mgmt., team collaboration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Enterprise resource applications (finance, HR, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Personal devices in the workspace (consumerization of IT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Customer relationship management (CRM) applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Content management applications (digital publishing, website mgmt., etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The 2012 Gartner Higher Education CIO Agenda Survey Cut
Figure 6. The 2012 Strategic Technology Map View of the Technologies in the Higher Education Top 10 Technology Priorities Versus All Other Mentioned Technologies by the Survey Respondents: Higher Education Top 5 Are Red, Top 6 Through 10 Are Orange, and the Rest Are Blue

Source: Gartner (June 2012)
### 2012 Educause Top 10 IT Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top-Ten IT Issues, 2012</th>
<th>What is Loyola doing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Updating IT professionals' skills and roles to accommodate emerging technologies and</td>
<td>1. Training budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changing IT management and service delivery models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supporting the trends toward IT consumerization and bring-your-own device</td>
<td>2. “Anytime Anywhere Access”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Developing an institution-wide cloud strategy</td>
<td>3. Selectively, Box, Sakai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improving the institution’s operational efficiency through information technology</td>
<td>4. ECM, BI, IDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Integrating information technology into institutional decision-making</td>
<td>5. ITESC, forecasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Using analytics to support critical institutional outcomes</td>
<td>6. DWBI, dashboards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Funding information technology strategically</td>
<td>7. Prioritization, budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Transforming the institution’s business with information technology</td>
<td>8. ECM, lecture capture, online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Supporting the research mission through high-performance computing, large data, and</td>
<td>9. RDC, CTRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analytics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Establishing and implementing IT governance throughout the institution</td>
<td>10. ITESC, collaborations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Campus Computing Project: Priorities

Top Institutional IT Priorities Over the Next Two-Three Years

- Assisting faculty integrate IT into instruction
- Providing adequate user support
- Hiring/retaining qualified IT staff
- Implementing / supporting mobile computing
- Providing online education
- Upgrading / enhancing network & data security
- Financing the replacement of aging IT
- Upgrading / replacing the campus network
- Migrating to Cloud computing
- Upgrading / replacing ERP systems
- Upgrading / replacing emergency comm.

pct reporting very important (6/7)
scale: 1 = not important; 7 = very important

Top priorities focus on instructional integration, user support, and IT staffing
2012 Highlights

- Assisting faculty with the instructional integration of IT returns as a top CIO priority
- Big gains (again) in the deployment of mobile apps
- Budget cuts continue to decline, but public campuses more at risk than privates.
- Mixed assessments from presidents, provosts, and CIOs about the effectiveness of IT investments
- Still searching for the Clouds!
- Transitions continue in the LMS market
Affirming the Strategic Importance of the Cloud

percentage who agree/strongly agree, fall 2012

Across all sectors, a clear message that CIOs view moving ERP to the Cloud as strategic for their institution.
Cloud Migration

The Cloud
Slow Migration to Cloud Computing

percentages, fall 2011 vs. 2012

Still little movement to the Cloud for the really “Big” Tasks

- Risk
- Limited Options from Providers
- Trust
- Control

The Campus Computing Project
LMS in the Cloud

LMS Moves to the Clouds

percentage reporting Cloud-based LMS, fall 2011 vs. 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Universities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Universities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-Yr. Colleges</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 4-Yr. Colleges</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LMS as the “toe in the Cloud” experience for higher education?
Security & Disaster Recovery Planning

Updating Campus IT Security & Disaster Plans

Last Update for IT Security

- 25% do not have a strategic plan for network security
- 39% do not have a strategic plan for IT disaster recovery

Last Update for IT Disaster Recovery

The Campus Computing Project
STUDENT, ACADEMIC AND CLASSROOM TECHNOLOGY
2012 ECAR Study of Undergraduate Students and Technology

- Published September 2012
- 195 Participating Institutions
- Over 100,000 students from around the world
- Collected students perceptions of technology and how various technologies contribute to their academic success
Key Findings

✓ Blending Modalities and Engaging Learners is a Winning Combination

✓ The Time has Come to Move Beyond Thinking About Individual Platforms and Devices

✓ Students Believe that Technology is Critical to Academic Success and that it Plays an Important Part in Their Future Accomplishments

✓ Students Want Multiple Communication Options, and They Prefer Different Modes for Different Purposes and Audiences
Technology Usage ...

