



**Minnesota**  
STATE COLLEGES  
& UNIVERSITIES

**Minnesota State Colleges and Universities  
Systems Development Steering Committee**

**MEETING NOTES**

**January 8, 2008**

**12:30 PM – 3:30 PM**

**Conference Room 1802, UBS Building, St. Paul**

**NEXT MEETING: Date:** February 5, 2008

**Time:** 12:30 PM – 3:30 PM

**Location:** Conference Room 1802, UBS, St. Paul

**ATTENDEES:**

Deb Anderson

Mike Bruner

Joanne Chabot

Jim Dillemath

Al Essa

Glen Guida

Mark Malecek

John O'Brien

Dave Overby

Bryan Schneider

Dawn Syverson

Ra Nae Thompson.

**Via ITV:**

Les Bakke

Art Lieble

1. **Review Agenda/Minutes from 11/6/07 Meeting:** e-Time Sheets added. Minutes approved for posting on the website.

**2. IT Governance:**

Ra Nae distributed draft v. 5 of the IT Governance that Al Essa presented at the last CIO meeting. He advised that these are still under discussion and decisions have not been made. This is intended to be complimentary to the EIC process. Al stated that IT Governance is primarily about who makes IT decisions, how do stakeholders influence in the decision-making process and how IT performance is measured – both qualitative and quantitative. Goal is to put in place an IT Governance mechanism that gives stakeholders information that enables them to answer questions. Narrower objective is to align the process with the advisory committees, simplify structure, develop charter and get feedback from the people. He informed that currently Architecture & Infrastructure is in Foundation, Security & ID Access Management is also a foundational piece and some business application (e.g. ISRS). While DARS, CAS, e-Folio, D2L, etc. are part of the Enterprise.

Al informed that a new group to be called Cross-Functional Review Committee will come into play in helping EIC make final decisions on what project gets priority funding. This committee will consists of representatives from student and faculty groups, finance and the union that will look at all the projects to give the EIC another opinion.

If there is an IT initiative that originates from other channels within the Enterprise group, it has to go through governance process even if they are using their own funding. Any projects costing >100K need to be approved by the EIC; <100K are approved by the vice chancellors.

Al informed that currently, the structure is composed of the Leadership Council Technology Committee which has the ultimate oversight of all expenditures; IT Infrastructure Steering Committee, Information Security Steering Committee and the

Systems Development Steering Committee (SDSC). Role of SDSC would change. SDSC currently handles ISRS or other administration system-related issues. Scope would expand to include DARS, CAS, iSEEK, etc.

The proposed structure is:

- Enterprise Architecture and Infrastructure Committee – for infrastructure/architecture issues;
- Security Steering Committee – for security issues;
- New (Name TBD) – for IDM issues. This will overlap with Security Committee and eventually will merge together.
- Four (4) new committees – for applications issues – (2 will belong to academic side-ASA; 2 to administrative-IT).

Project Approval Stream – One channel proposes a project and develops it into a business case and then goes to EIC for pre-approval. Once pre-approved, it goes to IT delivery to begin development of the actual project.

Business cases are submitted twice a year. EIC meets in March and will prioritize the top 6 projects selected. Vice chancellors meet monthly for the smaller projects. If not approved in March, maybe resubmitted in June.

Al reported that one complaint received from the IT delivery sites is that there are too many projects going on at the same time. Projects must be prioritized and be brought down to around 5-6 projects. Smaller projects, such as glitches in the system, will be top priority if it affects system functionality.

John O'Brien questioned why ISRS is not a separate unit. Joanne responded that ISRS touches on so many other applications that separating it would be inefficient. John stated that the simplicity of analytic administrative system should be academic and IMS should be underneath that in the chart. He suggested that there should be a student IT committee to participate in the dialogue. It was suggested students be given the elective choice to join the committee with corresponding credit for the participation; but that is not feasible.

### **3. Revised EIC Process:**

Jim advised that before any portfolio projects go to EIC, a cross-functional team will be put together to look at the whole portfolio – this team will consist of student and faculty representatives from several groups, 20-30 people in total – to give the EIC one more piece of information to look at in terms of why one project is more important than the other. The letter from Linda Baer has gone out to invite people, including Ken Niemi and some from Linda Baer's group, to participate in this group. Jim will provide the committee a copy of the letter. The main purpose of this process revision is to limit the number of projects to 5-6 only. This process will apply to new projects only. This process is not a filter to remove any projects that they deem is not a priority. This team will be operational in February during which time a meeting will be held.

