



Minnesota
STATE COLLEGES
& UNIVERSITIES

Systems Development Steering Committee

MEETING NOTES

April 3, 2007

12:30 P.M. – 3:30 P.M.

Conference Room 3362, Wells Fargo Place, St. Paul

NEXT MEETING: Date: May 1, 2007

Time: 12:30 P.M. – 3:30 P.M.

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

ATTENDEES: Glen Guida, Joanne Chabot, Tim Gilsrud, Dawn Syverson, Ken Ries, Mark Malecek, Mike Bruner and RaNae Thompson

ITV: Tara Boerst, Les Bakke, Bryan Schneider and Debi Anderson

1. **Approval of Meeting Notes from March 6th, 2007 Meeting.** Approved without revision.
2. **Review / Adjust Agenda:** The following additional requests were made:
 - ITS organizational chart
 - Next years priorities
 - Assessing customer satisfaction
 - New registration system (web)
 - Issues related to budget management that Metro State is doing
 - RightNow technologies application.

Follow-up on Action Items:

- **Browser Standards:** We would like to focus in on one or two of the standard browsers: Foxfire, Netscape, Safari etc...
- **Vista / Uniface Issue:** Glen sent a follow-up after the CIO meeting. The current version of Uniface does not support Vista. Vista has a lot of open issues. The SDSC is in agreement to hold off on moving to Vista until February.
- **Legislative Lobbying Information (Joanne):** We do not know what will happen. There will be some money but we do not know how much and what restrictions will be put on it. The legislative staff was able to work with the legislators to develop a less restrictive language. All decisions will be made in the Conference Committee. There are several schools of thought: Some people may not want to see growth in the metro area. This is an on-going debate.

HR Access Data: There is never a resistance to getting access to public tables, but there is an issue when it comes to ethnicity and other sensitive data areas. The message that came out was unclear whether things would be granted by special permission or not at all. The problem is that the Office of the Chancellor Human Resources department does not separate normal production versus casual ad-hoc information. Personal data can be placed in three groups: Institutional research, Development activities, and Casual ad-hoc. We need to rephrase our needs to HR so they do not think it is all casual ad-hoc information.

Action Item: Dawn Syverson and Bryan Schneider will work to define the distinction between back-office needs and casual needs.

Budget Management Issues: Dawn speaks about the BMS Project – Metro State is set up for hosting the budget information for 6 campuses. They hired a contractor to create this web-based application. We do not have enough resources to allow this to move forward.

We may have to look at this as an opportunity missed. The bigger issue is: How do we prevent this from happening again in the future?

Sometimes when we come up with a snapshot for the budget at the beginning of the Fiscal Year, positions don't get filled and projects do not go the way we predict them. Is there a way to leverage what has already been done?

We have a communications issue. We do not know what projects are happening on other campuses.

We need to decide who the parties are and get them together so they can figure out the issues.

Action Item: Dawn Syverson and Mark Malecek will get together and compare notes on the subject.

Communication Issues: Institutions are working to develop a budget module. Why didn't we know about this and why didn't they know that we were doing a budget module. MNOnline developed a module to create a liaison for each institution. The concept is that it is so complex within institutions. A lot of institutions out there have CIOs who are not even in contact with the network modulators. We really do not know where information should go. Each institution will have a person who receives and spreads information. Joanne Chabot is inclined to write up a charter for this project.

Thoughts and reactions:

Would this be a listserv?

Yes, but also possibly periodic meetings as well. It would be the point of communication to the institutions. We would speak to a primary contact. People on campuses would know where to go. We want to give the campus presidents the opportunity to think it through. The point people need to be readily available. For example, if a campus CIO is acting as a LAN administrator, then he/she is probably not the right person for this job.

Action Item: Joanne will work on this idea. Maybe we will have a dialogue via email on this concept.