Figure 4. Device Ownership and Usage

- **Laptop**: 86% Own, 97% of Loyola Students
- **Smartphone**: 62% Own, 65% of Loyola Students
- **Desktop computer**: 15% Own, 10% of Loyola Students
- **Tablet**: 12% Own, 18% of Loyola Students
- **E-reader**: 

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS

2012 ECAR Study of Undergraduate Students and Technology
The 2013 ECAR student technology survey is now closed with more than 250 institutions and more than 110,000 survey responses. ECAR will take a stratified sample of 10,000 survey responses and use these data to write the annual ECAR report about undergraduate students and technology. The annual report will be released in September and the findings presented at the 2013 EDUCAUSE conference in Anaheim.
Lecture Capture and Podcasting

Rising Use of Lecture Capture
(percentage of classes by sector, 2008-2012)

Steady Gains in Podcasting
(percentage of classes by sector, 2007-2012)
MOOCs

Much Ado About MOOCs?

percentages who agree/strongly agree

- Offer a viable model for the effective delivery of online instruction
- Offer a viable business model for campuses to realize new revenues

- A bare majority of CIOs see MOOCs as viable model for online instruction
- More than two-thirds of CIOs are uncertain about the revenue model

The Campus Computing Project
Social Media

Institutional Use of Social Media

Campus Presence on Facebook
(percentages, 2009 vs. 2012)

Campus Presence on Twitter
(percentages, 2009 vs. 2012)
Other Media

Institutional Use of Other Media

Campus Presence on YouTube
(Percentages, 2009 vs. 2012)

Campus Presence on iTunesU
(Percentages, 2009 vs. 2012)
A Profile of the LMS Market, Fall 2012

Does your campus have a single [campus-wide] LMS?

(Percentages, all institutions)

- Topping off on LMS use? 58% of classes using the LMS in 2012, little changed from 2011 but up from 17% in 2000.
- Blackboard share down from 57% in 2010, 71% in 2006.
LMS Demography

Institutional Demography of LMS Providers, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Pub Univ</th>
<th>Pvt Univ</th>
<th>Pub 4-Yr</th>
<th>Pvt 4-Yr</th>
<th>Comm Coll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2L</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eCollege</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructure</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenzabar</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodle</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakai</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Market presence often varies by sector
- Two-thirds of campuses report plans to review the current LMS strategy for budget or other reasons
STRATEGIC PROGRAMS AND INVESTMENTS

- Electronic Content Management (ECM)
- Data Warehouse/Business Intelligence (Decision Support)
- “Anytime Anywhere Access”
ECM Results...

• Live for 4 years
  • 1st client in Feb 2009
  • 61 major deployments
  • 32 unique departments
  • Across 3 campuses
• Repository:
  • 3.3M documents
  • 1053 document types
• 900 faculty and staff have access
• Single click access to documents in over 35 different Campus Solutions/PeopleSoft screens
• Metrics:
  • 74% average process improvement on key metrics
  • 7200+ hours of annual effort savings (3.7 FTE equivalent)
  • $47,000+ of annual cost reductions (maintenance only)
• Portfolio: 10 active projects, 25+ in the queue
ECM Awards...

2012

• Loyola was recognized for its ECM implementation process and was awarded the 2012 Carl E Nelson Best Practices Award from the Association for Information and Image Management (AIIM).

• The award recognizes excellence in information management deployments.

2013

• Loyola was recognized for its process efficiency in Account Payable for it’s ECM implementation and was awarded the Spring 2013 Models of Efficiency Award from University Business Magazine.

• The award recognizes process efficiency in administrative and student services.
Simple reports can be easily drilled down and sliced to uncover powerful analysis and insights.

