



**TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 15, 2010  
10:30 a.m.**

**BOARD ROOM  
WELLS FARGO PLACE  
30 7TH STREET EAST  
SAINT PAUL, MN**

---

**Please note: Committee/Board meeting times are tentative. Committee/Board meetings may begin up to 45 minutes earlier than the times listed below if the previous committee meeting concludes its business before the end of its allotted time slot.**

Committee Chair David Paskach calls the meeting to order.

- (1) Minutes of July 21, 2010 (pp. 1-5)**
- (2) Information Technology Update
- (3) Discuss and Select Committee Goals (pp.6-7)**
- (4) Students First Report (pp. 8-10)
- (5) Office of Legislative Auditor Compliance (pp. 11-13)
- (6) Discuss Future Meetings

Members

David Paskach, Chair  
Christopher Frederick, Vice Chair  
Cheryl Dickson  
Jacob Englund  
Phil Krinkie  
James Van Houten  
Michael Vekich

**Bolded** items indicate action required.

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
July 21, 2010**

---

***Technology Committee Members Present:** David Paskach, Chair; Christopher Frederick, Vice Chair; Trustees Cheryl Dickson, Jacob Englund, Phillip Krinkie, and James Van Houten*

***Technology Committee Members Absent:** Trustee Michael Vekich*

***Other Board Members Present:** Board Chair Scott Thiss, Vice Chair Clarence Hightower, Chancellor James McCormick, and Trustees Louise Sundin, Dan McElroy, Thomas Renier, Duane Benson and Alfredo Oliveira*

***Leadership Council Committee Members Present:** Vice Chancellor Darrel Huish and President Judith Ramaley*

The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities Technology Committee held its meeting on July 21, 2010, at Wells Fargo Place, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Board Room, 30 East 7<sup>th</sup> Street in St. Paul. Chair Paskach called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m.

**Approval of the Technology Committee Meeting Minutes**

*Chair Paskach called the committee to order. As this is a newly formed committee there are no minutes for approval.*

**1. Vice Chancellor Overview Process**

Chair Paskach welcomed the members to the Board Technology Committee. This committee was formed in part as a response to the Office of Legislative Auditor (OLA) report and as a means of addressing the critical nature technology plays in all areas of the system.

Vice Chancellor Darrel Huish provided an overview of the important insights gained during these first 15 weeks with the system. Vice Chancellor Huish has been meeting with presidents, faculty leadership, student leadership, chief information officers, technology staff, and many others. A half dozen campus visits have been conducted and three more are scheduled in the near future.

This system has a strong CIO community, which is a tremendous asset. An atmosphere that cultivates sharing of information has been created because of the efforts of individuals like Ken Niemi, Carolyn Parnell and Ken Ries, CIO from Pine Technical College.

Vice Chancellor Huish reported that information technology governance structure is above average, the governance processes are generally strong with exception of

the project initiation and selection process as mentioned in the OLA report. Trustee Van Houten inquired about the difference between the governance chart depicted in the OLA report and the one shown in the packet. Vice Chancellor Huish responded that the chart within the OLA report on page 75 figure 5.1 describes the prioritization of projects and new initiatives; the chart in the Board packet shows the overall advisory structure within information technology.

Vice Chancellor Huish reported that excellent progress has been made to address the audit findings. That includes reduction of reliance on consultants, improvements to the process for prioritizing IT projects, implementation of a process to track progress on audit findings and implementation of new software and processes to improve user access controls. Trustee Hightower responded that caution should be used when interpreting the finding on consultants. Consultants were used to address difficulty in hiring; as the use of consultants is decreased, the staffing increase may cause some concern. Instead, careful consideration should be given to the use of contractors without a cost benefit analysis. Hiring staff without a cost benefit analysis may result in the same finding.

Trustee Krinkie inquired if the audit finding stating that there was inadequate sequencing of projects and staff resources was an accurate statement. Vice Chancellor Huish responded that it was an accurate statement. When the analysis was completed, there was considerable room for improvement in project management. There is a lag from the time the need for improvement is recognized and the time it takes to bring about change. Changes in staffing and training have resulted in improvements that are now being realized.

Chancellor McCormick stated there are three topics that this group might want to be prepared to address with the legislature in February. First, what are the benefits and efficiencies of providing centralized technology services as opposed to each individual campus providing their own services? A list of return on investment benefits should be developed. Second, develop an explanation of cost savings for hiring staff rather than using consultants. Finally, determine if the presidents along with leadership from the other areas of the organization support the investment in technology. Vice Chancellor Huish will be ready for a presentation to the legislature in February. President Ramaley responded that efforts have been made to bring different constituencies together.