### **4. Project Communication Effectiveness:**

How to measure effectiveness?

Glen asked if the group wants all the managers to be involved in every project. Increasing membership from different campuses would help get a more diverse representation. Some members of the group are not aware that information on past year's projects are all archived in the website under Consultation History.

John O suggested that approval history is included in the charter.

John stated that they have never received any memos or letters from IT department nor has any IT representatives ever attended their CAO meetings. John would advise the group of any upcoming meeting and welcomes IT people to join.

#### Feedback from customers –

John O'Brien reported that Metro CIO group suggested that one of them could attend Metro CFO/CAO meetings and serve as the liaison between them or that meeting minutes from different committees are shared; however, issues from different committees are so varied that it won't work. CIO/CAO/CFO members are usually members of another committee in their home bases and some relevant information they received from the CIO/CAO/CFO meetings can be shared with them. Joanne asked if expanding the roles of the members would create a stronger relationship with other channels. The faculty is the hardest to connect with due to their unavailability while the students are the least served in the community.

### **5. Regional Meeting Results Summarized:**

Some items on the list are under ongoing projects such as reporting and training issues. Training issues can be easily worked out.

**Action Item:** Deb to bring the list to the analyst group and discuss how to resolve the issues.

### **6. Major Project Questions and Concerns**

- CAP Project – Dawn expressed concern about CAP documentation. There was a list of issues at the beginning that went out to the CIO group. Some items were dropped from the list without notice and this was reportedly done due to non-response from the people concerned. Classification of the list is also creating some frustrations. Status list was color-coded and how it is coded is very confusing.
- HR Module Implementation - Joanne reported that there are two major problems with this implementation. First is Handler Errors that are preventing a transaction from going through. It occurs intermittently. It may be an Oracle issue and a ticket has been opened. Second is the Security Design for the new system. OPI has created a new structure and is now with QC and will go on production on Monday. Feedback from 5 campuses is that the system is slow, Mankato being one of them. Toni will do some time testing to monitor data next week.

One requirement of this project was to replicate a limited amount of data from oracle back to rdb. The replication is working but not with all data. Original intent of the conversion is to include only a minimal amount of data. We are finding that, based on other application and/or campus application needs, additional data elements need to be included. At this point it is known Data card will be affected as SSN and DOB and

address info weren't migrated. Replication tasks will be expanded to include this missing information.

- Client / Server to Web – no further discussion (outside of the HR application)
- Resources / Ability to Deliver - It was agreed that a letter will be drafted by the group to report on the realities about resource status. Ken Reis (chair) will be responsible for this task. The target audience is the PMO.

## 7. Other:

EIM Process – Mike wanted to know how the EIC knows the impact of their approvals on staffing levels. Joanne stated that they don't and AI is working on a process for this. They have to be provided with this information. Vice Chancellors have 3 days to write a review report to EIC on the projects they approved.

IT Budget - Mike inquired about the budget allocation. Joanne informed that out of the \$28M - \$17.5M is allocated to staff salaries, including the projected 55 new positions estimated at \$100K each. Leases and other operational costs will take up most of the budget.

Application Inventory – Dave Overby stated that we need a thorough knowledge of the current inventory.

The group wants a list of who is in charge of which application and who to call when they encounter technical problems. Generally, technical problems are handled by IT; User support issues by ASA.

### EIC Projects – General Discussions

There are 26 existing projects – list can be found in the ITS Portfolio – and there are more that are not on the list. This list must be prioritized and narrowed down to top 3 (or ?). Joanne suggested that they work with the existing list and re-looking at the available resources at hand, re-evaluate the projects that need to go first. Additional proposal must be reviewed along the old ones and decide which ones will go forward in terms of importance. Joanne and AI have been talking to Tim Price at the request of Linda, who is working through the same issues and shares the same concerns. It is apparent to all that, due to lack of resources, some projects may not go forward at all.

Dawn advised that it is impossible to plan if we define resources based on original scope of work. First scope should be data entry and second scope is the integration data. Usually, the scope of work is changed and it affects the cost. Change control process should be incorporated in the governance draft.

Next Meeting – February 5, 2008

Agenda Items: to be gathered from the group.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:40 PM.

Meeting notes submitted by Sonia Go, [sonia.go@csu.mnscu.edu](mailto:sonia.go@csu.mnscu.edu).