### Discount Rate Analysis

#### BI Reporting Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Aid Award Description</th>
<th>Tuition Only DR</th>
<th>TEST_ACT_COMP__</th>
<th># Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Tuition Grant</td>
<td>108.13%</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Room Grant</td>
<td>136.27%</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damen Scholarship</td>
<td>51.76%</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignatian Honors Scholarship</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Scholarship</td>
<td>52.23%</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Merit Full Tuition</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Merit Recognition</td>
<td>79.57%</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Scholarship #1</td>
<td>50.74%</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Achievement Award</td>
<td>98.94%</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Scholarship</td>
<td>63.02%</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rambler Award for Leadership</td>
<td>40.97%</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Simple Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Aid Award Description</th>
<th>SAT_ACAD_PROGRESS_DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Tuition Only DR</th>
<th>TEST_ACT_COMP__</th>
<th># Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damen Scholarship</td>
<td>Meeting Sat Acadm Progress</td>
<td>51.67%</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Meeting Sat Acadm Progres</td>
<td>50.77%</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>67.00%</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignatian Honors Scholarship</td>
<td>Meeting Sat Acadm Progress</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Scholarship</td>
<td>Meeting Sat Acadm Progress</td>
<td>52.20%</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Meeting Sat Acadm Progres</td>
<td>54.42%</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>54.32%</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNDER CONSTRUCTION- TEST DATA USED
Discount Rate Analysis
BI Reporting Samples
### RMS Executive Report Recap – Old Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available Beds</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission Deposited</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>2089</td>
<td>2094</td>
<td>2072</td>
<td>2076</td>
<td>2072</td>
<td>2072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Applications</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemption Granted</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemption Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Historically the First Year housing applications increase by 82 from May 1 to when the halls open. This is based upon the last two years of data.

Total number of available beds adjusted based upon the final number of spaces in Campion being handed over the Assignments Team by the Architects.

The May 29th Exemptions granted number has been corrected to not include automatic exemptions where students submitted a housing application.

### First Year Exemptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Granted</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancelled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Release</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live at Home</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other includes releases for the following reasons: Care Provider for Relative, Religious, Military, Over 21, and Marriage/Civil Union; all of these have been administratively verified through LOCUS and the requirements remain in place.

### Freshmen Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshmen Occupancy</th>
<th>TOTAL STAFF ASSIGNED</th>
<th>AVAILABLE STAFF BEDS</th>
<th>TOTAL STUDENT BEDS</th>
<th>TOTAL APPLIED AND DEPOSITED STUDENTS ASSIGNED</th>
<th>TOTAL APPLIED AND DEPOSITED STUDENTS CURRENT WEEK</th>
<th>AVAILABLE STUDENT BEDS Prior Week</th>
<th>AVAILABLE STUDENT BEDS Current Week</th>
<th>PERCENT BUILDING OCCUPANCY Prior week</th>
<th>PERCENT BUILDING OCCUPANCY Current week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mertz Hall</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>96.66%</td>
<td>96.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion Hall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis Hall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson Hall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVM Hall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Freshman</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>96.66%</td>
<td>96.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the 10th class day Fall 2011 there were 1,727 first year students in on-campus housing.

Two beds in Campion have been closed to create singles for honors students with SSWD recommendations.

One international student is unassigned while we wait on the confirmation of the student’s gender.

Four beds in Mertz hall will be used by the admissions office for tour rooms/overnight student guest.

One student in Campion is a sophomore, requested to live in freshmen housing by the honors program.
### Executive Housing Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term: Fall 2013</th>
<th>Bed Space Type: All</th>
<th>Display: Housing Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>02/25/2013</th>
<th>03/04/2013</th>
<th>03/11/2013</th>
<th>03/18/2013</th>
<th>04/04/2013</th>
<th>04/11/2013</th>
<th>04/18/2013</th>
<th>04/25/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; C Standard (System Potential)</td>
<td>4,864</td>
<td>4,864</td>
<td>4,867</td>
<td>4,867</td>
<td>4,867</td>
<td>4,867</td>
<td>4,867</td>
<td>4,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Assignable Beds</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue Beds</td>
<td>4,645</td>
<td>4,649</td>
<td>4,627</td>
<td>4,627</td>
<td>4,627</td>
<td>4,627</td>
<td>4,627</td>
<td>4,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Revenue Beds</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVAILABLE REVENUE BEDS</td>
<td>4,484</td>
<td>4,478</td>
<td>4,469</td>
<td>4,467</td>
<td>4,466</td>
<td>4,464</td>
<td>4,464</td>
<td>4,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Revenue Beds</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned Revenue Beds</td>
<td>4,271</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td>4,416</td>
<td>4,414</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>4,404</td>
<td>4,403</td>
<td>4,403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Deposits (Enrollment/Housing) | 2,231 | 2,401 | 2,368 | 2,360 | 2,375 | 2,360 | 2,375 | 2,375 |
| Housing Application | 1,821 | 1,857 | 1,856 | 1,856 | 1,856 | 1,856 | 1,856 | 1,856 |
| No Housing App / No Exemption App | 1,727 | 1,753 | 1,764 | 1,764 | 1,764 | 1,764 | 1,764 | 1,764 |
| Exemptions Granted | 269 | 258 | 261 | 261 | 261 | 261 | 261 | 261 |
| Exemption Request Pending | 166 | 169 | 162 | 162 | 162 | 162 | 162 | 162 |
| Deposited Auto Exempted Population | 273 | 288 | 269 | 269 | 269 | 269 | 269 | 269 |