Trustee Van Houten stated the report contains criticism on how the board was providing oversight to the system. Page 78 of the report states that, "we observed that oversight of the \$30 million spent on IT-related professional/technical services between fiscal years 2007 and 2009 fell short of state standards set for state agencies." To address the findings the system will need to manage to the state standards and evaluate project management. Chair Thiss responded that a lot can be done by February and a clear message can be developed for the legislature. It has become clear that there is not an appreciation or understanding

about how big a role technology plays in higher education. This message must be clear for both the legislature and all of the constituents. Technology touches all aspects of education; it is complex and massive.

**2. Students First Update**

Vice Chancellor Huish introduced Jon Eichten, Director of Students First who provided a Student First update.

Jon Eichten acknowledged John O'Brien's leadership, which led to a collaborative, inclusive process that considered the interests of students, faculty, staff and administrators. Jon indicated that Students First would continue to function in the same collaborative and inclusive spirit.

Jon Eichten presented the Student First Update to the committee providing an update on the six projects within Students First including the key milestones, the campus preparedness plan and the next steps. Individuals interested in following progress on these projects can find additional information on the following website: [www.studentsfirst.projects.mnscu.edu](http://www.studentsfirst.projects.mnscu.edu).

Chair Thiss stated that fraud prevention has been an additional benefit from the e-transcripts project. Jon Eichten replied that the response to the completion of this project has been positive, from both the students and the campuses perspective.

Board Chair Thiss requested that Jon Eichten provide an update on Students First at every meeting.

**3. Brief Primer on Information Technology Services**

Vice Chancellor Huish introduced Carolyn Parnell the Chief Operations Officer and attributed the recent progress to Carolyn's efforts.

COO Parnell presented the Brief Primer on Information Technology Services. Some of this information was included in past board presentations; however, this will provide a baseline of information to the committee.

Trustee Van Houten stated increases to bandwidth capacity have been described as essential improvements; what other items are essential? Carolyn Parnell responded that improvements to servers were essential. The risks of running an aging infrastructure with little redundancy is high. This investment has created redundancy between the Westbank Office Building and Classroom Office Building server sites. Successful failover tests of the Learning Management System (Desire 2 Learn) have been conducted. Once the upgrades to the data center are complete, a failover test of the ISRS system will be conducted.

Carolyn Parnell stated that by 2009 the enterprise information technology division doubled the amount of money spent per student on activities that can be directly

attributed to student services. The numbers do not reflect the amount of money the campus IT units spend in terms of student support.

Trustee Van Houten complimented Carolyn Parnell for a first class presentation of a complicated subject. Trustee Dickson thanked Carolyn Parnell for a valuable presentation that should be heard by the Leadership Council, student organizations and any of affiliated groups or associations that would be interested. It is tremendously important that everyone understand the comprehensiveness of the presence of technology in every area of higher education.

Trustee Dickson responded to the pyramid chart on page 26 of the board packet. One of the criticisms heard is that information technology does too much. An evaluation of the services provided would be helpful this may include analyses of which services are being used, which are cost effective, which services people need versus want and a study of the cost. President Ramaley responded that Vice Chancellor Huish has presented information on reviewing innovations that begin anywhere in the system to help determine if a service is helpful and cost effective.

Board Chair Thiss thanked the presenters for the information shared especially use of measurements and accountability to describe the progress made. This is exactly what was needed from the IT division. These presentations demonstrate why the board came to the realization that a Technology Committee was needed.

Chancellor McCormick commented that the IT system was previously at the breaking point. The old system did not have any more capacity and without the Oracle conversion the system could not move forward. Chancellor McCormick suggested that committee members take a moment to thank the people of Minnesota for the significant investment in technology. A thank you should also be extended to the governor, legislature and the Board who supported this request. The conversion could not have taken place without this investment in technology.

Carolyn Parnell agreed that the system was at risk. Chair Paskach responded when you compare the amount spent on some major conversions ISRS is still a bargain due to its capacity alone. This is a bargain compared to what others are paying for the same functionality. The money received and the speed of the action may have led to the findings but it was critical that the upgrades were quickly completed. Now the process of project management can be refined and improved.

Chair Paskach requested that efforts be made to include the campus per student spending in the per student calculation in order to measure the amount spent by the whole system. Carolyn Parnell agreed to gather this information.

Trustee Sundin inquired where the system is compared to the other institutions around the county. How do the services provided by the system compare with the

793 institutions or the for-profit institutions? Carolyn Parnell responded that the obtaining average of the five institutions was difficult. There is not a good set of comparative institutions to measure against. The information on these five institutions can be gathered again. Information on comparative services can be gathered as well.

