



Attendees:

Area	Name	Status	Area	Name	Status
Academic Affairs	John Pelissero	In Attendance	ITS/Facilitator	Susan Malisch	In Attendance
Academic Affairs	Nancy Tuchman	In Attendance	ITS	Jim Sibenaller	In Attendance
Advancement	Jon Heintzleman	In Attendance	Student Develop.	Rob Kelly	In Attendance
Facilities	Phil Kosiba	In Attendance	UMC	Kelly Shannon	In Attendance
Finance	Bill Laird	Delegated	Guests:		
Finance	Andrea Sabitsana	Absent	ITS	Kevin Smith	In Attendance
Human Resources	Tom Kelly	Absent	ITS	Dan Vonder Heide	In Attendance

Welcome, Meeting Purpose & Agenda

The meeting commenced at 1:30 PM with a review of the agenda and introduction of guests. The minutes from the April 7th meeting were reviewed and approved as written.

Data Governance Committee & DW/BI Program Updates

Kevin gave an overview of the DW/BI program efforts to date. The hardware for the development environment is in place and the environment is being built out including the new business intelligence tool. The primary active task at this time is the DW/BI requirements meetings. The detailed schedule and list of attendees was reviewed. A considerable investment is being made to ensure that we do this right the first time, from the beginning. Adjustments have been made to shrinking the duration of the meetings as well as clarifying the desired outcomes up-front to gather the required details without wasting time. Kevin feels an appropriate balance has been reached. The major milestones of the program were also reviewed. Requirements sessions should end in June with the design for the Faculty Teaching Load following in July. This will be delivered for testing in October. Remaining components will follow, designed and delivered in an iterative manner with planned conclusion in April 2012.

The Data Governance Committee meets twice monthly with the goal to capture & define data definitions for the university. They are currently working with the CHESS tool from NCHEMS which provides a starting point of university definitions.

Architecture Review Board Update

Jim reviewed the activities of the Architecture Review Board. The core tasks of updating the technology inventory and roadmap and technology assessments continue. Currently there are 12 technology assessments committees in progress and another 10 pending/ready to start. In addition to the core tasks the sub-committee has been focused on a refresh of the enterprise architecture principles. There were originally 16 principles which have now been consolidated down to 11. An assessment matrix has also been streamlined for use when conducting technology assessments. These tools should be applied with any group assessing technology for the university. Future tasks include updating the "Current State" application diagram and loading the technology inventory of nearly 400 items into a tracking database.

Cellular Contracts & Support - Update

Dan reviewed the goals of the effort; to identify multiple carriers with a centralized contract and decentralized billing. This will include an approval process device and package recommendations and support model. A survey of other schools was conducted to research what agreements and processes are in place. Most are in a similar position to us but several have put some standards in place for their universities. Internally at LUC we found that we have just over 200 cellular accounts. Current carriers for these accounts are AT&T, Sprint/Nextel, US Cellular, Verizon & T-Mobile. An exclusive agreement is not in Loyola's best interest because we want some flexibility of services and the ability to support personal device preference. AT&T, Sprint & Verizon have been identified as the three primary carriers to focus on. All three have provided fair rate proposals based on our current and potential number of users. We are in process of refining and finalizing those agreements. The details of the sample plans, discounts and savings were reviewed. A sample of two bills from Conference Services and Athletics showed that a centralized contract could present a 5% savings. Dedicated web pages will be created to identify package recommendations, approval process, support & service expectations,



decentralized billing & administration and FAQ's. Discussions with Athletics are active to identify sponsorship opportunities. This is a collaborative efforts between Athletics, ITS and the three vendors. Next steps for the program include refining and finalizing the contracts, assisting users with a transition to the new agreement/carrier, completing the web site and completing conversation with Athletics. *Task: Dan to follow through on next steps.*

Dan also reviewed summary data regarding cellular call performance. Specifically, the survey conducted in 2008 was repeated and results compared to 2011. The improvements for each vendor were significant for various reasons including removal of Damen Hall and line of site to the cell tower above Hamilton's along with normal cell technology improvements. Despite this, there are still a few spots on campus that have poor signal strength.

BCDR Program - Business Impact Analysis

Dan informed the group regarding the current state of our BCDR efforts and activities. Work continues to improve the built in infrastructure redundancy between the LSC & WTC campuses and will be enhanced with the remediation or move planned for the WTC data center. We also have a reciprocal agreement for failover and redundancy of website and DNS services with Boston College; this project is underway and not yet complete.

Currently we are working with CDW to identify the business/functional recovery time requirements for applications. The next step in the process is to discuss with functional areas what their requirements are. The approach is to have one hour working sessions based on a questionnaire to identify which applications are critical to the function of the university. Critical application needs can then be compared to the time to recover. Meetings are tentatively scheduled for end of July. *Task: Dan to create a summary of what is expected from the meetings, timing and the desired participation from departments.*

Project Portfolio Prioritization

Susan and Jim reviewed the ITS project portfolio numbers. The FY11 Q3-Q4 portfolio grew to 243, with 108 items being forecasted as completed. The current Plan of Record for ITS FY12 Q1-Q2 is comprised of 152 projects, the highest ever. The corresponding effort of the projects within this period's portfolio is 10% less than the previous. The portfolio distribution across the five strategic categories and within the priority breakdown remains consistent and within normal changes of < 10%. Susan noted a couple of items regarding the prioritization process. The Novell to Microsoft migration is a Mandatory but really should be an A. The A priority project list was reviewed and several B priority projects were highlighted including; 72-Drop to Zero Hours, 73-Financial Aid Packaging, 105-Loyola Mobile-GPS Coordinates Send & 113-RMS Check In & Check-Out. *Task: ITESC members to submit their prioritization results by June 23rd. Susan/Jim to give an overview of the prioritization process to Kelly & Andrea.*

Meeting Wrap-Up

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 pm. The next meeting is scheduled for July 7th.