



SEATTLE UNIVERSITY

Information Technology Council

*Minutes of the Meeting
Tuesday, August 22, 2006
Hunthausen Hall, Room 160*

Committee Members Attending*:

Tim Leary, <i>Chair</i> *	Nancy Gerou	John Popko *
Sharon Cumberland	Heather Geiger*	Ivette Serna *
Doug Duncan *	Jacquelyn Miller*	Gregory Silverman
Robert Duniway*	Melissa Mullinax *	Bo Vieweg
Joe Eastham *	William Poole	James White

Guest: Julie Ouska (Sungard)

* Denotes that member was present at meeting

Membership. Heather Geiger substituted for Michel George as Facilities Department representative. Michel has indicated that he will not be able to attend future meetings. ITC voted to have Heather replace Michel.

ITC Procedures Work Group. Doug reported that Greg is working on next draft and group will meet thereafter. (Greg was out ill today.)

Chartering of a CMS Working Group. The discussion continued... The group agreed that there are enough large publications, especially with reusable content that an ECM (as opposed to a “web CMS”) will be needed and used on campus. Examples: Bulletin, Employee Manual, Faculty Handbook. Heather noted that building floor plans in Facilities Dept. would fit well into a CMS.

The question became how many more non-web related publications need to be identified before an ECM is selected and how long will that take? (And how much longer can campus wait to meet the web content need?)

It was suggested that SU could use SiteBuilder as an interim solution for those, particularly in academic units, who have the most difficulty updating their sites using existing tools, e.g. Dreamweaver. Use of SiteBuilder would be for a limited time and purpose as a web CMS and the data would be migrated to an ECM later.

Julie Ouska (Sungard) noted that SiteBuilder has an SQL database backend so that migration from it to an ECM should not be too difficult. She didn’t have examples of Sungard clients that had done this, besides LMU. **Julie will send links to schools that use SiteBuilder now.** She noted that migration and training does take time, but she couldn’t say how much. She offered to have tech personal discuss this with ITC and/or do a demo.

ITC decided a demonstration would be appropriate. Melissa will set it up.

Questions were raised as to which specific sites would be moved to SiteBuilder, whether this would change the “load balancing” project for OIT and where the funding for an ECM would come from.

Melissa noted that there was a “restricted fund” set up a year or so ago with \$70,000 for purchase of an ECM.

Discussion proceeded as to which campus groups would be asked (told?) to move into SiteBuilder. Group agreed that while SiteBuilder may not be appropriate for all current websites, especially the sophisticated ones such as top level of public website (WebComm) and certain schools/colleges, eventually all sites should be contained within and published through the final ECM product.

Since S/B is an interim solution, only sites that cannot manage their sites now should be migrated. Others should prepare to be migrated, e.g. by deleting obsolete content and updating all other content. Question was raised as to whether the eventual InSite replacement (Faculty/Staff Portal) should be part of the consideration for selecting an ECM. Answer: no, they do different things and have different purposes. They can co-exist. We have a portal product already.

Assuming we use SiteBuilder as an interim solution, a **SiteBuilder Transition Work Group** would be chartered to identify the appropriate sites for SiteBuilder, manage the transition and notify the more sophisticated sites to prepare for eventual transition to an ECM. Need to see demo of S/B first.

Another group, "**Business Objectives Work Group**" should be formed to identify the business objectives for the ECM. This group should include "researchers" more than "techies." Suggested members: Bob Duniway, Joe Eastham, Nani Paape (if OK with Dave Balsler), Katherine Hedland Hansen(Law School) and Ivette Serna.

In terms of forming work groups, the chair should have authority to appoint members after seeking input from the relevant Standing Committees.

Questions raised as to whether a "**Web Steering**" or "**Web Policy**" group should be formed regarding use of the public website. At present, no one is guiding Joe and his WebComm group as to how the web should be used for SU... and Joe would like to have some guidance. **Add to ITC agenda.**

Next steps: (1) demo of S/B for ITC; (2) demo of S/B for College of Arts and Sciences; (3) demo of S/B for other schools/colleges and sites using the "homegrown" CMS (built by OIT).

Tim suggested that we take a "pause" and present the E-Team with an **ITC Status Report**. Doug was volunteered to prepare this for September 5th E-Team meeting.

Future Agenda Items:

- "Roll out" plan for the new, improved ITC and its procedures, including communication procedures between and among the ITC and the various committees, work groups and operating groups.
- Approve IT Strategic Plan and OIT Tactical Plan
- Create communication plan to inform constituents
- Draft or modify critical policies and procedures governing IT resources, including integration into budget process.
- Establish work groups for such projects as a Information Security Plan (including password policies and laptop data encryption) and a Computer Replacement Policy.