Trustee Sundin stated that if this is truly a learning organization then a goal should be to retain knowledge and improve employees' skill sets. This will allow employees to become proficient and provide great service. Carolyn Parnell stated that a tactical plan for professional development and succession planning has been created. The information technology division is committed to and believes in the mission of higher education and making sure that employees have the training needed is a component.

#### **4. Discussion of Committee Goals**

Chair Paskach lead a discussion of the committee goals. The committee agreed that the completion of the Students First project and response to the OLA report would be the top two overriding goals.

Vice Chancellor Huish requested that the committee consider setting the development of a service delivery model as a goal. There is considerable activity in developing innovations and efficiencies. This committee could assist by providing clear descriptions of when an institution has the latitude to develop innovations or share services and when they cannot. Chair Paskach responded that this really is an IT strategy. In developing this the roles for the whole system will be clearer. President Ramaley responded that collaboration on this goal would get to the issues of how to determine if something should receive centralized support as opposed to what should distinguish institutions. This goal sets a platform for the future. The Leadership Council Technology Committee is prepared to act as a companion to the Board Technology Committee on this goal.

Chair Paskach stated that the first two goals would be sent out to the committee for acknowledgement from members. Additional information on the last goal would be provided for clarification. The goals will be presented at the September committee meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.  
Respectfully submitted,  
Christine Benner, Recorder

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**Agenda Item Summary Sheet**

**Committee:** Technology Committee

**Date of Meeting:** September 15, 2010

**Agenda Item: Discuss and Select Committee Goals**

Proposed  
Policy Change

Approvals  
Required by  
Policy

Other  
Approvals

Monitoring

Information

**Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:**

The Technology Committee of the Board of Trustees will discuss and select the committee goals.

**Scheduled Presenter(s):** Darrel Huish, Vice Chancellor – Chief Information Officer

**Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:**

**Background Information:**

This is the second meeting of the Technology Committee. During the July 21, 2010 meeting the committee discussed the goals listed.

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

<b>BOARD ACTION</b>
<b>DISCUSS AND SELECT COMMITTEE GOALS</b>

1 **BACKGROUND**

2 The Technology Committee of the Board of Trustees will discuss and consider approving the  
3 goals listed below.

<b>Board of Trustees Technology Committee Goals FY 2011</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Status / Complete Date</b>
The committee will monitor progress of Students First initiative	A single page update for purposes of review and discussion will be provided at each meeting of the technology committee	Status: Draft single page status report has been shared with Committee Chair Paskach. (see attached draft sample)
The committee will monitor the technology related activities that are in response to OLA audit	A single page update for purposes of review and discussion will be provided at each meeting of the technology committee	Target is to have substantial completion by Feb 2011. An identified issue is to be more specific about what is meant by the term "complete".
The committee will sponsor the development of a strategy for delivery of technology services so that these services can be provided efficiently while also sustaining an institution's ability to innovate and differentiate student and community services	The Leadership Council Technology Committee will publish an advisory to Leadership Council and to all campus CIO's	Status: preliminary discussions have begun within Leadership Council Technology Committee. Target date for final completion is April 30, 2011

4

5

6 **RECOMMENDED MOTION**

7

8 *Date of Adoption:*                    xx/xx/xx

9 *Date of Implementation:*        xx/xx/xx

10



**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**Agenda Item Summary Sheet**

**Committee:** Technology Committee

**Date of Meeting:** September 15, 2010

**Agenda Item:** Students First Report

Proposed  
Policy Change

Approvals  
Required by  
Policy

Other  
Approvals

Monitoring

Information

**Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:**

Board Chair Paskach requested that the Technology Committee monitor progress on the Student First initiative.

**Scheduled Presenter(s):** Jonathan Eichten, Students First Director

Darrel Huish, Vice Chancellor – Chief Information Officer

**Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:**

**Background Information:**

Students First embodies projects in several key areas of student services, including application, registration, billing, payment, academic planning, and shared services.

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

<b>INFORMATION ITEM</b>
STUDENTS FIRST REPORT

**BACKGROUND**

Jonathan Eichten Director of Students First will present a report on Students First projects. Full detail may be found on the Students First website [www.studentsfirst.project.mnscu.edu](http://www.studentsfirst.project.mnscu.edu).



