Scheduling Task Force Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, August 6, 2013, 12 p.m.
Lee Hall, Room 414

Date: Tuesday, August 6, 2013, 12 p.m.
Location: Lee Hall, Room 414
Present: Hall B. Cheshire, Acting Chief Information Officer; Rita F. Dunston, Registrar; Megan L. Higginbotham, Assistant Director of Student Activities and Engagement; Louis A. Martinette, Associate Professor; Jeffrey W. McClurken, Co-Chair; George R. Meadows, Professor; John T. Morello, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs; Fred A. Pierce, Associate Provost for Enrollment and Student Services; Christine M. Porter, Director of Residence Life and Commuter Students; Debra J. Schleef, Chair/Professor; Douglas N. Searcy, Vice President for Student Affairs; Gerald Slezak, Director of IT Support Services; Erika P. Spivey, Administrative Support; M. Gregg Stull, Chair/Professor; Linda R. Thornton, Associate Director of Business System Analysis; Martin A. Wilder, Co-Chair; Matthew C. Wilkerson, Director of Institutional Research; Susan B. Worrell, Special Assistant to the President for University Events

Note: Dr. Searcy participated via conference call.

1. Charge
a. The committee has been charged by the President with finding an enterprise scheduling system that meets the needs of departments across campus.
b. Project is a priority and progress needs to be made quickly, especially due to:
i. Student Center and Convergence Center opening
ii. Expansion of the Summer Conferencing program
2. Introductions
a. Committee members introduced themselves and stated their interest in the scheduling system project.
3. Current Systems
a. Academic Scheduling
i. Each department has first preference in scheduling a set of rooms and also has access to a set of shared rooms in their building. The departments within each building schedules to meet their needs and then opens up the rooms to other departments. Department chairs submit Excel sheets with
their room requests to the Registrar, who then submits the schedule to the Director of Scheduling. After the semester starts, all scheduling responsibility is given to the Director of Scheduling.
b. Events Scheduling
i. Most event scheduling is run through WebEvent. The Director of Scheduling approves room reservations as requests are received. Reservations can also be made manually through WebEvent, but the Director of Scheduling is not automatically made aware of these reservations and the user is not able to view all actual available spaces.
c. Residence Life Scheduling
i. Event spaces overseen by Residence Life are managed manually with a calendar. Residence Life also handles key access for the event spaces that require access. Residence Hall room assignments are managed manually. Students have priority access to the lounges in the residence halls.
d. Student Activities Systems
i. Students submit requests for spaces using OrgSync. A Student Activities staff member submits the information to the Director of Scheduling. There is no automatic confirmation process.
e. Other Systems
i. Some departments control spaces on campus that are not available on campus-wide calendars.
ii. The Events AV Office creates a manual calendar to determine which events require AV support.
iii. The Dahlgren uses RoomView to schedule classrooms and other spaces.
iv. Canvas has a scheduling feature, mostly used for faculty office hours appointments.
v. Group study rooms in the library are not currently scheduled.
4. Previous Work
a. 2005-2006 Research Group
i. Search for a scheduling program to integrate with banner was unsuccessful due to software limitations and the unresolved conflict between priority for events vs. academic needs.
b. Enrollment Management
i. At the direction of the Interim Provost, Enrollment Management began research on a scheduling system. Scheduling systems to support academic activities were found, but several policy issues regarding "ownership" of space were brought forward.
c. Office of Events Research
i. Looked at a number of scheduling systems, most recently Kinetic Software. Other available systems include R25, Ad Astra, and EMS.
d. Current Contracts
i. Erma Baker is looking at contracts with other Virginia institutions that UMW could ride. The list of required needs will determine which RFPs the University could ride or if we would need to issue a new RFP.
5. Timeline
a. Gather Information
i. Create a prioritized list of needs: Solicit input from the UMW community on current department scheduling needs. A rough working list of needs was provided to the task force with the appointment letters to serve as a starting point for building the list.
ii. Research available systems: Research available systems and determine how well each system can meet the University's needs.
iii. Compare systems at other institutions: Determine which systems are being used by other institutions and gather feedback from their experiences.
b. Solicit demos
i. Requested demos should address the specific list of University needs.
ii. All demos will be open to the UMW community.
c. Make Recommendations
i. Product Selection
ii. Implementation/Ownership/Management
iii. Policy and Operations Issues
6. Other Factors/Issues
a. Implementation
i. Question of whether implementation should be done all at once or one step at a time was discussed. Implementation timeline will need to be developed. Process will need to include building and verification of data base for room inventory, ongoing maintenance of system.
b. Representation
i. Please contact Dr. Wilder or Dr. McClurken if a department or area is not being represented in the committee. While not every area can have a representative on the task force, it is important that all perspectives be considered.
c. Budget
i. Costs of creating a building inventory, staffing, implementation, and maintenance must be considered.
ii. Should compare costs from other institutions.
d. Number of Systems
i. The committee was assigned to find a solution that best meets the majority of needs of both events and academics, which may include more than one system. Ideally a single, comprehensive enterprise solution can be found; however, need to keep open mind to other possibilities at this point.
e. Ownership
i. The committee will need to address issues of "ownership" of space and recommended levels of access to campus spaces. The system should allow for granular assignment of scheduling control, but varying levels of approval authority will need to be established.

## f. Software Preferences

i. Software capabilities that are preferred, but not required, should be included in the list of needs. A subcommittee will prioritize the list of needs to ensure that necessary needs are fulfilled, and preferred options are considered.
g. Interim System
i. Suggestion to create a subcommittee to determine whether an interim scheduling system for managing the Convergence and Student centers will be necessary.
7. Meeting Schedule
a. The committee will meet every two weeks until December. Meetings will be held at 2 p.m. every other Monday, with the next meeting on August 26.
8. Immediate Tasks
a. Communication with the UMW Community
i. The work of the task force will be transparent, with minutes posted online. Broad input will be solicited and the UMW community will be invited to software demos. It is important that task force members act as ambassadors for the project to inform others about the work and to bring back information to the task force meetings
ii. A list of talking points will be created to assist members in spreading information about the task force.
b. Assemble list of needs for each area
i. Task force members should solicit input on the list of needs from his or her department.
c. Subcommittees
i. Each committee member should submit preferences for the following subcommittees: Develop Prioritized List of Needs; Research Available Systems; Contact Other Institutions.

Next Meeting: Monday, August 26, 2013 at 2 p.m., Lee Hall 414.
Prepared by: Erika Spivey
Project Coordinator
Office of Events and Office of the President

