

Attendees:

Area	Name	Status	Area	Name	Status
Academic Affairs	Chris Wiseman	Absent	Human Resources	Tom Kelly	Absent
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	In Attendance
Finance	Bill Laird	In Attendance			

Minutes:

Welcome, Meeting Purpose & Agenda

The meeting commenced at 1:12 PM. The meeting marks the 1 year anniversary of the installation of the ITESC. As part of the review discussion Fr. Salmi asked about the Connect Ed project and commitment to move forward. Susan confirmed that the project was moving forward and that we were currently working on the contract. The minutes from the 10/19 meeting were approved as written. Jon joined the meeting at 2:02 pm due to a scheduling conflict.

EDUCAUSE 2007 Top IT Issues

Susan reviewed the Educause 2007 top IT issues report. The full 2007 article was also distributed for reference. The top 10 issues survey respondents identified in answer to what most "Needs to be Resolved for the Institution's Strategic Success". Correlations to work being done at Loyola were noted on the slide and highlighted in blue. Funding of IT has been consistently at the top of the concerns since 2003. It was #1 in 2007. Bill asked if it specifically related to capital needs. Susan believes it is a combination of capital and operational needs. Bill asked about the availability of grant monies and if there were any opportunities for IT to participate. Susan responded that regular meetings with the grant writer in Phil Hale's office had not yielded any applicable opportunities to date, but that we are interested in investigating new venues when they are identified.

Article Highlights Pg 16, Chronicle of Higher Education - non IT trends that will influence us: shared services, collaboration, group contracts (potential opportunities for AJCU). Pg 18, Sloan Consortium - growth in on-line students, mostly undergraduates. Given the hedgehog statement regarding being great at undergraduate education – How does/could this effect us? John discussed the "Law School On-line" program in cooperation with Concord University. It may be possible to use this as a baseline for other pilots. Bill added that it could help with continuing education as well. Gartner's Top 10 – This is another best practice we rely on but this list is higher level than Educause. Areas of "incremental opportunity" at Loyola were shown on the slide.

2007 LUC Technology Scorecard

The premise for the scorecards was reviewed noting the alignment to the ITS Rings of Excellence, ITS underlying governance/process and the alignment to LUC's mission and goals. The health ratings are still somewhat subjective and most of the items are not metric based as of yet. The intent is to get a sense of where we are, what we need to work on and drive towards more sophisticated measurements where appropriate. Scorecard highlights/changes are noted below.

Academic and Faculty Support

Labs – A definition was created for John to review. There has been progress on unsupported labs. Susan would initially rate it lime. It was suggested that this scorecard go in front of the ATC for review. All were in agreement. *Task: Susan will work with a multi-faced group including folks like Patrick Boyle/Lisa Kerr per John's suggestion.*

Administrative Technology

It was noted that registration was moving backward in regards to health. There is currently no enterprise approach and varying processes. John questioned this as nothing had changed from his perspective except for SSOM. Susan said the item covered the Law School, Rome & SSOM. John suggested that maybe we need to separate Registration from Records for this measurement. *Task: Susan to take this concern to Kevin Smith & Clare Korinek to further discuss the health measurement.*

Positive movements on credit card and content management were noted. Maxxess was added as it was identified as a critical system that was not previously identified. *Task: Susan to create the health definitions for this item working closely with Phil Kosiba.*

Student Technology

A row for Emergency Notification System was added. Other minor structural changes were made. Susan asked about not having a student advisory group and if this was a concern. As an example, she talked about the twice yearly IT focus group and that attendance was difficult to determine. Fr. Salmi said that it didn't seem like a bad idea and to discuss it with Scott Harris and the Unified Student Government Association. He suggested it might be a good time as students are looking to drive change and have input on the future of teaching and education at LUC. *Task: Susan to contact Scott Harris regarding student involvement.*

A gap was identified as to how to communicate with the Deans. Susan asked John about what input they should have. He acknowledged that it was important to share this information. Fr. Salmi also suggested maybe IT should be a guest at Deans Council. *Task: Susan to look into the option of ITS attending the Deans Council meetings.*

Infrastructure

The scorecard has been consolidated down to 1 page. Susan noted changes to security & compliance and that we now have more information than last year but have a program established to address the relatively poor health of the item.

Continuous Service

Substantial progress was noted. Positive movements were shown on Technology Service & Support, Project Management and Research. Remote access moved back slightly due to our inability to easily and securely access files. Also a general lack of ability to collaborate with outside institutions and groups was discussed.

Governance & Funding

A couple of items were consolidated on the scorecard (refresh combined with procurement). Several of the decision making and collaborative type items showed significant progress as highlighted by the bold arrows.

John asked a general question about students using instant messaging for GroupWise (GW) and that he thought students were unaware of the tool. Susan said she didn't think we had done a good job at promoting it and that she just learned that it wasn't part of the standard desktop image but that it soon would be. The limitation is that GW is for internal use only (must be on the network) so it may have limited appeal to students. She thought it may be beneficial for something like on-line office hours. John also brought up the initial use of pod-casting and that the demand would likely grow. He understood that the preferred method was to push out content via Serena Collage. He asked if instructional pod-casts could be promoted through BlackBoard or a better media distribution device. Susan said she was unaware that this was the approach and discussed recent conversations with Apple and that we should revisit. She also commented on the classroom capture technology being built into classrooms in the Information Commons. Simple click and publish methods are to be available in these new classrooms. *Task: Susan to follow-up with Bruce Montes and Carol Scheidenhelm regarding pod-casting needs and options.*

FY08, Q1-Q2 Plan of Record Review

Susan reviewed the major initiatives, highlighting completed items within the ITS Rings of Excellence. It was noted that Items without checkmarks would roll-over into the next Plan Of Record (POR). As of 11/15/07, 51 projects have been completed, 92 projects are remaining open. These are in progress and/or scheduled as part of the current POR. 45 new projects have come in and will need to be reviewed. A summary was provided via the pie charts and the detail is contained within the POR spreadsheets. The ITESC will re-prioritize "A-level" projects in December based on the initial prioritizations submitted by the Project Review Board (PRB). John commented that it was discussed within the PRB that they and the ITESC should only be prioritizing those items that aren't part of the normal standard support and service work (maintenance items). A short discussion ensued regarding estimating capacity and balancing the ITS services versus new efforts/projects. We will also move items to M (mandatory) to further minimize the number of projects the ITESC is ranking. Jim commented on the new column for project grouping to cluster related or dependent projects so they can receive a single priority rating as a group. *Task: Move mandatory items to the top of the ranking spreadsheet for sorting purposes and ease in identification.*

The meeting was adjourned at 2:56 PM.