



Attendees:

Area	Name	Status	Area	Name	Status
Academic Affairs	John Pelissero	Absent	ITS/Facilitator	Susan Malisch	In Attendance
Academic Affairs	Nancy Tuchman	In Attendance	ITS	Jim Sibenaller	In Attendance
Academic Affairs	Paul Gabriel	In Attendance	Student Develop.	Rob Kelly	In Attendance
Advancement	Jon Heintzelman	In Attendance	UMC	Kelly Shannon	In Attendance
Facilities	Kana Wibbenmeyer	Absent	Guests:		
Finance	Bill Laird	Delegated	Academic Affairs	Carol Scheidenhelm	In Attendance
Finance	Andrea Sabitsana	In Attendance	ITS	Ana Prokic-Kostic	In Attendance
Human Resources	Tom Kelly	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 Sep 22nd meeting were reviewed and approved as written.

Academic Technology Committee Update

The ATC has met twice since the semester began after taking a hiatus during the summer due to faculty being unavailable. Carol noted four major efforts which are of interest.

Alternative LMS – The pilot has been running smoothly. Several faculty members provided direct feedback on Moodle/Sakai. They will continue to monitor the pilot and review feedback.

Portable Devices – Investigating the benefits and drawbacks of various new mobile devices (ipads & mobi) and mobile learning applications.

eBooks – Discussions with students are being held to see how they feel about ebooks. Challenges with the publishers regarding availability and costs still exist. They are also looking at ePop, which allows faculty to create content that reads like an ebook. A pilot effort is also in progress with the Rome Center.

Copyright Task Force – The membership for the group is being formed. Information regarding policy direction should be available within 6-8 months.

Off Campus Addresses

A checklist item to support the functionality of tracking offsite campus addresses exists in LOCUS and is now available for use. Currently there is about a 10% hit rate according to Kevin. An embedded URL in our email communications directing users to LOCUS will get us to 20-30% use. There are currently a total of almost 6000 entries but we have yet to expire last year’s information. Some students also put their address in the PERM address field which will need to be looked at. Going forward we are introducing a new pop-up screen asking for compliance and will hold their UPASS until students are in compliance with completing the information.

Architecture Review Board Update

Jim reviewed the current state application data relationships diagram. Over 50 modifications were made to our application data relationships over the last year. Specific to note is both the complexity and quantity of the relationships between the different technologies. Key additions were the TaskStream, Online Applications for OIP and Conflict of Interest Disclosure solutions. There are an additional 400 items in the technology inventory; however this diagram only represents major/enterprise solutions where data is exchanged. The technology roadmap and the active technology assessment committee’s (TAC’s) were also discussed. Eight TAC’s are currently researching technology changes in support of operational efficiencies and strategic improvements. An additional nine are on hold or pending status.

Technology Scorecards

The current year technology scorecards were reviewed by Susan. The scorecards are a draft and we are encouraging feedback from ITESC members and their direct reports. The six scorecards represent the major technologies and operations that are relevant to the university. As a reminder we are not rating the area, we are rating the technology and how it supports the area. Overall we are relatively stable. We continue to add new characteristics to the scorecards,



revise the health definitions, and have found that over time ITS has become harsher judges of a positive health ranking. The Student Technology scorecard is always our healthiest. And we also have added additional items to the scorecards where appropriate. A couple of highlights to note include:

Classroom Technology Improvements – A few classrooms exist where faculty have their backs to the class.

Advising & Retention – Several improvements in that area to do earlier identification.

Research Data Center – No permanent funding and support model exists, current space at capacity.

Advancement – Need to validate with Stacey whether or not the health remains a 5. Jon did not think so.

Data Warehousing & Reporting – This is a big initiative but is still being developed.

ECM – In our third year, forward progress. Version 10 is a big next step, backlog still exists.

Budget Planning – Capital process is not being supported.

Faculty Information System – Moved back due to the multitude of authoritative systems for faculty data. Tom suggested FIS produce information from the payroll transaction.

Salary Planning – Tom also commented on and that it might not be a five.

Room & Event Scheduling – Concurrence from the committee on the poor health of this item.

ePortfolio – Two new items added.

Digital Media Services – Need to improve awareness and equipment availability.

BCDR – We are not comfortable with our current data center backup at WTC, need improvements to that facility, our business process and more testing.

Security & Compliance – PCI & PII compliance tasks are operational, not advancing strategically.

Security Cameras – Assessment and improvements underway.

International and Remote Campus Support – Expanded scope of this item and have improved services/coverage but we still have a way to go.

Resource Planning – Have added some people in critical areas.

The Technology Scorecards have been active for 6 years, current improvements have been more modest as expected.

We continue to add new items to keep the scorecards relevant. *Task: ITESC members to communicate back with their areas and provide any feedback.*

Tech Fee

Ana reviewed the criteria for how costs get allocated to the technology fee. The allocation is defined by how much of the service/support/learning activity applies to students. The projected revenue for FY12 is \$2,770,000. The breakdown is 51% for service, 22% towards support, 16% for learning and 11% capital projects. Ana reviewed the three year comparison. The initial year allocation of the tech fee was difficult to plan due to its newness and various unknowns. \$1,000,000 (37%) was carried over in year one and is being used for various student based capital projects. The planning for the two subsequent years was based on gathered information from year one, input from Finance and improved planning resulting in only a 1% carryover. All were satisfied with the breakdown of the information and plan of use of the funds.

Meeting Wrap-Up

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 pm. The next meeting is scheduled for December 15th; subsequently deferred to January 26th, 2012.