PolyComm Status
Craig Schultz reviewed the current status of the project. Significant progress has been made on the RFP. The PolyComm Chairs and working group have completed needs analysis and requirements have been identified. These are not being reviewed and categorized for inclusion in the RFP. The RFP was originally targeted to be complete by 3/17; that has now been extended to 3/20. This will not cause any slippage on the backend. The formal bids process is scheduled to open 4/29. The current high level schedule is to complete Contracts and Procurement in June; begin development test and site preparation in July with development and testing completed by September. The first
pilot group would then be activated in late September or early October. The target would be to complete implementation in late December.

Dave Ross will lead Phase II of the project which is Implementation. He is looking for advice regarding the implementation plan and in particular the optimum size and make up of the pilot group. Bowker recommended that campus technical support personnel be given access as soon as possible. Dave confirmed that the pilot group would include technical group and power users.

Craig will come back to group with profiling types to cross-check implementation. Craig made special note that the Contracts and Procurement team; specifically, Greg and Brenda have done an enormous amount of work and have been extremely helpful during this process.

**Ad Hoc Web Refresh**

Dave Ross reviewed handout “University Identity and Communication Elements Required for Official Cal Poly Web Pages.” ITS has been working for over a year to determine what needed to be done to provide a consistent look and feel across the multitude of Cal Poly website pages. Steve Rutland showed a slide of a variety of Cal poly website pages, demonstrating the current lack of uniformity. ITS conducted a Web survey of users as well as various focus group meetings. These resulted in solid findings which help to drive the document. The document reflects minimum required elements for web page and campus websites. Cal Poly web sites will not be actively “policed” for use of these elements but campus senior management is highly encouraging their use. Would like people to comply the next time they upgrade their site.

David Mason pointed out that previous design suggestions did not last very long and process was difficult to follow; asked what will be done to insure conformity this time. Dave Ross responded that 4 different designs for home page were presented based on the information received. One was chosen, changes being made, will re-present in mid April to the Web Ad Hoc group. If approved, templates will be built that include minimum requirements but are flexible enough to allow for individual innovation. Steve discussed the Web Authoring Resource Center which will cover all aspects of building a website and provide resources, style guides will be included to further ease the development of Web sites incorporating the minimum elements. This will be presented at the next LAN coordinators meeting, 4/15. While the sites will be monitored, it is anticipated that by providing the tools and templates, and with the support of IRMPCC and executives, the process will be broadly adopted. The branding effort, including color standards, has been turned over to Public Affairs. This process is the foundation of “branding” strategies to be expanded in the future.

**Online Grading/WaitListing**

This item was brought forward from the IACC. Members of the IACC were expecting online grading to be activated within Blackboard sometime in the Spring quarter. Some of the members had been promoting this with their faculty and were disappointed not to see something yet. Dave Ross from ITS told the IACC that this might not be possible due to campus resource prioritization conflicts. He suggested the discussion move to the AACC.

Dave Ross indicated that technically the best solution appeared to be to build a portal channel which would feed from the Blackboard, learning management system gradebook but also allow direct grade input within the channel. These grades would in turn be fed into SIS+. This would automatically pull in grades for anyone using Blackboard Gradebook and also provide a means for those who don’t use Blackboard to plug in grades online. As the business process owner, OAR would need to determine best process.
Tom Zuur provided some history regarding online grading. OAR has been on record that they want to have electronic grade collection but they do not want to manage and support 2 disparate processes; paper and electronic. They would want to transition completely to electronic. Our current Student Administration vendor, SCT has been offering the Web for Faculty module that included a grade collection process. However a couple of years ago it was decided not to put more money into the SCT system, given the upcoming CMS Student Administration implementation.

Tom wanted everyone to be aware that there was a lot of work in transitioning from process to process. OAR’s current top priorities are Degree Works and the Student Administration Needs Assessment. Degrees Works is a large implementation project which has been a daily challenge and will continue to be for quite some time. The Needs Assessment will address requirements for whatever future system we will chose and certainly online grading as well as other types of functionality will be addressed. These two priorities are requiring what little extra staff time is available beyond what is required to keep current critical business processes working and performing normal ending term and grading processes as well as new term start up processes. Tom agreed that online grading is desirable for students, faculty and staff. He doesn’t know how to fold that priority in with all the others because it is a big project in itself. Basically it all boils down to a prioritization issue; how do we stack this project against other key issues and projects that are being worked on and how can it fit into the schedule effectively.

An overall discussion regarding the IACC/AACC/SC3 sweep process and overall annual IT prioritization process then ensued. Everyone agreed that there was no existing process that took all the sweep input as a whole and then prioritized the various tasks/projects based on BOTH technical and functional resource availability. Some kind of joint committee/meeting with representatives from the 3 committees as well as key functional staff organizations such as AFD and ESS would be appropriate to do this prioritization. There also needed to be a process by which ITS tasks/projects originating from other standing committees such as RegSched etc could be addressed in this process. A prioritized joint list could then be passed on to the IRMPPC for further discussion regarding prioritization and funding. George and Dave agreed to develop a strawman and discuss this further with Jerry Hanley, Chair of the IRMPPC.