



**Attendees:**

Area	Name	Status	Area	Name	Status
Academic Affairs	John Pelissero	In Attendance	Operations/HR	Tom Kelly	In Attendance
Academic Affairs	David Prasse	In Attendance	ITS/Facilitator	Susan Malisch	In Attendance
Advancement	Jon Heintzleman	In Attendance	ITS	Jim Sibenaller	In Attendance
Facilities	Kana Wibbenmeyer	Absent	Student Develop.	Rob Kelly	Absent
Finance	Bill Laird	In Attendance	UMC	Kelly Shannon	Absent
Finance	Andrea Sabitsana	In Attendance			

**Guests in Attendance:** Tom Catania, Cass Coughlin, Larry Fortuna, Rick Hurst, Pauline McKinney, Enrique Olmo Charlotte Pullen, Ann Simmons, Kevin Smith, Conrad Vanek, Dan Vonder Heide

**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 December 11<sup>th</sup> meeting were reviewed and approved as written.

**Data Warehouse/Business Intelligence Program Review**

The delivery process and history of the DWBI effort was reviewed. The demos to be shown are a work in progress; many new requirements are being discovered as the team continues to analyze the initial data that has been loaded.

**Demo 1: Discount Rate**

Larry shared exciting new developments about the data warehouse progress regarding the discount rate. A number of reports/views were created with the Tableau tool. New definitions were created to help "tell the story" of discount rates including reporting and examples of data. The Tableau application will allow the drill down capabilities needed to understand the data fully. The tool can also easily add fields to the views via drag & drop capability. The following was demoed: Pell Grant students in state versus out of state, discount rates over time, "on the fly" analysis, hierarchies, and drill-in/down capabilities. The information in the data warehouse in combination with the Tableau tool is making it much easier to complete the analysis versus manual methods used in the past.

**Demo 2: Housing**

Rick and Cass demoed the Info Assist tool and information available via the data warehouse for housing. The drop down and filter capability available allowed for easy modification to the resulting information display. A drill down capability also exists within the tool. The occupancy summary report view was viewed. Data is coming from multiple systems directly (i.e. Slate, RMS & LOCUS). This particular view is refreshed weekly so that it is in sync with the source systems reporting. This centralized approach helps sync up and eliminate some of the timing issues with the previous manually reporting. This tool is less complex and would be available as an alternative to Tableau.

The go forward approach and current status was reviewed next. Core modules in-process include additional views for Financial Aid, Admissions, Faculty Instructional Activities, Student Financials, Campus Community and Student Records. Additional data can be added if defined. The group anticipates additional information being added to the data warehouse so that tools like Tableau and Info-Assist can become commonplace for university academic and financial analysis.

**Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Update**

Susan began the update with explaining the three related university efforts that are linked; emergency response, business continuity and disaster recovery. The program setup was reviewed in detail by Dan including specific definitions for disaster recovery (DR) and business continuity (BC). ITS has primary responsibility for the DR plans. DR priorities are based on agreed upon Recovery Time Objectives and Recovery Point Objectives established by the institution; the DR plan for technology is based on these needs. Business Continuity is primarily determined by Academic Affairs and other administrative units to develop alternative plans for continuing operations and teaching and learning for faculty and students in the event of an outage. Campus procedures for Emergency Response initiatives need to be coordinated with these efforts but may also operate independently from any BC or DR requirement. A program status was reviewed.

*Internet Redundancy* - Failover for the LSC, WTC and the School of Nursing (HSD) is in the final installation phase that will be deployed in the event of a circuit failure in the public network.

*Lawson DR* – Currently sits in one building with tape backups and some hardware redundancy (150 ft. away). Preliminary design for migrating Lawson to LUC on new infrastructure and redundancy is in progress. The team is currently in the discovery phase to document the Lawson current-state environment. Good meetings are occurring within the functional areas, LUC ITS, LUHS staff and Lawson. The goal is to migrate in the next 18 months, preferably in FY14 Feb-May or FY15 Feb-May (functionally the best time).

*Luc.edu Recovery* – Primary infrastructure is at LSC, with some components replicated locally. If we lose LSC entirely, it will fail over to WTC, manually at this point. If we lost both we would use a server that is reserved at Boston College. This would not support the full luc.edu website but would allow for some communication. The team continues to test the functionality (April timeframe).

*Email redundancy (with MS Exchange)* – Primary infrastructure is at LSC, with 3 servers replicated amongst themselves. We have the same setup at WTC in case we lost the entire LSC campus; failover would be immediate.

*Tool selection* – The group has reviewed three products to manage the BCDR planning. The short list was defined from peer institutions: *Kuali* – USF, *CPO Tracker* – Fordham & Loyola Maryland, *Bowmac* - Loyola New Orleans. The initial analysis has shown the Bowmac is not really meant to manage BCDR plans but rather to manage incidents. The other two tools manage multiple plans and provide an audit process to maintain them. Neither actually creates plans nor provides a template for plans. Each functional area would still need to create plans on their own to be placed into the tracking tool. Most likely we will end up with a blended solution of Bowmac (Loyola uses now for hazardous chemical use) and either Kuali or CPO Tracker.

*Data Center* - The WTC center is now complete. Features are similar to LSC just smaller in scale.

Over 300 applications are managed at LUC; the focus for DR planning however will be only on Loyola's "core items", specifically when looking at RTO's & RPO's.

RTO/RPO Discussion – The purpose of the exercise was to determine the gaps for what infrastructure is needed in order to meet the recovery times to support the three goals of BCDR planning: to teach, to communicate and to make and receive payments. Time of year will likely influence the order in which systems are brought back up. There is also a need to build redundancy towards particular levels of recovery and scenarios. Relationships with various support services also need to be part of the plan (i.e. Northern Trust, US Bank, PNC, TIA CREF/Fidelity etc.). *Task: Determine departmental level relationships/services in place as part of the DR planning.* SAS70 reports should be documented as part of the program as well. The ITESC agreed we should build a plan of what it would cost to recover, meeting the RTO/RPO needs, given the scenarios so that appropriate budgets can be determined. All items on the list need to be reviewed in detail in order to get a better understanding of how they relate to each other in order to identify any dependencies for shared internal services (databases & servers). For outsourced/cloud items we need to review our contract's SLA's and recovery plans. Timeline and plan was reviewed and agreed upon. *Task: Report status/results to the Cabinet and to the Deans.*

The following changes were identified regarding the RTO/RPO scoring results:

- Lawson, the 3 items need to be combined into one.
- Kronos, was not on the list and should be inserted just under the Lawson item.
- Determine if Crestron should be removed, are classrooms self-sufficient?
- Combine Micros with CBORD.

### Change Management Process

A summary of change metrics was discussed. Change requests are increasingly moving away from the urgent and emergency category and into the non-emergency category. Over the last 5 years the movement towards more normal processing of change requests shows a 15% improvement.

### Meeting Wrap-Up

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 pm. The next meeting is scheduled for April 25<sup>th</sup>.