---

### Occupancy Summary Report

For Term: 1136 / Week Ending: 04/22/2013
For: All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence Hall</th>
<th>Student Occupied</th>
<th>Student Unoccupied</th>
<th>Student Occupancy Rate</th>
<th>Staff Occupied</th>
<th>Staff Unoccupied</th>
<th>Staff Occupancy Rate</th>
<th>Total Occupied</th>
<th>Total Occupied</th>
<th>Total Occupancy</th>
<th>Applied/Deposited (Current Week)</th>
<th>% change (±)</th>
<th>Available Beds (Current Week)</th>
<th>% change (±)</th>
<th>Available Beds (Prior Week)</th>
<th>% change (±)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bannert Hall</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>64.05%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>63.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellamore Hall</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99.65%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>97.63%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion Hall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Hall</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>98.11%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield Hall</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64.75%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.94%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham Hall</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>23.38%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63.71%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>43.25%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1,984</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>42.35%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Faculty Instructional Activities Sample Drilldown

**Loyola University Chicago**  
**Institutional Research Faculty Instructional Activity For Academic Year: 2012**  
**Summary By Department**

Export to Excel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Active Faculty</th>
<th>Faculty Load</th>
<th>Faculty (FTE)</th>
<th>Class Hours Taught (Undergraduate)</th>
<th>Class Hours Taught (Graduate)</th>
<th>Total Class Hours Taught</th>
<th>Core Hours Taught</th>
<th>% of Core Hours Taught</th>
<th>Classes Taught (Undergraduate)</th>
<th>Class Hours Taught (Graduate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,526</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,526</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FT-Contract</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,664</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,664</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Department - Anthropology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6,109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,109</td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FT-Contract</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,388</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2,427</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Department - Arts &amp; Sciences (Dean)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3,626</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>3,911</td>
<td>2,724</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6,713</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>7,419</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FT-Contract</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9,229</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>9,832</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Department - Biology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18,010</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>19,319</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5,804</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>6,008</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FT-Contract</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9,322</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,322</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Department - Chemistry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15,198</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>15,402</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FT-Contract</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNDER CONSTRUCTION- TEST DATA USED
IT Strategic Direction
“Anytime Anywhere Access”

• Concepts
  – Faculty/Staff/Student:
    “I can fulfill my relationship with Loyola from wherever I am.”
  – Easy to use
  – Web/portal-based
  – Secure
  – Self service
  – University:
    How do we “elegantly give up control?”
IT Strategic Direction
“Anytime Anywhere Access”

• Technology Implications
  – Reduce or eliminate constraints of things like VPN, Loyola Software, network drives
  – Portal
  – Virtualization
  – Desktop Management
  – Application streaming
  – Cloud-based
  – Bring Your Own Device
Steps Toward

LOYOLA joins THE CLOUD

Unified Messaging
Exchange
Office 365
Microsoft
Outlook
Online Meetings
Mobile
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Instant Messaging
Email Integration
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BUDGET AND FUNDING
Higher Ed IT Spend as a Percent of Operating Expense

