



Attendees:

Area	Name	Status	Area	Name	Status
Academic Affairs	John Pelissero	In Attendance	ITS	Jim Sibenaller	In Attendance
Academic Affairs	Nancy Tuchman	Absent	Student Develop.	Rob Kelly	Delegated
Academic Affairs	Paul Gabriel	Absent	UMC	Kelly Shannon	In Attendance
Advancement	Jon Heintzelman	In Attendance	Guests:		
Facilities	Kana Wibbenmeyer	In Attendance	Enrollment Mgmt.	Paul Roberts	In Attendance
Finance	Bill Laird	Delegated	Enrollment Mgmt.	Tim Heuer	In Attendance
Finance	Andrea Sabitsana	In Attendance	Student Develop.	Jane Neufeld	In Attendance
Operations/HR	Tom Kelly	In Attendance	Student Develop.	Irina Greenwald	In Attendance
ITS/Facilitator	Susan Malisch	In Attendance	ITS	Dan Vonder Heide	In Attendance

Welcome, Meeting Purpose & Agenda

The meeting commenced at 1:35 PM with a review of the agenda and introduction of guests. There were no responses received to date regarding the scorecard content, Susan will route one additional time for feedback. The minutes from the Nov 10th meeting were reviewed and approved as written.

R+ Replacement

Recap - R+ was being phased out so a full search was executed to find a replacement. The results of the RFP process was that neither of the finalists, Admissions Lab & EMAS Pro were ready to fill the void left by R+, so it was decided to hold off and restart the process for another recruitment cycle. Subsequently Admissions Lab transitioned their current email solution, which Loyola uses, to their new proposed system. The system fell short of expectations and they couldn't deliver resulting in a major effect on email processing. The concern was escalated by Paul Roberts with no response, so Admissions Lab was dropped from consideration. Several Enrollment staff attended an EMAS conference. Schools were generally happy, looking to do a technology refresh. At the conference it was determined that we were/are far advanced in how we approach enrollment from other users.

Current State – A new product was identified via the R+ user group/listserv – SLATE from Technolutions. After an initial sales demo and review, Technolutions was invited to respond to the RFP. During that time EMAS also provided an update on their software and processes. The Enrollment Dept was very impressed with the functionality of SLATE and found it a match to existing processing. In addition they had outstanding references (Xavier & Clark), lower costs, and is web/cloud based (software as a service). EMAS failed to move their software forward and didn't address our concerns raised during the first round of assessments. The recommendation for the Replacement of R+ is the SLATE product. Next Steps would be to engage in contract negotiation, develop the project plan and begin the implementation including the extensive integration/interface work. Susan noted that this is a significant effort and that the selection project within the portfolio would subsequently move to implementation. The costs are \$150K for 2 instances, UGRAD & GPEM, and include a possible elimination of Time Trade and the online application. There is also a potential to save on bulk email. We also could consider "front end document loading" but this is yet to be determined. The ideal timing is to use the new system for the undergraduate class of Fall 2013, so we would need it live by end of summer. If we miss that goal, the backup plan is to put GPEM live first. All were in agreement.

Student Development Tech Fee Funding Request

For student activity registrations we have been using Rec-Trac for about 5 years and are looking to upgrade to WebTrac. Various departments assisted with the analysis. The upgraded tool will allow registration and search capabilities on the web, including on-line for classes, equipment renting, club sports, and intramurals. It can also be used as a marketing tool. It will process credit cards via Touchnet and link to the University calendar, expedite registration processes and to gather required information. They are ready to do a final demo to confirm the configuration, 8 weeks to prepare for implementation, 3 days to install. The goal is to be ready for Fall 2012. Susan mentioned we need to consider this within our prioritization. The request is that the Tech Fee absorbs the \$16,830 one time cost and \$2238 ongoing maintenance. Consensus was to move forward and fund the purchase from the Tech Fee.



