Information Technology Executive Council

AGENDA

July 18, 2008, 12:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Fairbanks: Sherman Carter Conference Room
Anchorage: ADMINISTRATION 201

FACILITATORS | Jim Johnsen / UA PMO, Steve Mullins
NOTE TAKER | Steve Mullins
PARTICIPANTS | Ro Bailey, Mike Driscoll, Jim Johnsen, Steve Smith, and Steve Mullins (John Pugh and Dan Julius are out of the office)

Agenda topics

* Follow-up on Open Action Items (see below) from May 29, 2008 APEG / ITEC meeting.
* Discuss, revise, and approve Draft Governance (see attached governance diagrams)
* Discuss strategy (see attached strategy)
* Status update for Enterprise Content Management (Onbase, Document Imaging)
* Status update and legislative financial requests for Management Reporting Systems (see attached report), electronic Research Administration, Databrowser (see attached requirements), and Travel Management

Open Action Items

1. Ro Bailey to meet with Buck Sharpton and report back to ITEC and PMO.
2. Steve Smith: Prepare a memo from the President speaking to the original charge for MyUA. The Draft memo to be reviewed by ITEC. Memo should indicate the high-level objectives for information access for across the UA system and should task ITEC with fully specifying the needs, identifying possible solutions, and, if possible, implementing a technical solution or solutions that meet those needs.
3. Facilities committee needs to review the Facility Focus project. (Steve Mullins) In talking with Joe Trubacz, he will schedule this topic for a meeting in July.
1.0 Discuss Open Action Items from previous meeting

**Discussion**

1. Action Item: Ro Bailey to meet with Buck Sharpton and report back to ITEC and PMO → Discussion: **Ro informed the ITEC that she did meet with Buck and was waiting for feedback from him.**

2. Action Item: Steve Smith to prepare a memo from the President speaking to the original charge for MyUA. The Draft memo to be reviewed by ITEC. Memo should indicate the high-level objectives for information access for across the UA system and should task ITEC with fully specifying the needs, identifying possible solutions, and, if possible, implementing a technical solution or solutions that meet those needs. **Discussion:** **Steve Smith has not been in a position to generate the memo. Steve expects to release a draft of the memo to ITEC within the next two weeks.**

3. Action Item Facilities committee needs to review the Facility Focus project. Discussion: **Steve Mullins has spoken with Joe. Joe is scheduling the Facility Focus project for discussion with the Facilities Council’s end of July meeting.**

**CONCLUSIONS**

**ACTION ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
<th>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have the first two action items on the September ITEC meeting.</td>
<td>UA PMO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MINUTE

2.0 Jim Johnsen transition

**Discussion**

Jim Johnsen announced that Joe Trubacz would be taking over for him in chairing the ITEC group. Joe will be the new champion for the ITEC / governance effort.

**CONCLUSIONS**

**ACTION ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
<th>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have Joe Trubacz added to the sditec email distribution list.</td>
<td>UA PMO</td>
<td>Completed 7/23/08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95 MINUTES