Figure 1. Education: IT Spending as a Percent of Revenue

= Range  = Average  = Middle Quartiles

Source: Gartner IT Key Metrics Data (December 2012)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Scale</th>
<th>5.6%</th>
<th>4.1%</th>
<th>4.2%</th>
<th>3.6%</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$250M in Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250M- $500M in Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500M- $1B in Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1B- $10B in Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10B+ in Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Gartner IT Key Metrics Data (December 2012)
## 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>$379.5</td>
<td>$16.4</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$386.4</td>
<td>$16.7</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Draft</td>
<td>$410.6</td>
<td>$16.6</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ITS % of Total LUC Budget

2002-2009 ITS Budget Includes ITS Operating Budget
2009-2014 ITS Budget Includes ITS and Technology Fee Operating Budget
2012-2014 ITS Budget Includes addition of funds for Shared Services to LUMC, Lawson Maintenance, BSI Tax Software and MHC Payroll Software
## FY13 Projected Technology Fee Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY13 Allocations</th>
<th>FY13 Projected Revenue</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ResNet Lab Support</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecomm/Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership &amp; Dues</td>
<td></td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Technology Refresh Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,020,000</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Capital Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Fee Carry Over/overage</td>
<td></td>
<td>-$105,000</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY13 Technology Fee Breakdown

- **Software Maintenance**: 36%
- **Student Technology Refresh Programs**: 37%
- **ResNet Lab Support**: 13%
- **Telecomm/Internet**: 9%
- **Membership & Dues**: 3%
- **Planned Capital Projects**: 5%
EDUCAUSE: Core Data Survey Summary – Central IT Operating

**Loyola**
- Staff Compensation 74%
- Equipment 5%
- Software 9%
- Other 1%

**AJCU**
- Staff Compensation 72%
- Equipment 12%
- Software 10%
- Other 2%

**RU/H Private**
- Staff Compensation 64%
- Equipment 12%
- Software 8%
- Other 7%

**Institutions**
- Boston College
- Canisius College
- College of the Holy Cross
- Creighton University
- Fairfield University
- Fordham University
- Georgetown University
- John Carroll University
- Le Moyne College
- Loyola Marymount University
- Loyola University Chicago
- Loyola University Maryland
- Marquette University
- Regis University
- Saint Joseph's University
- Saint Louis University
- Santa Clara University
- Seattle University
- The University of Scranton
- University of Detroit Mercy
- University of San Francisco

21 Total

* EDUCAUSE Core Data does not include Technology Fee and Shared Services Numbers
EDUCAUSE: Core Data Survey Summary – Central IT FTE (AJCU)

2012 IT FTE per 1000 institutional FTEs

- Boston College
- Loyola University Maryland
- College of the Holy Cross
- Fordham University
- Georgetown University
- Creighton University
- The University of Scranton
- Saint Joseph's University
- Saint Louis University
- Le Moyne College
- Fairfield University
- John Carroll University
- Canisius College
- Loyola Marymount University
- Santa Clara University
- University of San Francisco
- Marquette University
- Loyola University Chicago
- Regis University
- University of Detroit Mercy

AJCU
Median
7.23

Loyola
5.41
2012 IT Student Worker FTE per 1000 Institutional FTEs

- University of Detroit Mercy
- Loyola University Chicago
- Loyola Marymount University
- Loyola University Maryland
- John Carroll University
- University of San Francisco
- Boston College
- Le Moyne College
- Saint Joseph’s University
- Seattle University
- Santa Clara University
- College of the Holy Cross
- Fordham University
- Marquette University
- Fairfield University
- Creighton University
- Canisius College
- Regis University
- Georgetown University
- The University of Scranton
- Saint Louis University

AJCU
Median
1.66

Loyola
6.56
CURRENT STATE
ITS Major Initiatives - FY13 Q3-Q4

**Academic and Faculty Support**
- Locus Enhancements (5)
- R+ System Replacement (2)
- Electronic Outbound Transcript Feasibility
- School of Nursing - SIM
- Sakai Implementation

**Administrative Initiatives**
- Advance Web Implementation
- Convio Replacement
- Database for Key and Lock Info
- Quick Updates to LUC Emergency Web Pages
- LOCUS Security Center Rollout
- SSP changes for FY14
- BAS changes for FY14

**Student Technology Support**
- Email Replacement/Migration
- Parking Enforcement /Permit Mgmt
- Illinois Articulation Initiative
- Lecture Capture

