

**SUMMARY FOR STRATEGIC INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE**

**DATE: July 13, 2016**

**TIME: 12-2 p.m.**

**LOCATION: Dumke Room, Eccles Broadcast Center**

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Cathy Anderson	Holly Christmas	Demian Hanks	Steve Hess
Mike Kirby	Nancy Lombardo	Harish Maringanti	Rick Smith
Mike Strong	Jess Taverna	Jeff West	Rob White
Amy Wildermuth	Joanne Yaffe		

**COMMITTEE SUPPORT:** Emily Rushton, Scott Sherman

**UNABLE TO ATTEND:**

Melissa Bernstein	Mary Burbank	James Elder	Aaron Fogelson
Bo Foreman	James Herron	John Horel	Jakob Jensen
Ken Nye	Andrew Olson	Mary Parker	Kevin Runolfson
Ryan Smith	Jim Turnbull		

**AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:**

- Holistic web strategy next steps
- Network connection memorandum of understanding
- Retire a service submission form approval
- UIT Project Management Office
- UIT service management platform
- Strategic plan progress
- UShop implementation timeline
- Set next meeting date/time
- Open floor

**Holistic web strategy next steps**

Barb Iannucci (University Support Services) explained that her group and University Marketing & Communications (UMC) reached an agreement to have a unified web presence for campus. They will use the governance process when necessary, under a new group facilitated by Paula Millington (Director, UIT Strategic Planning and Process Team). The two separate web groups will be maintained, each retaining its own sets of customers. USS may over time shift to recover costs by charging for some services. UMC will continue to set the templates for U websites, and UIT/UMC will meet periodically to collaborate.

Millington then took the floor to talk about the challenges with the U's web presence as well as next steps for the strategy going forward. There are current issues with the U's web presence, including security and privacy, accessibility concerns, web policy, and web property owners. Millington proposed to start with interviews, work sessions, meeting with campus thought leaders, and identifying the

current state and future vision. She then proposed creating a broad-based advisory committee to develop strategy for 2017. That committee will look at potential tools and enterprise-wide solutions to implement the strategy, as well as revisit Policy 4-003 and bring it up to date, along with the originally specified design standards. The goal with this effort is to create a baseline set of standards that university websites must meet regarding accessibility, security, and appearance, but allow individual areas the flexibility to go above and beyond that level to achieve their unique objectives.

Chief Information Officer Steve Hess reiterated that visiting the web is how many users engage with the university, and if it's confusing or there isn't a common way to approach all University websites, it creates a negative experience. The purpose of this ongoing project and strategy would be to set a minimum level of understanding and standards everyone can agree to. SITC Chair Amy Wildermuth, Associate Vice President for Faculty, clarified that what's being asked for is whether this approach presented by Millington – not a policy – can get approval. The approach being what Wildermuth called a “listening tour,” presenting the ideas to various people, getting feedback on how they might create the 2017 strategy, and then moving forward from there.

After a brief discussion, no vote took place but there was a general consensus from the committee that Millington could move forward with the initial plan.

### **Network connection memorandum of understanding**

Chief Technology Officer Jim Livingston said the Deloitte assessment made it apparent that we need to work more closely across campus on how we operate the network, handle security regarding the network, and connect devices to the network. We have to be more collaborative in our approach. Most universities have some type of network connection agreement, so Livingston said they felt it was time for the U to have its own. Trevor Long led this effort and created the agreement, which was presented to the Architecture and New Technology Committee and underwent modifications in a working group. The ANTC made a few final edits, and that document is what Livingston presented to the SITC.

Livingston reviewed the agreement and explained the verbiage to the group. He said they would like to have a standard agreement that works for everyone, but he understands colleges and departments have unique needs and requirements and plans to work with those groups on a case-by-case basis.

Prompted by a committee member's question, Hess reminded the committee that UIT does not run all networks on campus and doesn't have the financial resources to do so, in addition to the fact that there are already qualified people running the local networks. The strategy is to simply collaborate with the colleges that run their networks and agree to a standard network connection agreement that keeps the network up and running, and doesn't place any users or local networks in jeopardy.

Livingston reiterated that this network connection agreement is just a first step. A committee member said a distinction should be made on what the U's responsibilities are when a new building goes online vs. the ongoing maintenance that building's network will need. Livingston agreed and said getting the funding model nailed down will help with those kinds of issues.

Livingston said if the agreement was approved by SITC, the next step would be to build a communication plan and get signatures from every organization/department/college/etc. on the agreement, and work with those groups that need exceptions. The tentative timeline is to have every group sign the agreement by the end of the calendar year.