3.0 Governance

**Discussion**

Jim suggested the conversation on governance begin with a review of the email feedback sent by Mike to the ITEC on June 23rd. *There was a brief discussion on how quickly and by whom the APEG title was changed to ITEC. Does the name imply endorsement by the President? Answer: no. Later in the discussion, however, the question was raised as to the Board of Regents’ role as well as their policy and regulations. It was decided to seek the President’s approval of the governance structure rather than going the policy and regulation route. In addition, it was decided that Steve Smith should inform the Board of Regents in September of the governance. It is not the board’s role to approve the governance structure. Although disagreement exists on the most appropriate communication path, it was also decided to have Jim send the questions directly to the President in the form of a memo and then have the memo disseminated to the chancellors by the respective ITEC members. *There was a clarification that no report would be provided by Ernie Nielsen to ITEC. Instead, Ernie, in early June, reviewed and supported the latest revision of the governance structure. *Mike’s suggestion to consolidate IT functions in SW HR, SW Student, SW Finance, and OIT was very favorably received. It was agreed by all ITEC members present that, unfortunately, the current political landscape does not permit such a consolidation effort; rather, it is viewed as a future state endeavor. In the meantime, it is expected that ITEC and the underlying governance support structure would exercise oversight over these units or organizations. *The roles of the CIOs and CITO and how they should play together was discussed. It was suggested that perhaps they should conduct an exercise where they create a matrix defining their roles and working relationships - much the same way the Business Council members were to define and build at their July 22, 2008 meeting. The question was asked, “Is there equality of the CIOs and CITO?” Answer: no. The
CITO has an elevated role per Board of Regent Policy and Regulation.
*A potential reconfiguration of the ITEC along the lines of the MacTaggart-Rogers report with as many as eight members appointed by the chancellors and President was discussed. Some of the ITEC members felt the current make-up of ITEC was sufficient. Mike disagreed with the reasoning. It was, therefore, decided to have the President make the decision. Jim added this discussion point to the memo for the President.

Other topics discussed:
*With regard to budget and management of IT projects, at some future point in time, the relationship between ITEC and the Business Council should be explored and refined.
*What is the purpose of the PMO? Who is providing direction to the PMO? Answer: The PMO is to provide infrastructure to the entire governance process. The ITEC is providing direction to the PMO - the PMO reports to ITEC.
*A wide ranging discussion was held on the lower level details of the proposed governance structure. Discussion points included:
  * Should the ITC be “sun-setted” after approval of the governance structure? Steve Smith is leaning in this direction - of at least “sun-setting” the ITC after the Leadership Team is "activated.”
  * Where does the General Functions Council fit into the governance structure?
  * Is the Leadership Team too large? Consensus Answer: It does appear to be on the large side. Perhaps the Finance, HR, SAC, and Student roles could participate in a non-voting capacity. This will remain an open issue for now.
  * Is it appropriate to have Steve, as CITO, chair the Leadership Team? One suggestion floated was to have an annually rotating chair of the Leadership Team who would, in turn, “report” to the ITEC. Final agreement could not be reached on this point. It was decided to have the President resolve this issue.
  * Should Steve Smith be required to sit on the Leadership Team, Portfolio Management Team, Operations Management Team, and the Enterprise Architecture team? Steve Smith would like to have the ability, if necessary, to delegate responsibility to various Executive Directors. Final agreement was not reached on this point. Jim Johnsen has incorporated this issue into the memo to the President.
  * A general consensus formed that ITEC should (1) seek approval from the President on the general governance framework, (2) should have the Leadership team start-up and (3) let the Leadership Team work out the finer details of composition of the Portfolio Management Team, Operations Management Team, and the Enterprise Architecture team.

*A real concern exists on the part of Steve that it is important to “shop” or inform SAC, Student Services, and the Faculty Senate (among others?) about this governance structure. The ITEC members agreed and decided a communications plan will need to be developed by the PMO. The plan will then be discussed and revised at the next ITEC meeting. The plan should not be developed until the President signs-off on the memo.
*It is agreed to by the ITEC members present that a better way should be created to demonstrate the value of the governance structure. Perhaps: “The life of project” or “How does a bill become law?” “How does an idea become a service?” Tell a story of how IT projects flow through the governance structure.
*Both Steve Smith and Dan (via Steve) would like to know from Ernie the other universities where the suggested framework has been used. Steve Smith suggested that it might be nice to speak with at least one of these other universities to see how their implementations might be going.

CONCLUSIONS
Apart from the issues that Jim Johnsen is speaking to in the memo, the ITEC members agree in principle to the governance structure. They do recognize additional work is needed to define the lower level details of the structure.

