



Minnesota
STATE COLLEGES
& UNIVERSITIES

Systems Development Steering Committee

MEETING NOTES

March 6, 2007

12:30 P.M. – 3:30 P.M.

Conference Room 3362, Wells Fargo Place, St. Paul

NEXT MEETING: Date: April 3, 2007

Time: 12:30 P.M. – 3:30 P.M.

Location: Conference Room 3362 Wells Fargo Place, St. Paul

ATTENDEES: Glen Guida, Ken Ries, Tim Gilsrud, Joanne Chabot and Gerry Rushenberg

ITV: Mark Malecek, Tara Boerst, Les Bakke and Debi Anderson

Guest: RaNae Thompson

1. **Approval of Meeting Notes from 2/06/07 meeting:** Approved.

MEETING SUMMARY:

Skip to Agenda Item 4: Legislature Happenings: Joanne Chabot

All of the funding committee presentations are done and they went very well. We have been asked for some supplemental information which Ken has sent out. Laura King has asked that we do not provide so much detail so that people do not try to micro-manage. The last round of provisional information went to the House less than a week ago and we have not heard of any requests for changes which is positive. There are High Tech Association meetings coming up. There are a lot of business leaders out there who know how important this is to them. We have a good strategy in place.

Risks: The governor recommended \$45M in the 1st year and \$15M in the second year and we need that flip-flopped so we can afford future maintenance and support.

3 competing system interests:

- Inflation
- Tuition (buy-back or hold on increases)
- Technology funding

All are worth about \$70M.

People on campus need to be made aware about where we are in the budget process.

One of the risks that we have between now and the end of the session is that people tend to make negative comments to the legislature. We need to make sure that we are getting the correct information out to the right people.

Action Item: Joanne will see that lobbying information is forwarded to the committee electronically.

Skip to Agenda Item 7: Follow-up - HR Data Access:

We have not heard anything from HR. Our request may have been lost. From this point on, Bill Russ will start logging requests from campuses so this will not happen again.

- It is critical that we stay on top of this. This discussion needs to be brought to HR.

Concerns regarding HR Data Access include:

- Data Ownership Issue: We're in a situation where HR feels that they can control

access to their data. Who owns the data? Is it system HR's responsibility to gate-keep that data? We need to get this settled.

- What happens if there is a severe breach and private campus information becomes wide open to the world?
- Some people feel that they have to protect themselves internally, but the system will not work if we don't trust each other.

This is really more of an HR issue than an IT issue.

- Gerry: "I've got no dog in this fight".

- We have limited control over this situation, but hopefully a meeting with HR will clear our concerns. A decision needs to be expedited.
- The reason behind this problem is ownership of data. Maybe we should not think of it as owning groups of data, but the individual should be the owner of their own information. Someone may have an administrative need to view someone's information, but it should be clearly documented what their rights to access would be.

ACTION ITEM:

Someone in the Committee will send an email to HR to clear up the situation and let them know that we are trying to resolve the issue. But wait until after we meet with them to see if we can come to a solution in person.

Skip to Agenda Item 5: CAP Server 2 Project – Gerry Rushenberg

What is "Cap 2" exactly?

Cap 2 is a document with instructions on how to get data off of Rdb, it is dates and it is the final shutdown of Rdb. How do we migrate operations on the campuses and the OOC so that we can facilitate the shutdown of Rdb. Within the standards that we operate under, we do have the ability to remove data. "Cap 2" is not a second cap server; it is the second phase in the cap project.

By the CIO meeting, we want to have a draft charter for this project. We are looking at Aug 31st as the first cut off date and Dec. 31 as the Drop deadline. The full cut-off for getting off of Rdb entirely is Feb. 28th.

- Follow-up with campuses: A lot of them are saying they are too busy. Part of the project is figuring out what Microsoft Access databases need to be converted over to Oracle. This is not difficult, but we are facing issues regarding how much work we are making the campuses do in this project. What can we help them with?

Two issues:

- How do we classify our data to begin with?
- How do we handle confidential data in our IT system?

We need to put standards in place in terms of how we handle confidential data no matter where it lives.

- Cap 1 was turned into a security project. There was no continuity between Cap 1 and Cap 2. There needs to be some framework around this project. The campuses have a good idea of what data needs to be moved, but a lot of things are going on in other

computers that are questionable.

The cap server is not necessarily the solution to the safety and security of our data. It is intended as a solution to the handling of consolidated replicated data.

- Some campuses have had Cap servers for 3 months now and still have not started moving information yet. (See Gerry's handout for campus log-on information. Only 8 of the institutions are being active in the process).

Issues at the CIO meeting will include:

- How do we use the Cap server?
- Where is the next document that tells us how to use it?
- What are the dates?

Glen thinks we should create a support team to assist the campuses.

Agenda Item 6: Enterprise IT Investment Status: - Glen

Database migration and Client Server to web: We have an integrated system, so everything we do has intersections. Our teams know how to work together. These are big projects but they are similar in scope to our previous projects so they are not unmanageable for us. They will bring the system better flow and better communication.

- There are resource issues: We need to be actively involved in our projects. If we have to bring new contractors in and teach them the system, that is 3 months spent in training. Right now, Mark is working on about 10 hires. The 10 positions are vacancies/positions approved in past years. We need to try to use existing resources as much as possible.

Agenda Item 3: Regional Meetings follow-up – RaNae Thompson

- RaNae's position involves working with support analysts to assist campuses. We held regional meetings a year or two ago as a venue for users to voice their concerns. RaNae and her group are organizing another round of regional meetings.
- This will give us the end user's input, a broad group of users will be involved.
- The idea is to see what has happened as a result of gathering data from the last session of regional meetings.
- This would be an excellent forum to discuss opportunities that we have and that the campuses might have that we are not taking advantage of. We should try to put some ideas out there. It will help us to see how we will be able to function years from now.

Who are we looking at in terms of the audience, duration and scope of these meetings?

- We are looking for a cross-section (Frontline, Back Office, Directors).
- Around 5-6 meetings, 2-4 hours in length.
- Convey what is happening, make sure everyone has the right perspective, make sure everyone knows what's going on.
- There needs to be results from the meetings. They need to be worthwhile if people are taking 4 hours out of their schedules to attend them.

What would this committee's roles be in this project?

- Assist with the facilitation
- Be there to provide the background.
- Communicate current projects broadly.

Discussion questions at regional meetings should include:

- Is there something that we're forgetting?
- Is there something that is/is not a priority for you?
- What do you see coming in the future?

Meetings would occur tentatively in June.

Locations: Detroit Lakes, Mankato, Moorhead, St. Cloud and two meetings in the Metro Area.

ACTION ITEM:

The committee will send RaNae Thompson some goal statements and she will develop a plan. Glen will send a reminder email to SDSC list to send RaNae suggestions.

Other Follow-up Items:

- What is the cost benefit methodology: We will set this aside until Mike Bruner is here to discuss it.
- E-Timesheet: this has not been getting much development/testing time, a model has been presented to Bill Tschida, there are some design corrections being made to it. It would be better to start using it soon and track problems.
- Microsoft Vista/Uniface issue: We are going to have to hold off on supporting it until we support Oracle which is still a year from now.
- Limits on Web browser support for client/server applications: How do we certify all the variations? Glen will work with Infrastructure Committee on this topic.

Adjournment. Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM. Meeting notes submitted by Smitha Pennepalli (smitha.pennepalli@csu.mnscu.edu).

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AT FUTURE MEETING(S):

- RaNae will return with recommendations for Regional Meetings.