



Attendees:

Area	Name	Status	Area	Name	Status
Academic Affairs	Chris Wiseman	In Attendance	Student Affairs	Fr. Richard Salmi	Absent
Academic Affairs	John Pelissero	In Attendance	Academic Affairs	Carol Scheidenhelm	In Attendance
Advancement	Jon Heintzelman	In Attendance	Financial Services	Kathleen Steinfels	In Attendance
Facilities	Phil Kosiba	In Attendance	Financial Services	Tim McGuriman	In Attendance
Finance	Bill Laird	Absent	ITS	Bruce Montes	In Attendance
Human Resources	Tom Kelly	In Attendance	ITS	Kevin Smith	In Attendance
ITS/Facilitator	Susan Malisch	In Attendance	ITS	Leilani Lauger	In Attendance
ITS	Jim Sibenaller	In Attendance	UMC	John Drevs	In Attendance

Welcome, Meeting Purpose & Agenda

The meeting commenced at 1:35 PM with a review of the agenda and introduction of guests. The minutes from the January 8th meeting were reviewed and approved as written.

igNation/iTunes/Podcasting Strategy

Bruce introduced the topic of rich media which includes wiki's, blogs and podcasts. He reviewed uses of Blackboard, igNation, and the Web followed by an information session on iTunes University or iTunes-U. There are three basic service options today: 1) Private: Blackboard, for faculty use, 2) Semiprivate: igNation, can set specific audiences or public access and 3) Public: Loyola's web presence via our CMS tool. Usage of igNation is somewhat seasonal. They receive approximately 5-10 submissions/wk, mostly video. The usage breakdown is 50% students, 25% faculty and 25% staff. Marketing tries to encourage usage via contests, etc. Bruce added that currently no archiving is occurring on any of the submissions; this will need to be addressed in the future. Tom asked why they use igNation and not Blackboard. Carol believes it is because the videos are too big. Bruce mentioned that you can add a link from Blackboard to igNation. John asked about how long it takes for a professor to upload a video or podcast; the form says 1-3 days. Same day is a normal response time but it is just a matter of when they get to it. One of the bigger problems is professors who submit lengthy videos. Optimization of the video before it is posted adds to the timeline. Academic Affairs expressed concern with this schedule in the timeliness of getting information to students for their next class especially on a Mon-Wed-Fri type class schedule. It was noted that Blog postings are immediate – no delays.

Bruce walked through an explanation of iTunes-U in that it is similar to igNation and is basically an audio/video player. Apple offers iTunes-U to universities at low/no cost to be able to store content in a easily consumable format and make it available to students. This places the students closer to the iTunes store. Benefits include integration with personal devices, mixing of public and private (or both) and that it can be Loyola branded. Carol added that with iTunes-U, faculty have more control and can upload immediately. You would create a parallel "course" in iTunes-U to match up with Blackboard. Many AJCU schools and large research universities are current users of iTunes-U. Some have public or private offerings but not many are mixing. (The University of Wisconsin is a big user but in a private sense only. Conversely, Northwestern has a huge public presence.) To move forward, no real hard monies are needed. A signed agreement with Apple, some internal resources, some design work and interfaces to Blackboard and igNation would be required. Some schools have already built interfaces to Blackboard (building blocks) that are available for re-use. It also does not require the Blackboard Community System to function. Carol believes there is strong interest on campus for such a service and academic needs are increasing outside of Blackboard. Carol also mentioned the need to manage copyright concerns and password protection on large content files. Blackboard and igNation can't handle that effectively. *Task: Bruce/Carol to look into the exposure and controls related to copyright violations regarding posting with iTunes-U.* Chris asked why we would maintain all of them. John Drevs said that we don't have a single solution that handles wikis, blogs and podcasts. iTunes-U is an enhancement to the suite we have and need. The recommendation from the ITESC was to utilize the existing workgroup to look further into iTunes-U and to create a proposal for review at an upcoming meeting. *Task: Rich Media Workgroup to create a proposal for usage of iTunes-U.*



Blackboard Transaction Server/Community System

Tim gave a brief history of the Transaction System noting that we are dealing with a very old system and there is a need and desire to replace it. There are only two primary vendors in the market that fit the complexity and needs of Loyola; Blackboard Community System & CBORD. An RFP was issued and a committee established to review the solutions available. Both companies were evaluated on 270 criteria, both business & technical. After the detailed review and scoring by committee members only a 13 point differential existed. Few real variances stood out but CBORD became a clear leader in how they handle offline reader notifications and their customer service appears better than Blackboard. Tim provided the pricing sheet and cost differential, both upfront and ongoing. Kevin reviewed the scenarios and the effects on the impact document, highlighting the integration limits and cost differences. Tim said they would recommend CBORD but understood the potential integration issues and interest with Blackboard Community System and the price difference. Carol said that they are currently determining the need for the Community System and importance of the Blackboard building blocks. The Transaction System and Community System are related decisions but independent of each other. Tim noted that the Transaction System budget is \$500K and they are able to fund the CBORD purchase. ITS has \$50K separately approved in FY10 for Community System or equivalent solution. All agreed that the Transaction System decision can be independent of the Community System decision or future uses of Blackboard. *Task: The committee is free to move forward with the CBORD purchase. Bruce and Carol will continue to evaluate Community System and bring a recommendation to a future ITESC meeting.*

Clicker Recommendation

Carol reported that the Academic Technology Committee (ATC) recommends i>clicker due to the simplicity of the software, simple design and straight forward registration process. Currently we have multiple systems, support issues, and parent complaints from requiring multiple purchases depending on the course or program. The ATC has completed several on-site trials over the last 18 months. The primary need is for multiple choice options. The cost is estimated to be somewhere between \$19 and \$29. The goal is to have one standard system we support. All agreed to accept the recommendation for i>clicker.

Security Review

Jim walked through the overview of the Personally Identifiable Information (PII) Protection project noting the delays in data received from the data stewards and difficulty they have dealing with older PC's and unwilling/busy customers. To date we are about two-thirds complete (64%). PII has been found on 34% of machines so far and we have used 80% of our encryption licenses. A high degree of follow-up has been required with the data stewards to achieve this participation level.

Going forward Leilani recommended that we address some of the training inconsistencies, reengage "line management" sponsorship/commitment and we should encrypt all devices. Additional licensing is being purchased this FY and ITS has successfully negotiated a lower cost per license at about \$9.40; this enables encryption of all assigned (non-public) devices. Tom suggested we create a peer group for data stewards to share ideas and experiences. The committee supports 100% compliance with the program for University-owned assets. *Task: Jim and Leilani will work with John to communicate with the outstanding departments and schools on the importance of this program.*

Leilani proposed a future structure the PIRG committee, the Information Security Advisory Council (ISAC). The group will have a broader focus on information security and risk management. They will also provide guidance and oversight to LUC's Information Security Program. A potential list of participants was reviewed. It was suggested that each member have an alternate so that all groups were consistently represented. All were in agreement on the concept and approved the commencement of the group. *Task: Jim and Leilani to finalize membership of the ISAC.*

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 PM.