

SUMMARY FOR UNIVERSITY SUPPORT SERVICES PORTFOLIO

DATE: July 16, 2014

TIME: 1-2:30 p.m.

LOCATION: Warnock Engineering Building, Room 1705

IN ATTENDANCE:

Brent Brown	Ed Davies	Larry Dew	Patricia Hanna
Jeff Herring	Laura Howat	Sandy Hughes	Matt Lopez
Karen Macon	Lori McDonald	Debbie Rakhsha	Brian Rasmussen
Andrea Rorrer			

COMMITTEE SUPPORT: Aspen Perry, Rene Eborn, Marv Hawkins

UNABLE TO ATTEND:

Mollie Cummins	Steven Corbató	Cory Higgins	Michael Kay
Gordon Wilson			

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:

- New members
- Update on project progress
- New projects review
- Revisit portfolio rules of engagement
- Brief on the procure to pay project

New members

Several faculty representatives have joined the portfolio: Mollie Cummins, from the College of Nursing; Ed Davies, from the College of Humanities; and Andrea Rorrer, from the College of Education.

Update on project progress

Debbie Rakhsha updated members on the progress made on portfolio projects, including that several had been completed or were nearing completion. She also briefed the group on the beginnings of a project to overhaul the user interface of the Campus Information System (CIS) portal. Members offered some suggestions for involving business units in the design. Portfolio members also requested that in the future, projects that are 80 percent complete be moved off the prioritization list. Currently, projects that had reached 90 percent completion are not shown. Based on the expressed interest to lower the percentage, it was decided that starting next month, the portfolio will use the 80 percent cut-off.

New projects review

The group reviewed the initial prioritization list (based on email responses), which included integration of new projects into the existing prioritization list. Discussion led to a slight modification of the initial rankings; with these in place, the list was approved.

Revisit portfolio rules of engagement

The following changes/clarifications of the portfolio's manner of reviewing and prioritizing requests were introduced by Pat Hanna. All of these were discussed at the Executive Committee meeting, and came with its endorsement.

1. The pre-meeting rankings for this month were set up so that the new projects were to be integrated into the existing prioritizations. The portfolio noted that this was a good idea and agreed that it should be continued.
2. Hanna noted that it seemed more useful to use a tiered prioritization rather than a strictly numbered list. Since University Support Services' resources are not all fungible, and it is impossible to predict when a particular skill set might be available for a project, the portfolio agreed that it would be more useful to give USS guidance on timing and allow it to manage its own resources.
3. A. The pre-meeting rankings have worked well. In order to ensure that the portfolio give all projects a thorough review, the Executive Committee proposed that the committee adopt a system of quorum (60 percent of the voting members) for the initial prioritization. Since these rankings are done online, with the seven-day lead time, it should be easy for members to register their prioritizations.¹
B. The Executive Committee also recommended that no quorum be required for the monthly meetings. This is because substitutes do not work for the work of the portfolio and the nature of the membership makes it impossible for everyone to agree to miss no meetings. The portfolio agreed to these practices.
4. Hanna then asked whether committee members wanted any more information to be given on the project-ranking interface. One member suggested that, if possible, more detail be given on the nature of compliance-related issues on specific projects. There was consensus that this should be done, and it was agreed that the USS staff would work to include this.
5. Hanna raised the issue of the impact of requests for integration of third-party software on the availability of USS staff resources. Members of the portfolio agreed to tell their units that if the purchase of such software is contemplated, the standard process of requesting UIT services should be followed, no matter how small the requester believes the institutional impact to be. This will allow the portfolio and USS to manage resources in a manner that more adequately reflects institutional priorities. Again, there was a consensus that we need to aim to make this a university-wide practice.

¹ If the quorum is not met, then the projects will not be reviewed at the monthly meeting.

6. Hanna suggested a timeline for submission and review of projects: If a project is to be considered for prioritization, it must be submitted and have an executive summary (developed in consultation with USS staff) by the first of the month. In order to meet this deadline, requesters should plan to make their initial inquiries by the 15th of the proceeding month, if not sooner. This will allow time for staff to prepare the requests for prioritization by the portfolio. This was accepted by the portfolio.

Brief on the procure to pay project

The portfolio agreed that because of its scope and impact on the operations of the institution as a whole, the procure to pay project should be considered as a strategic University priority. More information will be made available to the portfolio as the project proceeds.

Action summary			
Action	Topic	Person/Group	Next step
Vote	New projects review	Portfolio	The group made some adjustments to the prioritization list and approved it.
Vote	Revisit portfolio rules of engagement	Portfolio	Members approved changes to the timelines for project submission and information to be included in the executive summary.