





Institutional Research Systemwide Council Scorecard, Last Updated: October 2, 2017

Strategic Pathways Action Item	Task	Implementation Status	Articulation to Council Scope		
			CKN	Data Architecture	Education & Advocacy
Level 1: Best Suited to Centralization	1.1 Streamline queries and applications for database extraction, business intelligence reporting, and advanced analytics.	 Implementation possible following successful identification and adoption of prioritization criteria, common method for documenting and sharing. Committee Comments: Need a consistent method/language for sharing. Criteria for identifying the most impactful, priority items that should be focused on for this work are not mutually agreed to and should be established before this work begins.	✓	✓	
	1.2 Centralize most database queries and views in a new database schema that links directly with automated reports. A new operational database analyst--complementing the existing DSDMGR database analyst--manages this schema and co-develops queries, views, and tables with each IR office to ensure that they are accurate and meaningful.	 Conditional on base funding for an IS Professional position being made available through reallocation or new source. Committee Comments: UAA and UAS indicate this investment is important but not a prerequisite to successful implementation of the CKN components over a longer period of time; UAF and UA/SW indicate it would not be possible to implement the CKN without the additional staffing for level 1 functions. Regardless of whether an expansion occurs to add operational data warehouse support, all agree the current level 1 function is understaffed and may represent a single point of failure. There is 1 FTE at UA/SW staffing all of Level 1 now, with a backlog of work, and the only backup staff for this position is the Associate VP.	✓	✓	
	1.3 All IR offices will work from the same applications, server, and database.	 Yes, pending assessment and understanding of impacts and resource requirements. Committee Comments: Eventually, reduction or elimination of duplication of effort occurring now at UA and UAA will free up staff capacity for other activities. It may also help address some performance issues occurring now with required daily transfers of large amounts of raw data between the two systems, by performing data transformation and load processes on the same server. Other technical solutions that have functionality similar to the SAS Data Management tool may need to be considered if consolidation to one set of applications, server and database is not possible due to resource constraints.	✓	✓	
	1.4 Significant improvements in documentation related to IR-produced tables, queries, functions, procedures, etc.	 Yes, dependent on clear, sustained executive commitment, resource dedication, and necessary process improvements are required to implement. Committee Comments: Gaps in documentation for data definitions are more apparent and easier to identify when data are actually used. UAS and UAA expressed concern that identifying this as a prerequisite element will hinder progress on CKN implementation, while UA/SW and UAF identify this as a critical step towards advancing a more coherent and accessible data service to the broader university community. Documentation of this kind of information will aide in new IR employee onboarding. Much of this information exists today in an undocumented manner, a kind of institutional memory that is lost when IR professionals retire or otherwise move on. This step is perceived to be best accomplished over time in an iterative, incremental way, i.e., documentation is constantly improved as new knowledge is obtained and old systems/methods fade.	✓	✓	✓
Level 2. Systematically move from semi-automated/manual work toward fully automated work products in this area, freeing up staff capacity for Level 1 and Level 3 work.	2.1 Identify a core set of reports developed by each IR office.	 Pending mutual understanding and agreement on what is appropriate to share. Committee Comments: This step seems to be the inventory work that is frequently identified as a need.	✓	✓	✓
	2.2 Share report designs, benchmarks, best practices, etc. so that each IR office can focus on improving the quality of reporting for their institution instead of completing from scratch a report that already exists elsewhere in the system.	 Pending mutual understanding and agreement on what is appropriate to share. Committee Comments: A queriable repository needs to be used for these kinds of outputs. Work products may not always be adopted without modification, however having direct access to the library of work completed by others would be helpful in seeing "how they did it". Such sharing sometimes occurs easily now for reports and data products in cases when one office is aware a report exists and/or the authoring office is willing and able to share. On the flip side, there are situations where sharing does not occur for unknown reasons, or when the product may be considered proprietary (recruitment plans, proposal applications, etc.), sensitive or potentially damaging to the university now or in the future.	✓	✓	✓

Institutional Research Systemwide Council Scorecard, Last Updated: October 2, 2017

