Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda: The board has asked to be updated on a recurring basis on progress in implementing the approved IT Strategic Investment Plan.

Scheduled Presenter(s): Ken Niemi, Vice Chancellor for Information Technology – Chief Information Officer

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues: Vice Chancellor Niemi will present a review of the current status of FY08 Enterprise Investment projects’ progress, risks and issues.

Background Information: This report provides an update on the progress in implementing the Enterprise Investment Plan and an overview of current project status and issues.
BACKGROUND

The Board of Trustees has asked that they be updated on the ongoing activities in implementing the Enterprise Information Technology Strategic Investment Plan. Since the last update for the Committee in December of last year, significant progress has been made in ongoing project implementation and planning for FY 09 activities.

Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer Ken Niemi will brief the committee on the current status of projects, new project planning and implementation, and highlight any overall issues and concerns.
Enterprise IT Investment Plan Progress FY08 Initiatives

Strategic Directions and Goals Summary 2006-2010

Enterprise Information Technology - FY2008 Major Goals

Network & Data Center Modernization
- 7 State Universities
- 27 Community / Technical Colleges
- Total: $2,167,240

Student Services & Online Learning
- 6 State Universities
- 14 Community / Technical Colleges
- Total: $761,167

Enable Career, Business and Entrepreneurship
- 1 State University
- Total: $100,000

New Technology Architecture
- 2 State Universities
- 9 Community / Technical Colleges
- Total: $291,079

Security Management
- 5 State Universities
- 14 Community / Technical Colleges
- Total: $867,337

Faculty Research and Development
- 6 State Universities
- 12 Community / Technical Colleges
- Total: $575,166

Identity Management
- 1 State University
- 4 Community / Technical Colleges
- Total: $76,000

Retooled Administrative Systems
- 2 State Universities
- 5 Community / Technical Colleges
- Total: $340,980

How the $5,000,000 allocation to campuses is supporting the Strategic Direction and ITS Goals
Strategic Directions and Goals Summary 2006-2010

1. Increase Access & Opportunity
2. Promote and measure high-quality learning programs and services
3. Provide programs and services integral to state and regional economic needs
4. Innovate to meet current and future educational needs efficiently

Enterprise Information Technology - FY2008 Major Goals

Network & Data Center Modernization
- Redundant network paths
- Enterprise performance monitoring tools
- Secondary data center
- Firewall replacement

Student Services & Online Learning
- Diploma transfer for H.S.
- Rags
- ISRS communications module
- Graduation planner

Enable Career, Business and Entrepreneurship
- iseek

New Technology Architecture
- Oracle conversion ISRS
- Uniface to J2EE migration

Projects >$100k

Projects <$100k
Enterprise IT Investment Plan Progress

• MnSCU has one of the largest Wide Area Networks (WANs) within higher education across the entire country
  – Connects all institutions together
  – Connects all of MnSCU to the internet

• Upgraded routers
  – Campuses were exposed to significant risk
  – This involved replacing over $1 MM of infrastructure located on the campuses

• Also connects MnSCU to the University of Minnesota, State and Local Government

Enterprise IT Investment Plan Progress

• Router Upgrade (continued)
  – Nearly 40 router upgrades have now been completed
    • Increases bandwidth and speed
    • Provides expanded capabilities required for new applications
  – Quote
    • “This gets us caught up with current technology and resolves some maintenance issues we deferred for the last few years. While router upgrades are planned for every five years, some of the routers were more than 8 years old.” – Mike Janke, project owner
  – There are a few router upgrades remaining for next quarter and then this maintenance is complete until 2012
Enterprise IT Investment Plan Progress

• Firewall replacement is 2/3 completed
  – Over 70 sites, each requiring a separate firewall
  – In many cases, equipment was at least 8 years old
    • Original plans and industry recommendations call for replacing every 5 years
  – Again, this effort alone was in excess of $1 MM
  – On target for completion by end of FY08

Enterprise IT Investment Plan Progress

• Information Security
  – Campus security assessments are 2/3 completed with a detailed report of the findings delivered to each campus CIO. All remaining assessments have been scheduled.
  – 5 vulnerability management pilots are underway. Vulnerabilities are being identified and reported on.
  – Security Event Monitoring is in the requirements gathering phase. RFP is being developed with an anticipated release date of June 2008. Coordinating RFP process with OET. Working with 5 pilot campuses to validate requirements.
Enterprise IT Investment Plan Progress

• Information Security Awareness Program
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Enterprise IT Investment Plan Progress

• Information Security Awareness Program
  – Joint development effort with the University of Minnesota
  – Supports MnSCU policy to provide security awareness resources for each campus
  – Web-based materials directed to all workforce members, total of 3 courses, easy and quick to complete
  – More than 11,000 employees have participated on the first course, and 10,000 on the second and third courses!