Security Camera Update

Dan gave an overview of the infrastructure and solicited feedback. We currently have 6 servers supporting 560 cameras, two SANs or disk storage arrays, one at each campus. Our total capacity is 70TB which supports 14 days of camera footage, 1/2 of institutional capacity. We have two solutions in place, DVR (80 cameras) & Milestone. There is PC access for some people to access Milestone cameras. We also have over 10 different camera types of various ages.

The Good – Servers are upgraded and storage added increasing our frames per second. We have negotiated a new PMA, upgraded Milestone, LDAP authenticate and now have a single inventory of cameras (not really too different from other schools).

The Bad – 26% of cameras do not work for various reasons (140+). They are analyzing them one at a time. We have 77 cameras on "DVR" with a goal to move them into Milestone long term. We need a Governance policy, improved processes, standard placement definitions, a funding source & refresh program. We also have limited backend infrastructure and "Epic Fail" cameras (poor placement of cameras), and need full footage testing of each camera as random testing had varied success.

The Ugly – The average cost of a replacement camera is \$3388. We have two requests pending, Res Life & LUMA totaling \$535K. We also have an aging camera environment with no refresh established.

Next Steps – We will evaluate each camera/location including where cameras are missing, fix non-working cameras, review & implementation of policy, explore Milestone capabilities, and address pending capital requests.

Future Considerations – These include emergency phone use, DSI at HSD, Integration with MAXxes, Risk Mgmt & General Counsel involvement.

The Camera Inventory Review Group also needs to be defined, potential members include: - Tom Kelly, Bob Fine, Rob Kelly, Bill Sherry and an additional person from Res Life in addition to ITS members. Dan is to make a final recommendation to Tom/Susan. *Task: Finalize membership of Camera Inventory Review Group.* Bill asked about having an expert review the camera placements. Dan said they had brought in a security consultant for LUMA for \$38K with no real value. They now have found a neutral vendor, Mike Sherr from Renaissance. He looked at LUMA and came up with better and more practical solutions. Tom mentioned we have several proposals from firms – costs at \$80-\$90K. We still need to do a validity check once we validate our inventory. *Task: ITESC members to communicate back there perspective on the project.*

BCDR/BIA Status

Initiatives underway include a business impact analysis, update to business continuity plans, an environmental assessment and updates to disaster recovery plans. Dan will come back at a future meeting to provide details.

Project Portfolio Prioritization Results

The prioritization list was reviewed. There are quite a few XL initiatives towards the top which are mostly programs and that the entire program will be completed in one period. Susan highlighted the LUHS/LUC/HSD program is still being built out and the scope and priorities within are not yet defined. IL Articulation Initiative – ITS is looking for direction on the priority giving the differences in understanding from an Enrollment Mgmt and Reg & Rec perspective. John said that he feels it belongs within the top 10 and that he would resolve any conflicts. *Task: Need to validate project sponsorship and scope.* The R+ replacement effort will move from selection to implementation and will remain on the list. Mobile has moved down/off but is still moving along. ePortfolio is operational but we are still working on improving the automation of enrollment and with the vendor on several product issues. Housing Exemption was a late add and was not on our radar screen at the time of the prioritization. It is critical and being worked on. Other write-ins were all B projects that were written in and we are trying to move up and continue to work on.

ITS currently has 8 openings and 8 people with less than 1 year of service. The technology market is very active and people are moving. ITS is paying close attention to this and asks that you let them know if you are not being serviced appropriately. *Task: ITESC members to communicate any changes in service or service needs.*

LUHS/LUC/HSD Program Status

A program is being established to coordinate and govern the service based IT initiatives related to the sale of the medical center and ongoing operations of the Health Sciences Division. We have brought on a program manager consultant to assist with the coordination and management of the program. ID provisioning is one of the first and most complex items



we are working on. Analysis is quite difficult and we need to ensure we do not effect day to day operations. The Program Manager, Ann Simmons, is already active and conducting interviews/research on the various portions of the program.

Meeting Wrap-Up

Susan solicited the group for any particular systems or applications members wanted an update on. *Task: ITESC members to communicate any agenda topics.* The meeting adjourned at 3:25 pm. The next meeting is scheduled for March 8th.