



Attendees:

Area	Name	Status	Area	Name	Status
Academic Affairs	John Frendreis	In Attendance	Human Resources	Tom Kelly	In Attendance
Academic Affairs	John Pelissero	In Attendance	ITS/Facilitator	Susan Malisch	In Attendance
Advancement	Jon Heintzelman	In Attendance	ITS	Jim Sibenaller	In Attendance
Facilities	Phil Kosiba	In Attendance	Student Affairs	Fr. Richard Salmi	Absent
Finance	Bill Laird	In Attendance	Learning Tech.	Carol Scheidenhelm	In Attendance

Minutes:

Welcome & Meeting Purpose

The meeting commenced at 1:00 PM. The minutes were reviewed. An open item in question regarding adding learning management as an addition to the LUMC scorecard was modified to be a discussion point only versus scorecard addition. March 5th, 2007 meeting minutes were approved as modified.

PIRG Policy Review

Jim briefly reviewed the PIRG activities to date and discussed the growing number of PII breaches and vulnerabilities in 2007 specifically noting higher-education incidents. The proposed policies were reviewed in detail with the following enhancements to be considered and comments noted.

Data Classification – Add an appendix with brief definitions of the regulations and link to a corresponding web-site for details. Verify that the Freedom of Information Act has relevance and should be listed. UMC is not the proper department to determine the Public data classification. Add Institutional Research and President’s Cabinet instead.

Physical Security of Loyola Protected/Sensitive Data – Modify the paragraph on cleaning staff to be a variant of a clean desk policy stating a “best of your ability” approach to properly secure PII information when leaving the area. Add a “if practical” type of statement for cleaning during business hours.

Electronic Security of Loyola Protected/Sensitive Data – Add a link to the encryption standards and password standards referenced. *Task: Research the encryption/security within GroupWise and report back to the committee regarding the secure protection of emails.*

Loyola Protected/Sensitive Data Identification – No changes.

Disposal of Loyola Protected/Sensitive Data – Clarify the procedures for where to send devices for secure deletion or disposal. Add additional information in the appendix regarding the bonded shredding service available on campus.

Loyola Encryption Policy – Clearly identify the need to send passwords in separate emails when sending password protected files. *Task: 1) Verify that the estimate of 400 licenses is sufficient for proper risk reduction. Suggestion to use the Sullivan Center as a test. 2) Verify that the proper protection language regarding liability is built into our vendor contracts. 3) Ensure that proper training is planned for the encryption tool rollout. 4) Ensure the new encryption product is scalable towards a self-service model.*

Personal Information Security Compliance Review Protocol – Re-word the form regarding certifying compliance “to the best of their ability...”. Create a parallel compliance form that can be completed by each employee and made part of their personnel file; Review and sign each year; Add to the compliance lead’s checklist.

Data Breach Response Protocol – No changes.

General Comments Applicable to All Policies - Ensure that the appropriate “penalty clause” for non-compliance referring to disciplinary action up to and including termination, etc. exists in each. Add language to each policy regarding where to send questions. *Task: 1) Ensure that the awareness and training sessions discuss the requirements/effort required for the compliance lead role. 2) Verify that our processes are not too labor intense. 3) Investigate the possibility of outsourcing the training.*

The group approved the policies with the adjustments stated. *Task: Jim to update policies and send to General Counsel.*

John F. departed due to a prior commitment at about 1:55 PM.

ATC Blackboard Course Archive Policy

Carol Scheidenhelm reviewed the committee’s discussions regarding proposed policies for archiving course data. The

primary concern is increased cost of space. She reviewed graphically the impact of each option. Three options were put forth. Bill asked about the cost per gigabyte of storage. Susan responded that Blackboard informed us that we were using far more space than we were currently paying for. We are awaiting revised pricing for our current usage. The committee recommended by majority vote to apply a *1 yr plus 1 semester* approach to be applied twice yearly. Carol and John P question this timeframe but agreed to accept the ATC's recommendation and revisit at a later date. The recommended approach was approved by the ITESC providing validated costs were presented. *Task: John P. and Susan to validate the costs of the proposal and communicate back to the ITESC.*

FY08 Round 2 Budget Update

Susan reviewed the Round 2 submissions from ITS in detail. She noted that Intercampus Video Conferencing and Disk Encryption items will be funded out of FY07 budget dollars if approved. This would result in a reduction > \$100K. Susan also noted that recent Blackboard increases (true-up due to increased usage) will result in an increase of approximately \$70K, but that the number had not been finalized. We will revisit our commitment to Blackboard as the long-term CMS for Loyola in FY08 and the costs and timing of bringing the application in-house. *Task: Validate the costs of the BlackBoard increase/true-up and review the timing of moving the application to an in-house support model.*

Phil departed due to a prior commitment at about 2:35 PM.

SIS Reporting

John P. and Susan reviewed the two layer SIS Reporting Roadmap (build vs. buy approach) highlighting the benefits of purchasing a solution versus building one, including role-based security, drill-down capabilities, single sign-on, dashboards, and version support. Pre-built solutions are offered by CIBER and Oracle and a placeholder of \$400K (Oracle's OBIEE & FUSION product) was in the ITS Round 2 budget request for FY08. John shared examples of the two solutions. CIBER's offerings focus on IPEDS reporting; Oracle's dashboards report on at-risk students and other pipelines. Both solutions are not inexpensive; annual maintenance would be about \$70K. John believes this purchase would be extremely valuable to institutional decision-making. Jon asked if this would help with retention data and analysis. John P. said absolutely yes, the information will provide for retention analysis as well as a number of other key metrics. The group had general consensus to move forward with the request.

LUMC Follow-Up

Susan reviewed the follow-up items from LUMC.

Lawson Upgrade – Susan noted that the hardware upgrade was complete and that the software upgrade would be in two phases. Tom thought a possible February/March timeframe had been discussed.

LUMC/LUC SIS Data Integration – All agreed it was not plausible to pursue development of an interface or feed from the LUMC system to the LUC student system at this time and that a full process review and proper solution be addressed at a later date. *Task: Susan to communicate the decision to Art.*

New Scorecard Items - Three scorecard items are to be added, website interoperability, LMS and BSR. *Task: Susan to get an update on the new items and a refreshed scorecard from Art.*

Intercampus Video Conferencing – The older screens have been replaced and new cameras are being piloted. The equipment will be available for the May 23rd Campaign Meeting for a broader review and endorsement of the technology.

SSOM BCDR - The conversations have not moved forward.

Id Synchronization Project - Tom asked about the id synchronization project between LUMC and LUC. Initial discussions have occurred but an overall strategy and solution is still under investigation.

Student Equipment Recommendations

Susan briefly reviewed the information regarding how to communicate with students and parents regarding recommended equipment. Fr. Garanzini had asked to look into this based on questions received. A "Good, Better, Best" approach was being considered, leveraging vendor relationships with Dell. If successful, Apple could follow. Samples of similar programs at other institutions were shown.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:31 PM.