**Infrastructure**
- Novell to Microsoft Migration
- Security Camera Infrastructure (2)
- Information Security Program (8)
- Campus Construction Initiatives (12)
- LUHS/LUC/HSD Technology Program (5)
- Computer Aided Dispatch for Campus Safety Upgrade (ARMS)

**Continuous Service Development**
- Emergency Response Website
- Enterprise Content Management (9)
- Complete T4 Content Mgmt System Migration
- Enhancements to Immunization Data Mgmt
- Business Intelligence/Data Warehouse (4)
ITS FY13 LUC Technology Scorecard - Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITS Scorecard Summary</th>
<th>Health Index</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>FY12-13 Change</th>
<th>Total Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>FY13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic &amp; Faculty Support Scorecard</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Technology Scorecard</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Technology Scorecard</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Scorecard</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Service Improvement Scorecard</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp; Funding Scorecard</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average Annual Score                  | 3.1   | 3.3   | 3.6   | 3.9   | 4.0   | 4.0   | 3.9   | -1%    | 21%    |
| Year to Year Improvement              | --    | 6%    | 8%    | 8%    | 2%    | 0%    | -1%   |         |        |

As of November 2012

NOTES:
- Academic change related to HSD integration and RDC health
- Administrative change related to Slate implementation and Parking Administration
- Governance and Funding change related to lack of resources for EA, budget cuts, and new procurement requirements/process
Welcome …

to your main resource site for the Sakai migration project. This site is your home to access material related to Sakai and the migration project including: schedules and timelines, communications, training opportunities, FAQ's, and links to other resources.

Sakai @luc.edu

Teaching and Learning Support for Open Learning Management Systems

Announcements and Notices
- The Move to Sakai
- Spring Courses
- Course Migrations
- Timeline
- Communities Migration

Faculty Training Schedule
- Introduction to Sakai
- Advanced Sakai Topics
- Schedule of Sessions
- Individual Consultation Self-Service

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's)

Sakai Resources
- The Sakai Community

Related Links
- Loyola Sakai Login
- Faculty Center for Ignatian Pedagogy
- Instructional Technology and Research Support (ITRS)
- Information Technology Services
- Need Help?
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LOYOLA MOVING TO MICROSOFT EXCHANGE

MAJOR UPGRADE BRINGS NEW EMAIL SYSTEM AND OTHER COMMUNICATION TOOLS

A major upgrade to the University’s email system, coming in May 2013, will bring a wealth of new features and improvements, expanding the way Loyola faculty, staff, and students communicate with each other and the outside world.

With the upgrade, Loyola will be moving from GroupWise to Microsoft Exchange. The change in platforms will position Loyola to take advantage of anytime, anywhere communication and provide for more collaborative interactions via email, messaging, conferencing, and other tools. The migration will bring significant enhancements for both desktop users and those on mobile devices and tablets.

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS?

Microsoft Exchange will offer the same kinds of indispensable email and calendar tools currently provided via GroupWise. Our deployment will also include:

- **Streamlined access from any device**: Access your Loyola e-mail and calendar anytime, anywhere, on any device.
- **Expanded calendar features**: Share calendars with colleagues outside Loyola, and make use of more sophisticated editing and scheduling features.
- **Integrated instant messaging, voice mail, and conferencing capabilities**: Listen to voicemail messages through your e-mail inbox; access e-mail and calendar options with voice commands on your phone; and host audio, video, and web conferences with anyone, inside or outside Loyola.
- **Increased storage capacity**: Expanded storage capacity for files and attachments.
- **More seamless integration within the Microsoft Office suite and within the cloud**: Consistent formatting features mean e-mail messages will look the way you want them to.

For more information, see the [Benefits](#) page.

WHO IS AFFECTED?

The migration to Microsoft Exchange will affect all Loyolans – faculty, staff, and students – though there will be some differences in the way services and software are delivered. Faculty and staff will make use of Microsoft Outlook for email and calendaring, along with other communication tools, and be hosted through on-campus servers. Student tools will be delivered through the cloud (i.e., through the Internet) using a program called Microsoft Office 365.

Loyola Moving To Microsoft Exchange

About Microsoft Exchange
About Microsoft Lync
About Microsoft Office 365
About Microsoft Outlook
Benefits
Documentation and Training
FAQS
How to Prepare
Schedule and Statistics