ACTION ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
<th>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. As detailed above, a memo will be sent to the President speaking to (1) endorsement of the governance structure, (2) ITEC membership, (3) chairing of the Leadership team, and (4) Steve Smith’s role on the Portfolio Management Team, Operations Management Team, and the Enterprise Architecture Team.</td>
<td>Jim Johnsen with follow-up action by Joe Trubacz</td>
<td>Steve Mullins believes the memo was submitted to the President no later than July 28, 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inform the Board of Regents of the governance structure.</td>
<td>Steve Smith</td>
<td>September 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Generate a communication plan for dissemination of the governance structure - to the masses and to the respective MAU Chancellor cabinets. The President must endorse the structure before going forward with this step.</td>
<td>PMO to generate and reviewed / discussed at September ITEC meeting</td>
<td>September 3, 2008 (Tentative next ITEC meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sunset the ITC in the near future.</td>
<td>Steve Smith</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Upon receipt of signed memo from the President, kick-off / activate the Leadership team. **UA PMO** Upon receipt of signed memo.


7. As detailed above, contact Ernie Nielsen and research where and how implementation has gone at other consulted universities. **UA PMO** TBD – dependent on Ernie’s schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 MINUTES</th>
<th>4.0 UA STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISCUSSION</strong></td>
<td>Steve Mullins provided a spreadsheet showing in general terms a commonality exists between the Board of Regents and MAUs’ strategy statements. It is proposed that ITEC could ask the soon to be formed Leadership team to report back to ITEC in six or nine months and “show us which projects or efforts are conforming or complying with UA’s strategy.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONCLUSIONS</strong></td>
<td>ITEC suggested that the direction for the Leadership team be softened to, “tell us what you have done.” The Leadership team and ITEC should use the Board of Regents strategies to prioritize the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTION ITEMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 MINUTES</th>
<th>5.0 Status update for Enterprise Content Management (OnBase, Document Imaging)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISCUSSION</strong></td>
<td>The latest update was provided regarding OnBase. There is the possibility that Sungard and Hyland may at some point work together to develop better integration between Banner and OnBase. The update illustrated that the situation continues to be very fluid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONCLUSIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTION ITEMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to monitor.</td>
<td><strong>UA PMO</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.0 Capital Projects request

Steve Mullins provided an update regarding a FY10 capital legislature for administrative projects that incorporate possible funding for OnBase, electronic Research Administration, Databrowser replacement, and Travel Management:

- **OnBase**
  - 700K one time, 200K maintenance,
  - To be submitted by Myron Dosch and cost shared between MAUs and Statewide.

- **Electronic Research Administration (eRA)**
  - 1.3M
  - To be submitted by Buck Sharpton (UAF) with the majority of cost sharing going to UAF

- **Databrowser**
  - 680K one time, 105K maintenance,
  - To be submitted by Myron Dosch and cost shared between the MAUs and Statewide as follows: Approximately 56% to Statewide, 4% to UAA, 32% to UAF, and 8% to UAS.

- **Travel Management**
  - 350K one time, 80K maintenance
  - To be submitted by Myron Dosch and cost shared between the MAUs and Statewide as follows: 10.5% to Statewide, 23.7% to UAA, 60.7% to UAF, and 5.1% to UAS.

### CONCLUSIONS

### ACTION ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 7.0 Management Reporting Systems

Myron appreciated the ITEC / APEG spurring this project on at their last meeting in May 2008. ITEC members reviewed Myron’s progress report.

An open question remains unanswered from Myron’s update, “How can Raye Ann move so quickly on this project?” There is the perception in ITEC members' minds that other Finance projects will suffer.

FY09 $40K travel funding for this project will come from ACAS.

### ACTION ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does Finance have excess capacity to take this project on? Will other projects suffer?</td>
<td>Jim Johnsen and Joe Trubacz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OBSERVERS

### RESOURCE PERSONS

### SPECIAL NOTES

It was agreed to have Vickie review the Statewide HR portfolio at the next ITEC meeting.