Attendees:

Area	Name	Status	Area	Name	Status
Academic Affairs	Chris Wiseman	In Attendance	Student Affairs	Jane Neufeld	In Attendance
Academic Affairs	John Pelissero	In Attendance	**Guests:**		
Advancement	Jon Heintzelman	In Attendance	LUMC	Art Krumrey	In Attendance
Facilities	Phil Kosiba	In Attendance	Inst. Research	Richard Hurst	In Attendance
Finance	Bill Laird	In Attendance	ITS	Kevin Smith	In Attendance
Human Resources	Tom Kelly	In Attendance	ITS	Charlotte Pullen	In Attendance
ITS/Facilitator	Susan Malisch	In Attendance	ITS	Peter Prina	In Attendance
ITS	Jim Sibenaller	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 1st meeting were reviewed and approved as written.

Data Warehouse(DW)/Business Intelligence(BI) Recommendation
Kevin provided an overview of the project status. The strategy document is nearly complete and the project health is "green". An industry expert was used to assist with the needs analysis and interviews with 17 functional groups that included over 60 individuals. Three consistent messages were identified from the sessions: 1) the need for data definitions and governance, 2) data needs to be independently accessible and 3) an integrated authoritative source of data is needed.

Currently, Loyola has a Reporting Data Service (RDS) in place, implemented in 2004. Oracle no longer supports the service and it did not initially work when we upgraded the student system. An inexpensive and temporary work around solution was identified and implemented to meet the student system upgrade requirements. A long term solution is needed.

Rick Hurst spoke to several reports that illustrate how reports are currently put together. The Summary Funnel Report, Attrition Graduation Rates Report and Faculty Load Report were discussed. Multiple data sources, inconsistent data and verification of data are the primary concerns. Background data that is needed for the reports is difficult to summarize because it is not consistently organized. Since the data pull is new each time a substantial amount of effort is spent testing and validating each iteration of a report. A DW will eliminate these concerns. The definition of a *student, faculty member* and a *course* were also discussed as prime examples of where data definitions and governance is needed.

Kevin reviewed the future state DW environment. A primary benefit of the future approach is the development of business rules and definitions for how to pull, cleanse, identify and summarize data to populate an organized DW. The business intelligence tool will then access the DW for presentation of data (reports). The strategy for the DW/BI contains three components, data architecture (logical), technical architecture (physical) and data governance (process). Loyola already owns some of the physical elements for a DW/BI solution that are well-positioned in the industry; however, these must be re-validated against a long-term, cohesive strategy.   Critical success factors for the effort include leadership from Institutional Research, strong executive sponsorship, active engagement with existing committees (PRB & ITESC) and the creation of a data governance committee. Kevin and Rick also expressed the need for changes to some business processes and how work is accomplished. DW initiatives are longer-term projects taking five or more years.

The recommendations for the initial implementation are one of the following: Student Financial Analysis, Course Enrollment Mgmt. (e.g. Faculty Load Report), Recruiting (e.g. Summary Funnel Report), or Student Retention (e.g. Attrition Graduation Rates Report).

The initial timeline of the next steps was reviewed. Chris asked about how the technical alternatives would be decided and Bill asked about ball park costs. Kevin indicated that we don't have the complete numbers yet as it depends on the

technical evaluation and decision that takes place in the next steps. Susan noted that the current capital line item is approximately $395K and that most tools fit within a similar range although some potential incremental funding may be needed and an incremental, dedicated FTE required.

All agreed on the recommended implementation areas as priorities and to move forward with the next steps on the project. *Task: Bill asked for a long term business case, plan and budget for the project. Task: Jon and Chris also asked for validation/definition of resource requirements.*

LUMC Update
Art began with a discussion of the upgrade to Lawson. He stated that the upgrade appeared to go well and that the initial feedback was positive. They are working on securing the site with a SSL certificate for LUC and committed that it would be completed over the next several days. An internal IT audit is also in progress with Deloitte. They are considering moving to "strong passwords" across the board (except for Epic). He noted that they have a DW in place called Clarity, but it isn't very usable. He noted that they too are working on data access and business intelligence and are facing similar reporting consistency issues. Their primary focus has been to migrate to just two systems, Epic & Lawson. They recently moved scheduling and billing into Epic. There a number of integration efforts underway with Gottlieb as well although no plans to move them to Epic from their smaller, less expensive MEDITECH system at this time.

Plan of Record Review/Prioritization Assignment
Susan did a quick recap of the Plan of Record. The current plan of record started at 151 with 90 additions coming in. 89 projects were completed during the FY09-Q3-Q4 period. Additional comments were offered on notable "A" and "B" level projects to aid in prioritization. *Task: Prioritization sheets due back by June 30th.*

Bill suggested ITS pre-rank the projects to ease the challenge of reviewing and understanding so many projects. The information and ranking from the PRB and the discussions in the ITESC meeting serve to inform the members with pre-rankings and additional background on projects, however, Susan agreed to investigate additional options to aid this process that would not minimize the value provided by broader ITESC participation in prioritizing ITS resources for the university. *Task: Jim/Susan will look for adjustments to the process for December.*

AJCU-CITM Benchmarking Results
Susan distributed the benchmarking survey results; the survey was conducted in March 2009 and results shared at the AJCU-CITM meeting in May. Three topics were covered in the survey: Budget Information, Shared Services, Top 10 Issues for IT. Three opportunities will be explored by the AJCU CITM Shared Services Workgroup in the coming year; learning management system hosting, disaster recovery/hot sites and portfolio/project management systems in an effort to look for cost efficiencies across the AJCU institutions. Piggyback agreements that offer built-in pricing reductions for future purchases of DocFinity and Utimaco to other AJCU schools were negotiated by Loyola University Chicago this year, and a pricing reduction for existing AJCU customers of Blackboard's Connect product was completed as well.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 PM.