Public Jobs: Private Data
Enterprise IT Investment Plan Progress

• Information Security Awareness Program Quotes
  – “I’ve been working here for 20 years and while I’ve always tried my best to deploy the best security practices, this course provides the rules, standards and the education to ensure I’m doing all that I can, everyday.”
  – “Implementation went very smoothly thanks in large part to the campus teams. I credit them with getting the word out and providing the necessary technical support.”
  – “We received zero calls regarding content issues, disappointments or complaints.”
  – “From the user perspective, it was designed to be short and impactful. The program is directly applicable to their jobs, easy to navigate and each course can be completed in about 20 minutes.

Enterprise IT Investment Plan Progress

• Information Security Assessment Program
  – Security assessments at individual campuses to assist in risk management and compliance monitoring
  – Results in a roadmap tailored for each campus
    • Identifies current status and effectiveness of reporting
    • Also identifies compliance gaps and opportunities
  – Benefits include:
    • Enhanced staff knowledge of data handling practices
    • Protection and control of digital, non-public data
    • Benchmarks across all campuses
  – Phase I & II assessments have been completed and covered 24 institutions
  – Phase III assessments are underway and are scheduled for completion by the end of Q2 2008
Enterprise IT Investment Plan Progress

- For the first time, a disaster recovery site and secondary data center are in place
  - If a natural disaster or other incident occurred 2 years ago, no options were available
  - Full failover for D2L will also be implemented by the end of FY08
    - If D2L goes down, real-time failover will occur
  - Failover capability for ISRS will also be implemented by the end of calendar 2008

Enterprise IT Investment Plan Progress

- MnSCU was running out of storage space, both from a backup and redundancy perspective
  - 8-9 year old equipment
  - The Storage Area Network (SAN) efforts have resulted in automated tape backups
    - Increased operational efficiency
    - Reduced risk of extended down times
Enterprise IT Investment Plan Progress

• Developed the infrastructure to support a single instance of all students, faculty and staff
  – Subset of personal data that doesn’t change based on relationship with MnSCU
  – Allows students to apply at different institutions without repeatedly entering personal information
  – Reduces number of “lost” classes due to name change or older record keeping problems
• Will go live with the Oracle implementation in FY09

