

Technology Core Team

Lancaster 223

August 4, 2009

Members present:

Rick Chassey	Hazel Duncan	Dave Hooper
Virginia Kinman	Jay Lynn	Bob Murray
Tracy Nelson	Glenn Parker	Ken Perkins
Paula Prouty	Larry Robertson	Karen Schinabeck
Chris Shumaker	Angela Stimpson	Ling Whitworth

Also in attendance:

Frank Moore

Frank Moore informed the team that the Information Technology Resources and Systems Procurement policy would be presented to the Board of Visitors for approval in September. The policy will require all IT purchases at Longwood to be approved by the President or his or her designee with that authority currently designated to Moore as the Chief Information Officer. Requests will be reviewed to determine if Information and Instructional Technology Services (IITS) can technically support the product and if the purchase should be managed as a project by the Project Management Office. Dave Hooper inquired about whether the policy would apply to software purchases and Moore confirmed that it would apply. Moore emphasized that the policy should save money and ensure that products purchased are capable of being implemented.

Jay Lynn referred the group to the Technology Core Team proposal which was distributed to all members. The proposal will be provided to the Executive Steering Committee on 8/5/2009.

Lynn provided an update on the Banner 8 upgrade. Test instance implementation and testing of Banner 8 across campus is being planned.

Lynn reported on the difficulties encountered in scheduling the Hobsons constituent management software project for Admissions. Scheduling issues have arisen because of lack of resources in IITS due to positions lost during the recent budget cuts. Such scheduling issues are to be anticipated in future projects.

Ken Perkins discussed the College Persistence Questionnaire which is a remotely hosted application that would be used to identify students for early intervention as part of retention efforts replacing the Noel-Levitz College Student Inventory. Initially undeclared and PLUS students will be tested and potentially a comparison group with the goal of expanding to all freshmen. Lynn stated that the project would be directed to Moore for approval.

Lynn reported on the current installation and training occurring on the Dapro system for Longwood Police which will replace the Badge system. This project was grant funded and will allow officers to enter data from the field over cellular or wireless signals.

Lynn reported on the progress of the Kronos installation with server hardware, readers and software received for installation.

Lynn opened the floor to other questions, projects or policies.

Hazel Duncan reported that the Longwood University Foundation and Financial Aid are seeking a software solution to track student scholarships. Lynn encouraged her, and anyone with such requests, to bring the request to the Project Management Office or Technology Core Team when the search is narrowed to a single product or a couple of products.

Chris Shumaker reported to the group that IITS was willing and able to support open source products. Among the considered offerings are WordPress, Moodle, Unix, and an internal cloud that could be used to provide intranet to the entire university.

Shumaker referred also to the Google Search Appliance Hooper has had installed. Virginia Kinman suggested collaboration as the Library currently uses Google Custom Search and could benefit from the customization and flexibility of the Google Search Appliance.

Shumaker introduced the issue of individual departments buying software licenses, as often occurs with Adobe software. Often volume discounts exist or other departments have unused licenses for the requested software. Use of the purchase request link on the work order submission page, implemented to fulfill the procurement policy, should help the university use licenses more effectively.

Hooper asked for clarification on what types of purchase requests would be brought to the team. Lynn stated that single user software license purchases would not be brought to the group, but purchases with larger impact would. Hooper also asked for clarification on whether web policies, which are generally developed by the Web Committee, will be brought to the group. Shumaker stated that it would be beneficial for the group to be aware of such items.

An enterprise WordPress installation was discussed and implementation is in the formative stages. Kinman stated that the library is currently using WordPress and would be interested in using the enterprise version WordPress and would like to be included in planning.

Kinman inquired about being able to develop code for installation on university servers. Shumaker stated that a previous rule that no one on campus could write code to be installed on production servers except developers in IITS was no longer in place, although code developed in other departments will be reviewed by developers in IITS before being installed.

Kinman suggested the team consider more effective web forms. The group concurred that forms and data gathering was an issue on campus.

Shumaker stated that he had been researching the use of Ubuntu which would allow the university to save money by purchasing fewer licenses from Microsoft.

Lynn provided an update on the ID center project team's request for an ID center manager position. Per Lynn's conversation with Moore President Cormier has agreed to the position. Issues of concern with the system regarding accounting and security remain.

Glenn Parker raised the question of how the procurement policy would be communicated to the campus. Duncan concurred that policies are not communicated beyond the BOV meeting. Shumaker stated that the work order system will be used only for approval and purchases will still go through eVA. Duncan explained that she did not want people to use the Foundation to bypass procedures. Shumaker and Duncan will collaborate on a process for requester to get approval from IITS prior to requesting funds from the Foundation. Parker recommended a formal announcement from Cormier or Moore that purchases must be approved. Ling Whitworth stated that the group needed to see the policy to assess impact and there needs to be a step-by-step procedure developed to ensure that purchases do not slip through without approval. Duncan stated that the Foundation needs to be aware of policies in order to supplement them with their own documentation. Kinman suggested that in communicating the procurement policy the approach should be taken that the reasons for the policy are saving money by capitalizing on economies of scale and achieving a better inventory of technology at the university.

Retention issues were discussed including concern over the amount of outdated material stored on the "admin" server, cost prohibitions of implementing an e-mail shredding program and the at capacity status of the newly implemented storage area network due largely to audit and log files that the university is required to keep.

Hooper reported on his research into solutions for putting print publications online. Hooper has used the free version of issuu.com for the LCVA annual report. If departments are interested in such a solution an inexpensive paid version of Issuu, which removes advertisements present in the free version, may be feasible for purchase. However, such publications are not accessible for people with disabilities so alternatives would have to be provided.

Shumaker and Hooper discussed work in digitization of university stock photos. Kinman stated that the library was also working on digitization and would be interested in any work being done in that area.

Bob Murray suggested discussing the procurement policy at upcoming eVA material management training.

Murray raised the discussion of including faculty participation on the Technology Core Team. Rick Chassey pointed out that involving a single faculty member does not ensure that all faculty are aware of the issues. Parker suggested discussing the group's activities as a point of interest at Faculty Senate as one of the senators' responsibilities is to share information discussed with other faculty. The group concurred that the suggestion should be made at the 8/5/2009 Executive Steering Committee Meeting that full-time faculty representation should be added to the Technology Core Team.

Karen Schinabeck suggested the group consider an alternative to RSVP forms e-mailed by the President's Office.

Murray suggested a standard measure of cost-benefit analysis be established and requested the group receive up-to-date prioritized project lists for evaluation. Parker suggested a set procedure be developed for the Technology Core Team's evaluation of projects and purchases. Lynn indicated that procedures and matrixes used by the Technology Partner Planning Team (TPPT) may be adapted to be used by the group.

Minutes submitted by:

Melissa Short