



## Scheduling Task Force Meeting Minutes

**Date:** Monday, October 7, 2013, 2 p.m.

**Location:** Lee Hall, Room 414

**Present:** Kevin T. Caffrey, Senior Associate Registrar; Hall B. Cheshire, Acting Chief Information Officer; Rita F. Dunston, Registrar; Megan L. Higginbotham, Assistant Director of Student Activities and Engagement; Susan E. Knick, Director of Scheduling and Events; Louis A. Martinette, Associate Professor; Jeffrey W. McClurken, Co-Chair; George R. Meadows, Professor; Keith E. Mellinger, Associate Professor of CAS and Interim Director of Academic and Career Services; John T. Morello, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs; 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; M. Gregg Stull, Chair/Professor; 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

1. Report from Vendor Survey (Available Systems Subcommittee)  
*Presented by Hall B. Cheshire, Acting Chief Information Officer*
  - a. Subcommittee had one-hour phone calls with six out of nine of the leading market vendors. Remaining three vendors are smaller, niche products.
  - b. Vendors were asked questions in a series of categories. Most vendors seem to be able to do most of the things UMW will require.
  - c. Notes on the survey responses:
    - i. Infosilem is a Canadian company breaking into the U.S. market.
    - ii. Most vendors have regular business service hours, not 24-hour service.
    - iii. EMS and RoomWizard are on state contracts; need to determine if R25/25 or Ad Astra are on state contracts.
  - d. Ruled out RoomWizard due to expenses and lack of integration with Banner, among other reasons.
  - e. The goal is to have one system, not two systems, to avoid complicating the implementation process.

2. Revise List of Needs Based on Community Comments
  - a. Level of granularity was discussed multiple times.
  - b. Many community comments are about process, but not about the product.
  - c. Will include Athletics and Facilities representatives in the vendor demonstrations.
  - d. Will include community comments in the expanded List of Needs.
  
3. Moving forward: RFP or vendor on state contracts
  - a. The RFP process will extend the timeline and process of implementing a new system. It is preferable to go with a state contract.
  - b. Jeff McClurken will speak with Hall Cheshire and Erma Baker to determine if Ad Astra and R25/25 have state contracts. If all three have state contracts, the committee will move forward with vendor demonstrations for those three vendors. If not all three have state contracts, the committee will re-evaluate so multiple vendors are being taken into the demonstration phase.
  
4. Moving forward: Creating a more detailed needs list
  - a. Each vendor would receive the expanded list of needs and list of scenarios for the demonstrations. Vendors would be given time limits on specific topics so all issues are fully addressed.
  - b. Each committee member to look over the main list, the sub-categories on the Available Systems matrix, and comments from the Institutional Comparison group to review and expand the List of Needs.

Next Meeting: Monday, October 21, 2013 at 2 p.m., Lee Hall 414.

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