Strategic Pathways Action Item	Task	Implementation Status	Articulation to Council Scope			
			CKN	Data Architecture	Education & Advocacy	
	2.3 Well-designed database-linked automated reports can--over time-- replace some of the efforts that currently consume a significant amount of time for daily reporting and open/close freeze reporting. This will allow IR offices to develop new and higher quality reports, increase data literacy at each institution, and focus on complex research projects and advanced analytics.		Results from implementation of previous Level 1 and Level 2 elements. Committee Comments: Data literacy will flow if Level 1 data services are well constructed. Believe an expectation of the President is that under the CKN the direction the BOR sets for UA will be a priority and focus of most analysis efforts at every IR office, along with university-specific needs.	✓	✓	✓
Level 3. High institutional ROI for IR capacity applied in this area, utilizing complex analysis and predictive analytics, machine learning, and data visualization.	3.1 Determine the appropriate applications that should be used at each IR office to conduct advanced analytics.		Committee Comments: There were a spectrum of reactions to this item, summarized here. <u>Supporting</u> : Having a standard set of technology for this purpose makes development of training easier, lowers cost of software and infrastructure, ensures portability of technical pieces like code, and promotes collaboration. <u>Neutral</u> : This could be implemented later after earlier steps are established. <u>Not in support</u> : To dictate what software should be used is not appropriate. IR offices should take advantage of the different skills of IR employees, not lock people into learning something new just for the sake of standardization of software; the skills set of IR type people in Alaska are narrow.	✓	✓	
	3.2 Identify examples of past advanced analytics projects conducted in IR offices.		Yes The university perspective was that research questions are often unique to each institution, and research conducted at one university is not appropriate for another university. UA/SW's perspective was that some research is applicable across campuses or universities if of interest to the BOR or legislature or if considering student populations that attend more than one campus or university. There is support to have a forum to share information, for example the "PAIR Share" one-hour sessions -- it's helpful to explain to colleagues what we do and how we do it. Knowledge in this way expands and collaboration strengthens.	✓	✓	✓
	3.3 Share the models, methodologies, final reports, etc. with the other IR offices so that each office can focus on improving the quality of reporting for their institution instead of completing from scratch a model, methodology, final report, etc. that already exists elsewhere in the system.		Pending mutual understanding and agreement on what is appropriate to share. Committee comments: A queriable repository needs to be used for these kinds of outputs. Work products may not always be adopted without modification, however having direct access to the library of work completed by others would be helpful in seeing "how they did it". Such sharing sometimes occurs easily now for reports and data products in cases when one office is aware a report exists and/or the authoring office is willing and able to share. On the flip side, there are situations where sharing does not occur for unknown reasons, or when the product may be considered proprietary (recruitment plans, proposal applications, etc.), sensitive or potentially damaging to the university now or in the future.	✓	✓	

Implementation Status Key



Not ready for implementation at this time. May be revisited.



Once noted prerequisites and/or alignment issues noted are resolved, ready for implementation.



Ready for immediate implementation.

IT Council Scorecard

The Information Technology Council (ITC) is a standing body within the University of Alaska created to establish IT policy and administrative and operational standards, to analyze and set priorities for investment in information technology initiatives, and to ensure excellence and best practice in implementation in a way that directly supports UA mission attainment. The ITC is responsible for defining level 2 and level 3 governance committees, establishing the procedures and standards by which they operate, and will be accountable for the work of those groups in accordance with policies, practices, and standards.

The ITC is distinguished as a collaborative, student-focused group with transparency and consultation across all its members; planning for matters such as relevant Cabinet, Summit or Board agendas; identification of responsible individuals to undertake tasks agreed to by the Council; and other work products of the Council.

Values: The ITC embodies the values of being: student and mission focused, data-driven, transparent, inclusive, collaborative, timely, responsive, service oriented and respectful.

Green	On Schedule, On Budget, Clearly defined Scope: Results are on or over the established target
Yellow	<20% off schedule, <20% off budget, scope in progress or needs revision; Results are under the established target, but within a tolerance interval. They need to be analyzed and monitored
Red	>20% off schedule, >20% off budget, scope unclear or scope creep; Results are under the established target and require urgent attention

Objective	Measure	Baseline	Quantity	Target	Target Date	Status	Reduce cost of operations	Establish Policy & standards	Increase recruitment, retention, collaboration	Improve customer satisfaction	Innovations & Modernizations	Notes	Accomplishments
-----------	---------	----------	----------	--------	-------------	--------	---------------------------	------------------------------	--	-------------------------------	------------------------------	-------	-----------------

