Technology Steering Committee
March 24, 2010

Members Present: Alan Bearman, Bob Boncella, John Christensen, Wanda Hill, Richard Liedtke, David Monical, Nancy Tate (for Robin Bowen), Rusty Taylor, and Elliott Haugen.

Agenda:

1. Approval of Minutes. The Committee approved the minutes of the 2/24/2010 meeting, as distributed. The minutes will be posted on the Technology Steering Committee web site, located within the ISS site. (Copies of the pre-approved Faculty IT Advisory Council 2/24/2010 meeting minutes had also been distributed to the Committee.) Web links are provided from within the ISS web and from the Faculty Senate web site (the Council serves an advisory role to ISS and Faculty Senate.)

2. Banner Upgrade Status Report. The Committee reviewed the status report (Attachment A). Mr. Haugen responded to a question about the origin of the testing plan; he replied that it was drawn from SunGard conversion roadmaps, but the Washburn Banner 8 planning team (35 individuals) has modified the plans to match the modules and interfaces used by the University. A major Banner 8 testing process will be performed April 24-26. SunGard usually releases new versions every 18 to 24 months.

3. IT Assessment Project. Mr. Haugen indicated that he and his colleague Gwenn Weaver will be expanding the campus technology feedback process during the week of April 5. There will be two daily tracks of meetings scheduled for students, faculty, and staff. Members of the committee suggested possible groups, e.g., by School or those with similar interests. Target audiences for open forums were discussed. Mr. Haugen will prepare a draft list of groups for review by the Committee. Mary Jordan has rooms reserved in the Memorial Union and will begin scheduling session times. A draft discussion outline (Attachment B) was presented and will be provided to the campus.

Mr. Haugen stated that his goal is to complete a preliminary IT assessment report so presentations can be made the week of April 19, 2010. The presentations will include a list of planned ISS summer projects and technology resource and service improvements to be addressed during the upcoming academic year. A formal assessment report will be provided in May.

4. FY11 Technology Budget Requests.

IT Advisory Council met earlier this day to review the FY11 University technology requests, which totaled $1,421,205. The list consisted of 80 requests (some for multiple components). The Administration and Treasurer requests included general funding for University-wide desktop/laptop replacement, infrastructure improvements, and ISS-related technologies. The largest request was for replacing all computers over 4 years old; that would require $497,992. In addition, there is a deferred infrastructure replacement need of $480,000.
The full list had been compiled by Nancy Tate, Associate VPAA, and prioritized by a) the originating department; b) the supervisory/managing entity, if one existed, e.g., dean, directors; and c) vice president or executive responsible for each University division/unit (Academic Affairs, Administration and Treasurer, Student Life, Enrollment Management, Athletics, and University Relations).

A summary spreadsheet was assembled by Nancy Tate. The Faculty IT Advisory Council met earlier in the day to review the request listing and to recommend requests that should be funded. The University anticipates a minimum of $400,000 will be available next year (FY11) for technology acquisitions and replacements; this is the same amount as the current year.

The Technology Steering Committee discussed the following:

a) Mr. Haugen relayed comments about mediated classrooms that arose at the Faculty IT Advisory Council and that the University may need to rethink how upgrades are funded. There should be a review of computer labs to see if they are being used as originally intended (general or specialized use). This should be a task for the IT Faculty Advisory Council since they could address how students learn and how labs may be used in the future. In labs it is important to have all units upgraded at one time rather than doing a few at a time.

b) The request process has no mechanism for opting to defer upgrade of desktops. This is acceptable as long as old computers do not totally go off the list.

c) Discussed using technology funds for alternate requests not funded in the replacement cycle when an outside funding source, such as Friends of Mabee Library, is available. The important thing is to keep the replacement cycle.

d) Richard Liedtke requested his request for Digital Signage is changed to priority #1 and the Docking Stations be moved to priority #3. This was his first year being involved in the technology budget planning process.

The group received the following three motions from the Faculty IT Advisory Council:

A. It is recommended that the University fund all FY11 technology requests prioritized as #1 by the leader of each major University unit (e.g., vice president, executive director). These top priority requests totaled $86,834.

B. It is recommended that computer replacement, infrastructure, telephony, security upgrades be funded at $313,166.

C. It is recommended that additional funds be provided to upgrade technology-mediated classrooms and to address shortfalls in funding the computer replacement cycle.
The following table summarized the total requests; FY11 funding recommended by the Faculty IT Advisory Council, with Mr. Liedtke change; and this year’s funding (FY10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Executive Units</th>
<th>FY11 Requests</th>
<th>FY11 Faculty IT Advisory Council Recommendation</th>
<th>Percent of FY11 Requests To be Funded</th>
<th>FY10 Amount Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VPAA</td>
<td>172,586</td>
<td>69,691</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>64,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPAT w/o ISS</td>
<td>35,510</td>
<td>6,510</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enroll Mgmt</td>
<td>9,129</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>5,558</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>23,270</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Relations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exec Level Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>246,053</strong></td>
<td><strong>86,421</strong></td>
<td><strong>35%</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,877</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS/WU General</td>
<td>1,175,152</td>
<td>313,579</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>309,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,421,205</strong></td>
<td><strong>$400,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>28%</strong></td>
<td><strong>400,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of the Technology Steering Committee moved, seconded, and approved the recommendations of the Faculty IT Council for FY11 technology funding.