Enterprise IT Investment Plan Progress

• R dB to Oracle database conversions
  – Vendor indicated support would be soon be discontinued for the obsolete technology
  – Difficult to find staff with skills to maintain and support
• Will be deployed this summer
  – Eliminates significant technical risk
  – Increases ability to integrate additional disparate applications
  – A big step toward a more flexible infrastructure environment
# Portfolio Management Office Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Projects</th>
<th>Channel Owner</th>
<th>ITS Lead</th>
<th>Project Leader</th>
<th>FY08 Budget</th>
<th>2nd Quarter</th>
<th>3rd Quarter</th>
<th>4th Quarter</th>
<th>FY09 Overall Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Data Center (COB) / Disaster Recover Site</td>
<td>Novak</td>
<td>Berndt</td>
<td>Hertenstien</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DR Site and SAN re-architect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- D2L Failover - Physical components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ISRS Failover - Physical components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- D2L Failover / Recovery Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08 Firewall Replacement</td>
<td>Janke</td>
<td>Janke</td>
<td>Takkella</td>
<td>$458,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability Management Initiative (VMI)</td>
<td>Schuft</td>
<td>Schuft</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of Operations</td>
<td>Schuft</td>
<td>Schuft</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity and Access Management</td>
<td>Essa</td>
<td>Brumbaugh</td>
<td>Clothier</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatic Transfer of High School Data (Planning)</td>
<td>Chabot</td>
<td>Guida/Malecek</td>
<td>Swanson</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP Server Phase II</td>
<td>Rushenberg</td>
<td>Rushenberg</td>
<td>Hertenstein</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Module</td>
<td>Stoddard</td>
<td>Malecek</td>
<td>McDonough</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISEEK Business Solutions (Phase I - Planning)</td>
<td>Jacobson</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDB to Oracle Conversion - ISRS</td>
<td>Chabot</td>
<td>Guida</td>
<td>Wyland</td>
<td>$1,974,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2EE Conversion - HR</td>
<td>Munos</td>
<td>Guida</td>
<td>Swanson</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eTranscript</td>
<td>Langer</td>
<td>Guida</td>
<td>Roering</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Event Monitor</td>
<td>Schuft</td>
<td>Schuft</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>$391,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Security Assessment Program (ISAP)</td>
<td>Schuft</td>
<td>Schuft</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Response (Planning)</td>
<td>Schuft</td>
<td>Schuft</td>
<td>Novak</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eFolio</td>
<td>Langer</td>
<td>Essa</td>
<td>Swanson</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Planner (Planning)</td>
<td>Langer</td>
<td>Malecek</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundant Network Paths</td>
<td>Janke</td>
<td>Janke</td>
<td>Takkella</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRS Communication Module</td>
<td>Chabot</td>
<td>Guida/Malecek</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$288,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Learning Objects/Expand Gaming Capacity</td>
<td>Langer</td>
<td>Dickhudt</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance Improvements</td>
<td>Chabot/Essa</td>
<td>Guida</td>
<td>Roering</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPS - Iterations I - III</td>
<td>Schoenecker</td>
<td>Rushenberg</td>
<td>Braun</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unifier/PMIS Integration with ISRS</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Malecek</td>
<td>McDonough</td>
<td>$264,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Enhancements for Campuses</td>
<td>Chabot</td>
<td>Guida</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2EE Conversion - Accounting</td>
<td>Stoddard</td>
<td>Guida</td>
<td>Swanson</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification and Compensation</td>
<td>Skallman</td>
<td>Malecek</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARS/CAS Modifications</td>
<td>Langer</td>
<td>Malecek</td>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs Website</td>
<td>Kohl</td>
<td>Crandall</td>
<td>Crandall</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progress Key**
- Planning
- Targeted Execution
- Execution
- Projected Project Start
- Project is on plan
- Minor issues exist, currently being addressed
- Major issues exist, project is at risk
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### Portfolio Management Office Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inactive Projects</th>
<th>Channel Owner</th>
<th>ITS Lead</th>
<th>Project Leader</th>
<th>FY08 Budget</th>
<th>2nd Quarter</th>
<th>3rd Quarter</th>
<th>4th Quarter</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>Current Overall Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Performance Monitoring Tools</td>
<td>Janke</td>
<td>Janke</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIS (Planning)</td>
<td>Stoddard</td>
<td>Malecek</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prinsys</td>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>Malecek</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISEEK Business Solutions (Phase II - Execution)</td>
<td>Jacobson</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Modifications</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>Malecek</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Library Access Proxy</td>
<td>Langer</td>
<td>Janke</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Housing Module</td>
<td>Bier</td>
<td>Malecek</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Deposit Module</td>
<td>Stoddard</td>
<td>Malecek</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations and Grievance Management</td>
<td>Leary</td>
<td>Malecek</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Compensation Module</td>
<td>Skallman</td>
<td>Malecek</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Tracking</td>
<td>Skallman</td>
<td>Malecek</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progress Key**
- Planning
- Targeted Execution
- Execution
- Projected Project Start
- Project is on plan
- Minor issues exist, currently being addressed
- Major issues exist, project is at risk

Page 2
Additional Details on Project Issues

As of February 29, 2008

- The following pages provide additional details for all projects reporting an overall status of “yellow”
  - “Yellow” is defined as issues exist, but are currently being addressed
- Reflects status as of February 29
FY08 Firewall Replacement

- **Overall Status**
  - Yellow – project has been re-prioritized and is now being executed as high-priority
- **Schedule**
  - Yellow – behind original schedule, reset completion date to June 08
- **Scope**
  - Green – scope change documentation has now been completed
- **Cost/Resources**
  - Green – on track

Continuity of Operations (COOP)

- **Overall Status**
  - Yellow – project currently behind schedule
- **Schedule**
  - Yellow – 2 sub-teams have not completed updates, schedule has been adjusted
- **Scope**
  - Green – no major impact to scope
- **Cost/Resources**
  - Green – on track
Identity and Access Management (IAM) Program

- Overall Status
  - Yellow – need operations and infrastructure team support of technical component build, decision to utilize Sun System integrators to assist will impact budget
- Schedule
  - Yellow – will be re-baselined in March based on recommendation from Sun
- Scope
  - Green – critical milestones, deliverables and decision points have been realigned
- Cost/Resources
  - Green – although if outside Sun contractors are utilized, project budget will be impacted