After one small edit was requested (changing the word "interdependent" to "dependent"), the committee voted to approve the network connection agreement with the requested edit.

### **Retire a service submission form approval**

Scott Sherman, special assistant to the CIO, presented the new "retire a service" submission form for approval and explained that in most cases, the user filling out this form will likely be the owner of the service they're requesting to retire. The committee approved the form with no changes.

### **UIT Process Management Office (PMO)**

Jill Brinton, PMO associate director, covered the rationale behind creating the PMO. They discovered that many managers in UIT were spending so much time managing projects, to the detriment of operational work. The PMO was created to help with this by taking a modern approach to project management and focusing on getting the business value out of projects. Brinton covered the biggest objectives, such as building a project management discipline, and creating standard templates and processes. She also clarified that her office does work on cross-functional projects (not only UIT projects). The committee had no questions for Brinton.

### **UIT service management platform**

Livingston gave an update on service management and ServiceNow. He said that for IT, there are standards that we adhere to regarding the management of our IT processes. Things to be considered include service requests, asset lifecycles, service level agreements, incidents or problems, configuration of our systems, and how to make changes. The vast majority of IT outages are not caused by hardware failures – they're caused by process failures. A service management platform is the technology that helps us manage those processes in a more efficient and timelier way.

Livingston went on to say that after a thorough RFP process, they have selected the platform called ServiceNow, which is a cloud-based service designed around ITIL (Information Technology Infrastructure Library) principles and which focuses on customer-centric solutions. ITS and UIT will be

on a consolidated service management platform, which will enable tighter management of service level agreements to the customer, greater efficiency and speed in processes, improved transparency to the customer, and analytics and metrics for running reports. It also will allow groups to create workflows around the departments whose processes are interrelated, among other benefits.

Ken Pink, Deputy CIO, and Livingston are the sponsors of the project. There is steering committee that meets every two weeks and a third-party contractor helping with the implementation.

Phase 1 included implementation of incident, problem, and change management and went live on July 9. Phase 2 includes a new instance of the Service Catalog, intended to be a one-stop shop that will incorporate ITS services with UIT services. This is tentatively scheduled for completion by the end of the calendar year. Hess said the service management project dovetails with one of the Deloitte findings in the “strengthen the core” section.

There were no further comments.

### **Strategic plan process**

Hess gave an overview of what has been accomplished in support of the University’s IT strategic plan, as well as UIT’s IT strategic plan, including: implementing the IT governance process; significant progress being made in the development of a new funding model for core IT services; completing a physical wireless survey, which will provide data for a new wireless strategy; connecting the vast majority of campus buildings to the new backbone; finishing all critical PeopleSoft upgrades; Bringing IT equipment asset inventories up-to-date; completing a risk assessment process for campus applications in the cloud; creating a process office (led by Millington); creating a PMO (led by Brinton); implementing a new service management tool; among many other items. The committee asked for a copy of the accomplishments to share with others.

### **UShop implementation timeline:**

Jeff West, Associate VP for Financial & Business Services, gave a brief update on the UShop implementation timeline. This falls under the Procure to Pay project and seeks to improve business processes surrounding purchasing on campus. The past two years have involved configuring the system, doing training, working with vendors, and getting it ready to be implemented. A year ago, it was implemented and some pilot departments began using it. Gradually, the team has started to add additional vendors and departments, and West said it’s gone very well. Approximately 50 percent of campus is using UShop. The objectives are to automate a paper-based system and ultimately get rid of paper forms on campus. Other benefits include increased transparency and transaction speed, decreased cost, and potentially better contracts and pricing with vendors. The goal is to complete implementation by the end of this calendar year, and West said they feel very positive that can

happen. Hess brought up a question about analytics, and West clarified that analytics will be very useful because in the past with the paper-based system, some things simply couldn't be tracked (like purchasing card spend). As the migration takes place and more departments and organizations begin to use UShop, analytics will show how much the University is spending at big-name stores (e.g. Dell, B&H Photo/Video) and will provide better information for future negotiations.

**Set next meeting date/time**

Wildermuth suggested a poll be sent out to nail down members' availability for setting future meeting times. The committee agreed.

**Open floor**

There were no open floor topics or discussions.

Action summary			
Action	Topic	Person/Group	Next step
Approved	Network connection agreement	Portfolio	Creating a communication plan; reaching out to all applicable organizations on campus and obtaining signatures on the agreement by the end of the calendar year.
General consensus	Holistic web strategy	Portfolio	Paula Millington will move forward with the presented plan.
Approved	Retire a services submission form	Portfolio	The form will be created and published for use.
To do	Strategic plan progress	Scott Sherman	Post a copy of the strategic plan progress to the SITC Box folder.