



Date: October 13, 2009
To: Statewide Executive Group
From: Beth Behner, Chief HR Officer, Joe Trubacz, VP Finance, Steve Smith, Chief IT Officer
Re: Recommendations Based on Statewide IT Automation Review by Professor Charlie Dexter

A review of automation support at Statewide was sponsored by Joe Trubacz, Beth Behner and Steve Smith. Professor Charlie Dexter conducted the review and issued a report on July 23, 2009 after interviews with individuals at all MAUs. He suggested that we undertake three phases of recommendations: those to occur immediately or within 6 months, those to follow the completion of the first phase, and those to occur one year after the completion of the earlier two sets of activities. Following our review and consideration of Professor Dexter's report and specific recommendations (described on pages 7 and 8 of his report), we are forwarding our analysis and proposed next steps concerning those recommendations. Paragraphs in this memo have been numbered consistently with the recommendations made by Professor Dexter.

1. Professor Dexter notes the need to regularly communicate project status to stakeholders, address issues and resolve misunderstandings between SW and the campuses.

We agree that the OIT Project Management Office (PMO) could provide needed oversight and coordination for the System in the area of project communication, while in our view the SW functional areas that manage projects should continue to provide updates and regular communication concerning those projects. As an area of needed follow up with ITEC, some MAU communications, such as those between project workteam members and campus leaders, need to be enhanced so there is an effective level of awareness of automation project details for decision making and priority setting. Another clear finding from Professor Dexter's interviews is that both Statewide and campus employees participating in project work need to be willing to collaborate and recognize the value of each others' roles.

We would recommend the following specific actions:

- The review sponsors and PMO will work with Statewide Public Affairs to identify ways to improve information distribution and exchange about systemwide automation projects.
- The review sponsors and the PMO will study the existing systemwide groups/councils to clarify their roles both in providing input as well as distributing information to their members. We will identify areas in which communication and relationships support productive, efficient project work, and see if there are lessons for other groups.
- The PMO will review and make recommendations to refine information sharing through websites.
- The PMO will work with the Portfolio Management Team (PMT) to provide a central view of all Systemwide automation projects.
 - The PMT is scheduled to recommend a standard format for project status reporting in November. After that, PMT should set an expectation for the frequency of regular updates for projects to be done by each project manager.

This frequency would be reviewed by the PMT with ITEC, and adjusted if needed.

- The PMO and PMT will determine a tool and appropriate website location for project status and management reports, with information available to the public and maintained by individual project portfolio managers.

Key timeframes/milestones:

- Working with the review sponsors, the PMO will begin work with Public Affairs in September with an objective to test new communication approaches by January 2010.
 - Working with all necessary stakeholders, the PMO will review and report to the review sponsors and ITEC the membership and roles of existing systemwide committees and groups starting in December 2009 with a summary completed by March 2010.
 - With PMT participation and ITEC review, the PMO will provide guidance on project-related communication, input and decision-making role for each systemwide committee and group by April 2010.
 - The PMO will work with PMT to adopt/disseminate a standard portfolio format in December and implement its use to share information by May 2010. This date is to accommodate the current workload and the Banner 8 upgrade in February 2010.
2. Professor Dexter recommends that current and future projects should be inventoried and prioritized against each other. Additionally, he recommends that each project should be assigned to a responsible project manager, who will be held accountable for project deliverables.

The review sponsors agree with this recommendation, and believe these issues will be addressed through the current efforts of the PMT, which is acquiring project status data from all participants. The structure and processes of PMT and ITEC are fairly new and are still evolving. Some tasks such as identifying the definition of a “project,” the required qualifications for project managers and UA’s method of selecting project managers and determining their performance expectations may still need to be developed. It is expected that PMT and ITEC will review these topics and establish guidelines in these areas.

3. Professor Dexter recommends that Statewide and campus IT leaders develop a complete service catalog to identify all service lines and services across the UA system.

The review sponsors agree with this recommendation. UAA has already provided its service catalog, and if other MAUs had similar inventories available, it would permit more informed review and decision-making to further goals of improving efficiency, reducing redundancies and promoting standardization across the system.

We would recommend the following specific actions:

- The PMO will facilitate the work for the UA System to ensure that IT services are listed and described in a format that can most usefully inform the UA community and be utilized by OIT and ITEC.
 - OIT will complete work on a Service Catalog that will be part of the updated OIT web site. Other Statewide groups can then use lessons learned in developing this catalog to develop a Service Catalog for Human Resources, Finance, and Student Services. Following consultation with ITEC, all campuses who have not done so will then be asked to develop/submit service catalogs.

Key timeframes/milestones:

- OIT will complete its Service Catalog by December 2009.
 - Human Resources, Finance and Student Services will complete their catalogs by April 2010.
 - A Systemwide Service Catalog will be completed by August 2010.
4. Professor Dexter recommends that ITEC articulate requirements for projects, soliciting ideas from campuses before developing solutions. He states that ITEC should communicate priorities and timelines for IT system improvements, prioritizing more rigorously UA's ambitious collection of current and possible future automation projects. He also notes that once priorities are set through ITEC, other UA leaders must address the issue of resources to fulfill the priority goals.

The review sponsors are in agreement with this recommendation and believe the new structures and processes of PMT and ITEC, with the system and campus representative's in those groups, can address the first two areas. The VP of Finance and the CITO will identify and lead the process of addressing resource issues, and will request input from ITEC, the Business Council, the President's Cabinet, SAC, SSC and other stakeholder groups, before making a recommendation to the President.

5. Professor Dexter recommends that all Statewide automation project management resources be centralized under the command of a new high level OIT position. The position would be tasked with supervising project management staff and would control automation-related budgets for the system. Professor Dexter advises that this position be created after agreement on the systemwide service catalog and the delineation of campus/statewide project responsibilities.

It is clear that this recommendation by Professor Dexter involves not just the reporting line of system project managers, but also encompasses the alignment of automation project work, position and resources throughout the system. The review sponsors will defer making a recommendation on this topic to the president for at least a year until service catalogs are created, the collection of projects in the entire system can be analyzed, and it can be determined whether our focus on improvements in the areas of communication and collaboration have yielded positive results. It is our view that while PMT and ITEC need further time to develop, the work and responsibilities undertaken by these groups will benefit project management

throughout the system, including project processes, procedures, priority setting and decision-making. Within that same time, the PMO will be at an enhanced level of participation and involvement as a result of our recommendations.

6. Professor Dexter recommends that an IT consulting firm be hired one year following the hire of an Executive Director of IT and centralization of IT automation resources, to conduct an efficiency study to determine if cost savings and improved responsiveness can be obtained.

As this recommendation is specifically conditioned on prior centralization of IT automation resources and the hire of a new executive level project manager position in OIT, the review sponsors will defer a response regarding this recommendation until decisions are made on those recommendations.

Summary

The review sponsors appreciate Professor Dexter's work and the thought-provoking discussions that have since taken place with Statewide and campus colleagues concerning his report.

The follow up steps we have recommended in the areas described in this memo are important and need to be tracked as a formal project. The three of us will be sponsors.

Additional key timeframes/milestones:

- Project sponsors will report on these recommendations to PMT, ITEC and Business Council at upcoming meetings.
- PMO will complete a discovery proposal for this project (Statewide Automation Improvement) and project sponsors will appoint a project manager within 30 business days upon approval by Steve, Beth, and Joe.
- To evaluate the success of the outlined efforts, a baseline survey will be conducted by the PMO with various users (e.g. Vice-Chancellors, User Groups, and Directors) throughout the system and annual thereafter. The Project Sponsors will review the results of the surveys to determine if any implementation corrections are necessary.