IT Council: Scorecard													Accomplishments	
Strategic Pathways														
Strategic Pathways	Reduce Operating Cost	dollars	\$65,000,000	-\$13,075,000	20%	3/1/2018	Green	X				20% as of 7/1/2017. Mike Ciri leading documentation effort of how this is counted for validity (GG)		
	Reduce Distributed Technicians	number of positions	165	48	20%	3/1/2018	Green	X				UAS, no distributed tech staff, UAA completed review plan, in process of implementing, UAF Recommendations made. Administration reviewing, awaiting input from external review baseline calculated on ~\$90K/employee x 119 employees, target 20% reduction	FY13-FY18 IT Position Reductions (Central & Distributed) 110	
	Embedded IT Staff Analysis and recommendations	dollars	\$10,710,000		20%	3/1/2018	Green	X					FY13-FY18 IT Position Reduction Savings \$11,475,000 FY17-FY18 Network Contract Savings \$1,500,000 FY18 Contract reductions \$137,000	
Stewardship of Resources														
Stewardship of Resources	Telecommunications Initiatives	annual savings		\$200,000	5/1/2028	Green	X					Items being worked by cross-campus telecom teams		
	Contract Reviews	Reviews/year		5	3/1/2018	Green	X	X						
	Contract Savings from Reviews	dollars		\$200,000	4/1/2018	Green	X							
	Evaluate Open Source Software solutions	# of open source adoptions				Yellow	X					Need to identify current software solutions that may have open source counterpart		
	Outsource appropriate services	# of services				Yellow	X					need to evaluate services appropriate for outsource, have not begun		
	Transition to Cloud	# of services				Yellow	X		X	X		need to establish baseline and identify and quantify systems which may be applicable for cloud transition		
	Video conferencing review and platform decision(s)					3/1/2018	Red	X		X	X	RFI for videoconferencing services to be developed to evaluate service, IT Council reviewing RFI and business case examples, request for systemwide survey may delay implementation. Current equipment end-of-support Sept 2018		
Computing platform (Mac vs PC)	dollars			\$400,000		Red	X		X		Ongoing discussion item, scope and impact are high, decision affects personal use of platform of choice, establish baseline based on Educause data and Gartner Higher Ed metrics			
Customers														
Customer Satisfaction	Improve Customer Satisfaction	satisfaction score			80%		Green			X		Need to establish base line through survey and helpdesk metrics		
	Business service continuity and availability	up time			99%		Green			X	X	Need to establish base line and target metrics		
Monitoring Projects														
Monitoring Projects	Banner 9 Upgrade	Modules in Production				10/1/2018	Yellow	X		X	X	Banner 8 will no longer be supported by Ellucian beyond December 2018. All effort and development is going into Banner 9. UA needs to fully on Banner 9 by the end of December 2018. Target October 2018. This is a major systems upgrade and complex transition. Resource constraints may impact target date. Monitoring closely.		
Internal Business Processes														
Internal Business Processes	Establish project Intake process						Green		X			Requested draft proposal from Project Mgt Office 11/1		
	Establish Level 2 Committees						Yellow		X			IT Council has not identified or chartered any level 2 standing committees		

IT Council Scorecard

The Information Technology Council (ITC) is a standing body within the University of Alaska created to establish IT policy and administrative and operational standards, to analyze and set priorities for investment in information technology initiatives, and to ensure excellence and best practice in implementation in a way that directly supports UA mission attainment. The ITC is responsible for defining level 2 and level 3 governance committees, establishing the procedures and standards by which they operate, and will be accountable for the work of those groups in accordance with policies, practices, and standards.

The ITC is distinguished as a collaborative, student-focused group with transparency and consultation across all its members; planning for matters such as relevant Cabinet, Summit or Board agendas; identification of responsible individuals to undertake tasks agreed to by the Council; and other work products of the Council.

Values: The ITC embodies the values of being: student and mission focused, data-driven, transparent, inclusive, collaborative, timely, responsive, service oriented and respectful.

Green	On Schedule, On Budget, Clearly defined Scope: Results are on or over the established target
Yellow	<20% off schedule, <20% off budget, scope in progress or needs revision; Results are under the established target, but within a tolerance interval. They need to be analyzed and monitored
Red	>20% off schedule, >20% off budget, scope unclear or scope creep; Results are under the established target and require urgent attention

	Objective	Measure	Baseline	Quantity	Target	Target Date	Status						Notes	Accomplishments	
								Reduce cost of operations	Establish Policy & standards	Increase recruitment, retention, completion	Improve customer satisfaction	Innovations & Modernizations			
Effectiveness	Prioritize projects						Yellow	X			X	X		CIO Management Team identifying and categorizing list of IT issues	
	Define Metrics						Yellow		X	X			establish baseline based on Educause data and Gartner Higher Ed metrics		
	Routinely evaluate IT against institutional peers						Green	X					establish baseline based on Educause data and Gartner Higher Ed metrics		
							Green	X							
Policies and Standards															
Standards & Policies	Web Accessibility Policy and Guidelines	Document in place				3/1/2018	Green		X					Establishing task force with charter to develop draft recommended policy to ITC	
	Breach Notification and Reporting Guidelines	Document in place				12/30/2017	Green		X					Draft modifications submitted to ITC for feedback. Will review at November meeting	
	Establish Administrative Email Guidelines	Document in place				1/15/2018	Green		X					Governance review and feedback received. CIO Mgt team incorporating feedback	
	IT Risk Management Plan	Document in place				08/30/2017	Green		X					Completed and approved August 2017	
Based on the Scorecard framework, created by Robert Kaplan and David P. Norton. For more information, see www.thepalladiumgroup.com															