Cap Server Phase II

- Overall Status
  - Yellow – one campus will not have access revoked to the old queries until April, everything else proceeding as planned
- Schedule
  - Green – all other access to old queries was revoked on February 29th with minimal issues
- Scope
  - Green – no anticipated changes
- Cost/Resources
  - Green – anticipated requests for campuses have been taken into account and resource staffing has been planned accordingly
Redundant Network Paths

- Overall Status
  - Yellow – re-planning in progress
- Schedule
  - Yellow – revised plan in progress
- Scope
  - Yellow – additional potential changes are being evaluated
- Cost/Resources
  - Yellow – details being finalized, pending outcome of scope changes

Unifier / PMIS Integration with ISRS

- Overall Status
  - Yellow – experiencing delays with receiving information and data from vendor and business unit
- Schedule
  - Yellow – testing is behind schedule due to delays in defining business processes. Waiting for response from vendor to determine schedule impact
- Scope
  - Yellow – additional business process transactions have been identified, impacting time and complexity of project
- Cost/Resources
  - Green – additional funding request has been approved
Cross-functional Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting Summary

Cross-Functional Advisory Group Participants

- **AFSCME**
  - Karen Foreman, MnSCU Policy Committee
- **IFO**
  - Nancy Black, President
  - Russ Stanton, Dir., Gov't Relations
  - Kathy Summa, Academic Affairs, WSU
- **MAPE**
  - Melissa Ameson, BSU
  - (Lucinda Jones, Normandale CC)
- **MSCF**
  - Joe Juaire, Treasurer
  - Kendal Loewen, St. Paul College
  - (Greg Mulcahy, President)
  - (Warren Sheaffer, St. Paul College)
- **MSCSA**
  - (Scott Formo, President)
  - Jason Fossum, Director, Government Relations
- **MSUAAFS**
  - Ed Bouffard, SCSU
  - Leo Morgan, BSU
- **MSUSA**
  - Kelly Asche, Organizing Director
  - (Kara Brockett, State Chair)
  - ( ) unable to attend
- **ASA**
  - (Lisa Erwin, BSU)
  - (Irene Kovala, MCTC)
  - Mike Lopez, OOC
  - John O'Brien, Century College
  - Patrick Opatz, OOC
- **Finance**
  - Mike Nordby, OOC
  - Jeff Stierken, OCC
  - Dave Thorn, WSU
  - Christina Vopatek, Central Lakes College
- **HR**
  - Sue Appelquist, North Hennepin CC
  - Heather Kild, OOC
  - Annie Salter, St. Cloud TC
  - Johanna Simpson, MSU Mankato
- **ITS**
  - Joanne Chabot, OOC
  - Mark Peterson, Inver Hills CC
  - Bev Schuett, OCC
  - Kristi Torngquist, SCSU
Objectives of the Initial Meeting

• Provide an overview to the CAG of:
  – The 2006 long range IT strategic investment plan
  – The background and origin of the current biennium legislative ITS funding request
  – FY07 and FY08 accomplishments
  – Preliminary FY09 planning
    • Revised process
    • High level review of proposed initiatives

Results

• Solid participation and lively discussion on all topics
  – Many diverse viewpoints across the student, faculty and campus representatives
    • However, feedback indicated that individuals appreciated hearing the perspectives from different stakeholder groups
  – Intense discussions on some topics which involved conflicting opinions between faculty representatives and student representatives
  – Participants view the CAG as an opportunity to have input and influence the EIC process / decisions
• True consensus reached on recommendations to EIC
  – Identified additional questions to be answered and outstanding issues to be addressed
• Significant feedback and suggestions on how to improve the process
  – Responsibility is now shared with this group to become and remain involved
Results

• Desire an allocation of project funds to complete the “smaller things” in each of the following categories:
  – Faculty
  – Students
  – Administration
  – Staff

Results

• Near the end of the meeting, there was a revelation
  – This group would like to identify projects and ask the EIC to direct the development of business cases for these projects
• Group is cautiously optimistic that they will be heard and can have an impact
  – These meetings alone do not represent faculty, student and staff input, but can be a path in that direction
Expectations

- PMO will take the feedback provided and deliver to the EIC
- EIC will receive and acknowledge the feedback, and provide a response
  - Confirm agreement
  - Explain why a different decision / path was taken
- PMO will deliver feedback to the CAG

When do we Know the Process Works?

- “CAG wants to see that their comments can influence EIC decisions”
- “When the EIC kills a project mid-stream or doesn’t provide the next gate of funding based on CAG recommendations”
- “When the EIC allocates no additional funding because the business cases presented don’t merit it”