IT Council Minutes

Wednesday, June 11, 2014

President's Conference Room

Martha Potvin	Ross Snider	*Others in Attendance:*
Terry Leist	Eric Wold	*Erica Jansma*
Renee Reijo Pera	Adam Edelman	*Signe Lahren*
Robert Marley	Anne Milkovich	*Desirae Lindquist*
Brett Gunnink	Jerry Sheehan	

I. Call to Order

II. Announcements

III. Approval of minutes for Wednesday, May 14, 2014

MINUTES APPROVED

IV. Discussions

A. Update on Enterprise prioritization of ERP projects

Martha Potvin gave an update to the Bozeman IT Council on the results of the Enterprise IT Council ERP project rankings. Council reviewed the prioritization results for each size category. The final scores are results of both rankings and discussion amongst the Enterprise IT Council.

1. For the XL projects, the top two projects (EDM and CRM) are more closely aligned than the chart reflects; in discussion all campuses recognized their importance in improving efficiency. CRM came out slightly ahead as it was recognized as a priority by every campus. The Front End to Banner project replaced Identity Management in the top three since it is important to all campuses.

2. For the Large projects, the top three priorities were decided as Scholarship Tracking, Clean Addressing, and Electronic Add/Drop, in that order.

3. For the Medium projects, the top three priorities were decided as Director Data, Noncredit Online Registration Tool, and Course Evaluation Request Automation, in that order.

4. The Application Interface Tool (Axiom) was moved from Medium to Small, as it is almost Operational. The project is already underway in Great Falls, Billings and Bozeman. A more detailed update on the status of the project in Great Falls will determine whether the project should be moved to Operational.

5. The Rec Fitness Management Software project has progressed into the Acquisition stage, without formal approval because: 1) the PMO has not yet formally set in place stage gates for projects, where a project needs approval to move to the next stage once the previous is completed, and 2) the project has very low impact on central IT resources and is mission-

critical to Rec Fitness so was not held up for formal stage-gating. Most of the work is being done by Matt Bunko and Rec Fitness themselves as they are on a strict deadline to get the contract ready. If the project required more work, it would not have been allowed to continue without further assessment.

6. Not enough information is known about the projects in the Unknown category to place them in the prioritization list. It was suggested that the Council get a report from David Singel on the Classroom Scheduling and Forecasting project before moving forward.

7. In the Operational bucket, it was noted that another TAACCCT grant project has come up. The project team is asking for PMO assistance, since Great Falls is losing their purchasing agent. It is undetermined how much IT resource this would require and a decision has not yet been made.

B. Assessing Available Resources

The IT Center will develop an assessment of available resources now that the projects have been prioritized and a plan that lays out project timelines for the coming year. Through time tracking, we'll compare where we are to where we projected ourselves to be on a quarterly basis. The timelines we lay out will be adjusted throughout the year based off how much time they actually take. The goal is to allocate against workload, look at resources for staffing and then move to a methodology of how to track things and make improvements. When the quarter/year is done, we will be able to show what we have done for scheduled projects, how well we planned and how we need to adjust. This process is not meant to be a perfect cover for all work that we do, there will be additional work that comes that will not be prioritized and we will address those tasks as needed.

IT is assessing available hours within the Administrative Systems Group. We will need to consider how to get work done that exceeds ASG's resources, and the costs associated with that. At this point, nothing is off the table, including other campuses taking the lead on M and S projects. The Council discussed the various ways the other campuses do and do not contribute to projects.

IT will also report back on the Operational projects with a timeline for how much longer they will take to be completed.

C. Site Licensing Updates

IT is working on overhauling the funding model, since the traditional model and technology is changing. Negotiations with our two main site licenses, Adobe and Microsoft, are in the works. The Council reviewed the Microsoft site license and discussed how much it was being used/how many were aware of its existence.

It was mentioned that Colleges tend to rely on communication between ITC and their distributed IT support staff to stay up-to-date on licensing.

We are beginning a project to gather inventory of all specialized software in academic programs that students are required to use to assess whether it is more cost effective to manage it centrally.

The Microsoft site license costs $200K annually, and the Adobe is projected at $112,000 annually. We have that price locked down for three more years, and it is uncertain what will happen after that. Student licensing is not included at this time, as we do not have the resources to centrally manage student software use.

The negotiations with Adobe will provide all faculty and staff access to Adobe Acrobat with access to the Creative Cloud limited to 20% of institutionally owned workstations. Until LANDesk is fully deployed, we cannot demonstrate how many institutional devices we have or what is installed on them. As current policy stands, anyone is allowed to install anything they want on their desktops. We have no way to determine what is being installed and what is actually being used.

D. Network Commodity Contract

The primary competing network commodities that provide access to campus are Pacific Northwest Gigapop and Internet 2. We are effectively in the process of working on the annual contract that will drop the current price of $194K by nearly $140K. While there won't be a visible change in office functions, there is a substantial gain from a performance and price standpoint.

E. Security Training

We have an opportunity to reduce our cyber-security insurance by $13K if we require and provide training of security practices for faculty and staff, the program for which would cost approximately the same amount. This means that all faculty and staff would have to comply with mandatory training. While $13K breaks even with cost of insurance verses training, it does not factor in the hours spent in training. The Council also discussed how well mandatory training would be received and if 100% compliance was possible across campus.

Council members agreed the training would be useful, and discussed various ways it could be presented outside of the mandatory option. IT Security staff will look further into the training and come back at the next meeting with a recommendation about what we should possibly do with this moving forward.

F. July Meeting

The meeting for July 9 is tentatively in place. If there are not sufficient agenda items by July 1, the meeting will be cancelled.

V. Action Items

Owner	Action	Due
Martha Potvin	Get a status update from David Singel on the Classroom Scheduling and Forecasting project	Next meeting
Jerry Sheehan	Discuss other campuses roles in completing ERP projects at next Enterprise IT Council meeting	Next meeting
Jerry Sheehan	Assess progress and provide timeline on Operational projects	Next meeting
Jerry Sheehan, Adam Edelman	Review security training models further and discuss at next BZ IT Council meeting	Next meeting

Next Meeting: TBD