There are many other communication issues:

- There is frustration about the lack of information on what we are working on. Is the process mapped and documented? Or does everyone have their own

perception of it? How do everyone's ideas play off of each other. Pre-emptive issues tend to throw off our schedules.

- And user groups are getting out of control. They are always popping up. Ken Niemi has charged Al Essa with creating a new communication structure which is not complete yet.
- The problem has not changed, we used to have a process for dealing with it, but we moved away from this process because of a governance change. We need to be in a position to respond and we need to have a strong say on this topic. If this is the practice that the leadership wants to endorse, that's fine. But communication has to take place no matter what. It is a difficult problem because IT does not want to set priorities. Was the way we had it before better? Maybe this group should say something about that.
- This idea does not take into account interdependencies. For example we need architects, someone who specializes in financial aid, etc... Maybe we need to go back to this kind of integrated practice so we can create a plan that makes sense at whatever resource level we have.
- What gets us jammed up is that everyone is in both maintenance and development mode. This causes delays. We may have to take an internal approach and split our staff up. This would help us with respect to the little things that we need to keep going with.
- One option to consider is campus staff. The problem with that is that the technology we're using may not line up with what they know. A discussion item at the CIO meeting was about the OOC recruiting from campuses. But we don't want to cause disruptions to other institutions by taking away their resources. This could be a follow-up for the next meeting.

Brief Updates:

We will keep the current level of functionality, but we think that there are some very robust systems out there and we will integrate if necessary. We want to steer away from the prospect data. We are not opposed to the selection of outside systems.

Organizational Chart: Joanne goes over the org. chart. Al Essa's reports have changed. Rod Gerads and his staff have stayed with Joanne. The documentation group has moved over to Joanne. The re-organization was done to level the playing field between Al and Joanne. Al's interest is more on the technology side and Joanne's is on the business side. The infrastructure committee will probably move over to Al. Joanne is going to do a handoff document and from then on, Al will be the contact person.

Regional meetings: These have been delayed. We wanted to have them in February/March, but now we want to hold them after graduation. RaNae is

concerned about how attendees will feel about the purpose of the meetings. We need to be formally prepared to answer questions.

If we hold the regional meetings in June, how would we frame them?

- We have requested \$70m based on the consultant report. We are not going to get \$70M, we will get significantly less. Mike Bruner suggests coming up with different scenarios based on how much money we might get.
- There are 4 or 5 critical infrastructure areas and 3 to 4 urgent areas.
- A good thing to cover in these meetings would be the information we gathered last time we held regional meetings.
- Being able to show them the impact of their input would be great.

In our project plans, there is obvious order that things need to be accomplished in. We've all been through strategic planning, most of the time it reinforces what you know you need to do anyway. We need to go in and make sure we have the support of our users. Most of them are pre-disposed to the idea that we are in a rebuilding phase. They just want information.

As long as we have a rationale for our decisions, we are going to be able to defend ourselves.

We need to present a plan and ask for feedback. We could probably do that electronically.

Right Now Technologies Issue:

The system purchased enough licenses for each campus to participate in the applications. The cost was somewhere in the \$2m range.

- It is Mike Bruner's understanding that Century College will pay \$22,000 for their use of the licenses. That \$22,000 was going to go towards fees and the system was going to provide the support.
- The RightNow Technology people have come back with a price increase. In order for us to get to what we have purchased, it is going to take months because people are spread too thin. The resources are not in place to support what we have purchased.
- The implementation staff is also doing marketing presentations. They are busy doing presentations at universities and colleges. It is hard to do both things at once. The system is not used to sales and marketing efforts. We cannot take on anymore implementations.
- Small institutions in big systems have to take advantage of the right applications for their size. The cost of implementation is the same for small colleges as it is for large universities.

Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 3:15 PM. Meeting notes submitted by Smitha Pennepalli, Smitha.Pennepalli@csu.mnscu.edu.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AT FUTURE MEETING(S):

- Update on communication issues
- Update on regional meetings
- Update on budget and lobbying issues