



Scheduling Task Force Meeting Minutes

Date: Monday, September 23, 2013, 2 p.m.

Location: Lee Hall, Room 414

Present: Kevin T. Caffrey, Senior Associate Registrar; Hall B. Cheshire, Acting Chief Information Officer; Megan L. Higginbotham, Assistant Director of Student Activities and Engagement; Margot Jebb, Area Coordinator for Residence Life; Susan E. Knick, Director of Scheduling and Events; Louis A. Martinette, Associate Professor; Jeffrey W. McClurken, Co-Chair; 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

Absent: George R. Meadows, Professor

1. Subcommittee Reports

a. Available Systems

Presented by Hall B. Cheshire, Acting Chief Information Officer

- i. Made modifications to discovery tracking methods
- ii. Met with RoomWizard representatives
 1. Does not claim to be an enterprise scheduling system is an option for an interim system
 2. Has interactive screens for outside of each space that allows the user to view the room schedule and book time; one device serves as the primary server
 3. Drawbacks: big investment and device is not able to integrate with other systems
- iii. Will meet with Ad Astra, Infosilem, Kenetic

b. List of Needs

Presented by John T. Morello, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs

- i. Created two prioritized lists:
 - 1. List of Needs – required abilities of the new system
 - 2. Product Selection Criteria – preferred abilities for the new system
- ii. Focused on simplified concepts of each need instead of listing specific abilities separately
- c. Institutional Comparisons

Presented by Gerald Slezak, Director of IT Support Services

- i. Interviewed 24 individuals at 18 different institutions, including COPLAC and public Virginia schools
- ii. Only 3 systems that were represented: EMS, R25/25, and Ad Astra
- iii. Feedback:
 - 1. Most individuals expressed satisfaction with their system
 - 2. A few institutions were using the systems for residential scheduling too
 - 3. Made good contacts that offered to provide guidance or assistance
- iv. Common themes in discussions:
 - 1. Many schools are not fully utilizing all the tools
 - 2. Set-up and operation are complex from an IT standpoint
 - 3. Culture and process has as much to do with successful scheduling as the system; leadership at the top is important to encourage departments to move to the new system

2. Discussion

- a. Items Included in the List of Needs/Product Selection Criteria
 - i. Residence hall room assignments was removed from the List of Needs
 - ii. Granularity was discussed as a need but remained on the List of Preferences
 - iii. Integration with Banner was moved to the List of Needs
 - iv. Accessibility and systems security will be included in the Product Selection Criteria
- b. Prioritization for List of Needs/Product Selection Criteria
 - i. No issues with prioritization
 - ii. Clarification that while all items on the List of Needs are required, prioritization is important because some systems may have a higher ability to complete some tasks over others
- c. Demonstrations
 - i. The List of Needs and Product Selection Criteria are well-formatted for soliciting feedback from the UMW community, but a more detailed list

will need to be provided to vendors to ensure accurate comparisons between systems and fully understand their capabilities

3. Next Steps

- a. By the next meeting:
 - i. Solicit the UMW community for comments on the List of Needs and Product Selection Criteria
 - ii. Available Systems Subcommittee will meet with remaining vendors
- b. During the next meeting:
 - i. Review comments from the UMW community regarding the List of Needs and Product Selection Criteria
 - ii. Decide whether existing systems on state contracts offer sufficient options for UMW's new system and set up demonstrations
- c. The RFP process will take place only if the systems on existing state contracts do not meet our needs as the process will lengthen the implementation process

Next Meeting: Monday, October 7, 2013 at 2 p.m., Lee Hall 414.

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