

**SUMMARY FOR UNIVERSITY SUPPORT SERVICES PORTFOLIO**

**DATE: January 20, 2015**

**TIME: 1-2 p.m.**

**LOCATION: Warnock Engineering Building, Room 1705**

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Steven Corbató	Mollie Cummins	Ed Davies	Patricia Hanna
Jeff Herring	Stephen Hess	Cory Higgins	Laura Howat
Sandy Hughes	Michael Kay	Matt Lopez	Karen Macon
Lori McDonald	Ken Nye	Stephen Petersen	Debbie Rakhsha
Gordon Wilson			

**COMMITTEE SUPPORT:** Marv Hawkins, Scott Sherman

**UNABLE TO ATTEND:**

Brent Brown                  Brian Rasmussen                  Andrea Rorrer

**AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:**

- Talk with new CIO about governance and portfolio
- Discuss and approve ranking of projects
- Committee procedures

**Talk with new CIO about governance and portfolio**

Chief Information Officer Stephen Hess spoke with the group about his thoughts on governance as he takes over. He thanked Deputy CIO Steven Corbató for his efforts during his time as interim CIO, and said he appreciates the Portfolio members spending the time to help guide University Support Services' prioritization decisions. He urged the Portfolio to continue pushing for projects to be well thought out, have stated goals and funding sources, and provide a clear understanding of the benefits for the university. If those elements aren't present in a proposal, he asked the Portfolio to use its authority to delay prioritizing a project until any gaps are addressed. Hess suggested that the Portfolio continue to enhance and use the single sheet listing the benefits, goals, funding, outcomes, constituencies, and alignment with strategic initiatives to help rank each project against available resources and determine the project's ranking.

When asked, Hess said he did not foresee any major changes to the USS Portfolio; any decisions he may make in the future will be based on further information gathering and data. He reaffirmed his position that University Information Technology's efforts should be largely focused on strategic initiatives driven by academic and administrative leadership. Hess said the Portfolio's decisions about priority would help ensure the USS staff is aimed toward completing projects that align with the institution's needs.

**Ranking new requests**

The Portfolio discussed the initial ranking based on the electronic voting needed adjustment; several adjustments were made to the list based on deadlines, impact on institution as a whole, clarity of the proposal and connections between various projects (dependency relations, etc.) It was noted that there are several first-tier projects not listed because they have been identified as strategic priorities by the university and therefore not included in the list of projects for ranking. The Portfolio believes that while this approach worked well to help it work through the backlog of requests it initially faced, it is probably time to fold them back into the overall ranking scheme. It was suggested that doing so would work as a good reminder of the scope of USS commitments and would help in future rankings. Starting next month, the Portfolio will work to begin implementing this transition. The Portfolio discussed ways the information we receive to help with our rankings could be improved: for example, someone suggested adding a column that shows how many days are left before a hard deadline and/or requested completion date so timing can be more thoroughly considered in the voting. After looking at the adjusted list, it was moved and seconded that the modified list be approved; this passed unanimously.

**Portfolio procedures**

The Portfolio has considered use of a quorum to ensure that projects are thoroughly vetted. Because of the nature of this group, it was decided to continue to take an initial survey, and to discuss this tentative ranking at the meetings. Since the Portfolio always does a review of all the active projects in the ranking list, it is possible for adjustments to be made at any time. Therefore, there will be no quorum requirement for the initial electronic survey or the final ranking vote. This will ensure a timely update of the rankings for USS staff in the event there is not a quorum at the meeting.

**Deferred**

The Portfolio planned to discuss the issue of institutional priorities and how they impact the ability of USS to clear the priorities and how the Portfolio can best instantiate these priorities in its decisions; however, there was not sufficient time to get to this. Therefore, in consultation with new CIO, the Portfolio will take this matter up in the next months; it hopes to have a recommendation to for the CIO and central administration by the end of the academic year.

Action summary			
Action	Topic	Person/Group	Next step
Approve	Ranking new requests	Portfolio	A new ranking list was approved.