5. **Next Meeting.** The next Technology Steering Committee will be April 21, 2010.

Prepared by: Elliott J. Haugen, Director, Information Services and Systems

Approved by Technology Steering Committee: 4/21/2010
Attachment A:

Washburn University Banner 8 Upgrade Status Report  From Sue Jarchow, March 21, 2010

The conversion of data to a new format to support internationalization was accomplished without difficulty. Balancing reports revealed no differences before and after the conversion.

Functional areas have begun testing in the Banner 8 environment, with a goal of April 9 for completely testing functionalities currently used in Banner 7. Testing includes individual module testing, as well as the student life cycle processing from the point of admission through registration, bill payment, financial aid, and end of term processing.

A great emphasis is being placed on testing integrations with MyWashburn, online course tools, self-service functionality, and Banner channels in MyWashburn, in order to ensure that end-user functionalities are not broken at the point of go-live.

ISS is focusing on completing the testing environments for imaging, TouchNet, Enrollment Management Relationships and ACES2 this week and the next. After TouchNet passes testing in the Banner 8 environment, the revised method for Admissions applications fee credit card processing that reduces our PCI liability will be installed and tested.

A load test will be held on April 1 to simulate production load in the testing environment.

On April 15, the Banner 8 Project Team will meet to sign off on an agreement to proceed, or not, with the Banner 8 project, based upon the results of testing so far.

On the weekend of April 24, 25, and 26, ISS will “practice” the upgrade by starting over with data conversion and application of Banner modules. This will provide us with a better estimate of the amount of time it will take for our go-live in June.

Testing on existing functionality will take place again after this practice run. After this round of testing, functional areas will test new functionalities to be implemented during the Banner 8 go-live.

On May 12, the Banner 8 Project Team will meet again to assess the status of the Banner 8 upgrade project and make a decision to proceed, or not proceed, with the project. If a “go” decision is reached, communication will go out to campus about the upgrade to take place the weekend of June 4, 5 and 6.

Between May 12 and June 4, the Banner 8 Project Team will be busy planning for go-live, with the goal of completing the upgrade in such a way as to minimize downtime for MyWashburn and online courses.

New functionalities considered as a part of the go-live or after go-live include, but are not limited to:

- Self-service graduation applications.
- Detailed payroll self-service budget queries.
- Acceptance of admissions offer in self-service.
- Faculty load compensation module for maintaining summary and detail views of faculty load and compensation, positions, class assignments, and load history by course.
- Mutually exclusive courses tracking in registration.
- Mass entry capability for admissions, registration, general student, and graduation.
- NCAA athletic compliance enhancement for tracking athletic status and academic eligibility.
- Financial Aid tracking of student requirements by term, and algorithmic packaging.
- Supplemental data engine for storing data in Banner that is not a part of the existing data model.
I. Study Background

The University has begun a review of its information technology resources, services, and support. Kaludis Consulting, a higher education consulting firm, was selected to perform this study. Elliott Haugen, who is currently serving as interim ISS director, and his colleague Gwenn Weaver will be meeting with faculty, students, and staff to listen to their views on current and emerging information technology requirements.

Mr. Haugen has held some initial meetings, but most of the feedback opportunities are scheduled for the week of April 5. These sessions will provide the University community a chance to discuss educational, service, communications, outreach, and operational needs and expectations that involve any aspect of technology.

II. Consultant Meeting/Interview Topics

During the campus sessions you will be asked for your views on the following:

A. Identifying Strengths, Positives, or Advantages

1. How does Washburn use technology effectively to support its educational programs, research, services, communications, planning, and operations?
2. What technology resources or support services are especially valuable to you?

B. Identifying Weaknesses, Concerns, or Limitations

1. What concerns do you have about Washburn’s existing technology environment?
2. What are some of your unmet technology resource needs or support expectations?

C. Identifying Opportunities, Requirements, or Emerging Trends/Needs

1. What new uses of technologies should be considered to support Washburn’s changing educational, student service, communications, or operational requirements?
2. What emerging expectations (student, employee, alumni, parent, or community) do you see as being important for Washburn’s long-term technology planning?

D. Identifying Key Issues and Constraints

1. What issues or cautions regarding technology should be considered by Washburn?
2. What internal or external circumstances may affect Washburn’s plans for technology use and support?