



Scheduling Task Force Meeting Minutes

Date: Monday, March 17, 2014, 2 p.m.

Location: Lee Hall, Room 414

Present: Hall B. Cheshire, Acting Chief Information Officer; Rita F. Dunston, Registrar; Susan E. Knick, Director of Scheduling and Events; Jeffrey W. McClurken, Co-Chair; Mark A. Mermelstein, Director of Campus Recreation; John T. Morello, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs; Christine M. Porter, Director of Residence Life and Commuter Students; Debra J. Schleef, Chair/Professor; Gerald Slezak, Director of IT Support Services; Linda R. Thornton, Associate Director of Business System Analysis; Martin A. Wilder, Co-Chair; Mathew C. Wilkerson, Director of Institutional Research; Susan B. Worrell, Special Assistant to the President for University Events

Absent: Louis A. Martinette, Associate Professor; George R. Meadows, Professor; Keith E. Mellinger, Associate Professor of CAS and Interim Director of Academic and Career Services; Douglas N. Searcy, Vice President for Student Affairs; M. Gregg Stull, Chair/Professor

1. Introduction
 - a. Goal is the meeting to discuss and clarify concerns and comments made on the draft version of the Scheduling Task Force Report to the President
 - b. Task Force members were in agreement on the revisions requested after the first version of the Task Force Report

2. Discussion of Revisions
 - a. One-time versus Recurring Costs
 - i. The one-time costs include the base costs and consultant fees. Recurring costs include the annual service agreements, which might increase once the University purchases add-ons.
 - b. Installation of Glance
 - i. We do not have the installation costs for Glance. The price per room goes down with the more rooms you have.
 - ii. Rooms would need to be in EMS before you enable Glance on the rooms. Short-term solutions for the Convergence Center include a web-based system or installing iPads in the rooms until EMS is fully functioning.
 - iii. EMS and Glance should be ready by the time the Campus Center is open.

- iv. A concern was raised regarding the amount of information available about Glance. The Task Force suggests moving forward with five screens as a trial before moving forward with more.
- c. Installation Scheduling
 - i. Plan to implement the system for Fall 2015, which means the system needs to be in place by February 2015.
 - ii. A detailed implementation plan will be developed as the next step, the purpose of this report is to give a general goal.
 - iii. There is a division in recommendations from other institutions as well as among Task Force members in whether the system should be phased in or fully integrated from the beginning.
- d. Implementation Team Size
 - i. The report recommends representatives from the following departments: Events, Registrar, IT, University Relations, Student Affairs, and Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness. Further recommendations to include Facilities and Administration and Finance.
 - ii. Suggested role descriptions were pulled from the EMS Implementation Guidelines.
 - iii. Appointments to the implementation team should be made by the head of each area and made by a certain date.
 - iv. The team will need a project sponsor(s) in order to create a vetting process for resolving decisions within the team.
- e. Project Manager
 - i. The report recommends the project manager coming from IT. Concerns were raised regarding the capability of IT to support the project with current staffing, as well as the UMW community viewing the project as solely IT-based.
 - ii. The project manager, responsible for implementing the project, should be IT-based, but management of the application after implementation should be housed elsewhere. A person or person(s) need to be in charge of policy issues and operations for long-term. After implementation, IT will be responsible for technical updates and support.
 - iii. The implementation team will be responsible for making the decisions about who will be the project manager and what type of time commitment will be required.
- f. Inventory Data Collection
 - i. The implementation team will be responsible for determining the standards of the data and how the data will be collected.
 - ii. Estimated costs of staff support for collecting data will be determined as the implementation team moves forward.
- g. Conflict Resolution
 - i. The Task Force posed a question regarding who has the authority to resolve disputes about the scheduling system moving forward.
 - ii. The implementation team has the authority to make the decision within their group and develop best practices for the system.
- h. Future Decisions

- i. The report lists decisions that need to be made moving forward with implementation. A question was raised regarding the deadline for the decisions being made.
 - ii. The Task Force decided that they are not the group responsible for determining whether the system will be decentralized or centralized.
 - iii. The Task Force will encourage the Provost and academic leadership to determine whether the system will be decentralized or centralized this summer and fall so that the decision can shape the implementation of the system.
 - i. Report conclusion
 - i. The conclusion was rewritten to strengthen the Task Force's recommendations including leadership, policy decisions, and widespread community involvement.
3. Next Steps
- a. The Task Force will receive the final copy of the report that will be presented to the President.

Prepared by: Erika Spivey
Project Coordinator
Office of Events and Office of the President