Goal/Deliverables	Progress	Population	Available
<b>Single Search</b>			
Web tool to search multiple campuses	15%	student/parent prospects	June, 2011
Web tool available for campus web site	0%	student/parent prospects	June, 2011
<b>Single Application</b>			
E-Transcripts for transfer students	100%	transfer students	November, 2009
Student applicants initiated duplicate records merge	100%	admitted students	April, 2010
Communications module with students	90%	admitted students	November, 2010
Email and text messaging with applicants	10%	student applicants	February, 2011
Improve login process for online applications	50%	student applicants	June, 2011
Web single application for multiple institutions	15%	student applicants	June, 2011
<b>Graduation Planner</b>			
Implement tool that assists students to plan	10%	current students	May, 2011
<b>Single Registration</b>			
Waitlist with email communication	100%	students in full courses	February, 2010
Improve searches for courses shared by institutions	100%	shared program students	February, 2010
Search for equivalent courses at other institutions	90%	full course/time conflict	November, 2010
Waitlist communication enhanced text messaging	10%	students in full courses	February, 2011
Real-time web grading	10%	all students	February, 2011
Improve registration for courses at multiple institutions	10%	all students	June, 2011
<b>Single Bill/ Single Pay</b>			
Stronger passwords to better protect student data	100%	all students	November, 2009
Process multi-institution billing with a single transaction	40%	delayed- due to	SWIFT
Provide web access to 1098T and W-2 tax documents	10%	all students	June, 2011
<b>Shared Services</b>			
Student initiated duplicate records merge	100%	all students	April, 2010
Automate student loan approval and certification	10%	loan applicants	April, 2011
<p>*Please note that this is a high level summary of Students First deliverables. Full detail may be found on the Students First website.  <a href="http://www.studentsfirst.project.mnscu.edu">www.studentsfirst.project.mnscu.edu</a></p>			
<p>Jon Eichten email: <a href="mailto:jonathan.eichten@so.mnscu.edu">jonathan.eichten@so.mnscu.edu</a> phone: 651-201-1655</p>			

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**Agenda Item Summary Sheet**

**Committee:** Technology Committee

**Date of Meeting:** September 15, 2010

**Agenda Item:** Office of Legislative Auditor Compliance

- Proposed Policy Change       Approvals Required by Policy       Other Approvals       Monitoring
- Information

**Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:**

Board Chair Paskach requested that the board of Trustees Technology Committee be provided with progress reports on the resolutions of the findings cited by the Legislative Auditor in its February 2010 report, *MnSCU System Office*.

**Scheduled Presenter(s):** Darrel Huish, Vice Chancellor – Chief Information Officer  
Carolyn Parnell, Chief Operations Officer

**Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:**

**Background Information:**

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

<b>INFORMATION ITEM</b>
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR COMPLIANCE

**BACKGROUND**

Chief Operations Officer Carolyn Parnell will provide a report on Information Technology's progress on Office of Legislative Auditor Compliance.



**Office of Legislative Auditor Compliance**  
September 2010

<b>Audit Item and deliverables</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>
<b>Survey campus users on their needs and the performance of new systems</b>		
Campus communication preference survey	100%	May-10
Revive and administer 2006 campus service survey	0%	Dec-10
<b>Allot additional time for user testing and training</b>		
Build user testing and usability evaluation into development cycle	100%	Jun-10
Hire consultant for SF usability studies	100%	May-10
Hire usability architect	80%	Oct-10
Increase resources to provide end -to-end training	0%	TBD
<b>Improve IT system data dictionaries and user manuals</b>		
Improve Research & Data Services (RADS) communication and documentation	85%	Oct-10
Document production data marts, enterprise products, processes, procedures	80%	Oct-10
Develop dashboards for ISRS and RADS data dictionary, and APPL/REPL performance monitoring	95%	Oct-10
Improve APPS documentation and content on data flows, mappings and scheduled processes	75%	Oct-10
Provide updated and current user manuals for each ISRS module	0%	TBD
<b>Closely track the status of individual projects</b>		
Formally assess the PMO and its processes	100%	Mar-10
Improve monthly status reporting by improving report formats, reviewing with business owners	100%	Feb-10
Schedule formal, open monthly status review meetings	100%	May-10
Develop and implement a formal external stakeholder communication plan for each project	100%	Mar-10
Develop and implement formal transition plan for operational support of all projects	50%	Nov-10
Develop a project management database for all PMO and infrastructure projects	100%	Apr-10
<b>Specify project deliverables more clearly in contracts</b>		
Develop and implement contractor statement of work template to be used on all ITS projects	100%	Mar-10
<b>Implement a contractor performance review process</b>		
Develop and implement contractor evaluation template for all ITS projects	100%	Feb-10
Operationalize a formal performance review of the contractor and work delivered	100%	Jun-10
Work with other divisions in the OOC to provide consistency in the contractor evaluation process	0%	Oct-10
<div style="background-color: #e0e0e0; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> <span style="font-size: 2em;">■</span> indicates deliverable is complete.         </div>		

For additional information please contact:

Carolyn Parnell    email: Carolyn.Parnell@csu.mnscu.edu    phone: 651-201-1433