

**SUMMARY FOR STRATEGIC IT COMMITTEE**

**DATE: May 25, 2016**

**TIME: 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**

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

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Cathy Anderson	Holly Christmas	Bo Foreman	Demian Hanks
Steve Hess	John Horel	Mike Kirby	Nancy Lombardo
Harish Maringanti	Ken Nye	Mary Parker	Jess Taverna
Amy Wildermuth	Jeff West	Rob White	

**COMMITTEE SUPPORT:** Scott Sherman

**UNABLE TO ATTEND:**

Melissa Bernstein	Mary Burbank	James Elder	Aaron Fogelson
James Herron	Jakob Jensen	Andrew Olson	Kevin Runolfson
Rick Smith	Ryan Smith	Mike Strong	Jim Turnbull

**AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:**

- Debrief of Deloitte findings
- Campus IT strategic plan
- Governance submission web form approval
- Financial model statement of work
- BI Center of Excellence
- Holistic Web strategy proposal

**Debrief of Deloitte findings**

The university contracted with Deloitte to do an in-depth campus IT assessment last year, which wrapped up in November 2015. Deloitte made 28 recommendations for improving the IT experience and technical capabilities of the University. Chief Information Officer Steve Hess presented a review of Deloitte’s findings and recommendations.

Hess said technology is strategic to what we do at the university. We’re an information industry, which means much of what we do can be put online, which could have an impact on our future. Other industries, such as network television, are undergoing major impact thanks to changing technologies. Big companies and, increasingly, higher education institutions that are taking advantage of analytics and data are doing better. In the process of putting something online (like the U is currently doing with UShop), we can eliminate steps, decrease wait times, get immediate feedback, and receive data and analytics.

Hess showed a slide of the rising costs of higher education. Medical care is rising at a rapid rate, but tuition is going up at an even more rapid rate. Government funding for higher ed is decreasing. Hess

said we need to be more business-like in the way that we manage our IT on campus and the overall business of the U. IT is involved in every aspect of higher education. Because of that, it's a strategic asset, and one that needs to be managed appropriately. We won't be able to transform the U for the future unless we all work together. Hess said the U is not a top-down institution – we come together and collectively, with data on the table, make decisions about how to move forward.

Deloitte performed over 70 individual interviews and reviewed documentation in order to assess the current state of IT at the U. Based on that, Deloitte made 28 recommendations for improvement.

The three core objectives of the Deloitte assessment are: 1) strengthen the core (UIT's initial focus must be the delivery of reliable, cost-effective core infrastructure and services), 2) increase alignment (between UIT and college/department IT to operate collaboratively), and 3) innovate and transform (the U needs to focus on enhancing the end-user experience to deliver efficient, timely, and innovative IT services). The 28 recommendations are divided into these three objectives.

One of the criticisms from Deloitte is that the U builds too many custom applications rather than buying. Hess said if we bought more in a unified campus way, we would save a lot of money. Deloitte suggested we inventory all applications, then determine if they should be maintained, replaced, retired, etc. This is a long-term process.

Another important recommendation is to mature the funding model to align to ubiquitous services, which are the baseline services that every college and student should have access to (e.g. wireless network, UMail). These services are fairly cheap to run, but some are currently done in a distributed way and the U could save money if departments worked together with UIT on those services. Deloitte also found that the percentage of total IT staff on campus is very high compared to other benchmark institutions, but that the percentage of central IT staff is very low.

Deloitte also identified the services that should be unified core services offered by UIT. A big part of the plan moving forward is to figure out how UIT can be more efficient in providing these core services to campus.

Based on Deloitte's findings and 28 recommendations, UIT has created two strategic plans – one for UIT, and one for University campus IT as a whole to consider.

### **Campus IT strategic plan**

Hess first presented the UIT strategic plan. Hess went over UIT values and how they relate to the recommendations from Deloitte. He covered the goals within each of the five defined IT strategic goals (support faculty and student success, advance research computing, support health care, promote campus efficiencies and effectiveness, and strengthen internal operations). Every employee in UIT has

been evaluated and some are being reassigned based on their core strengths. There was no action item or vote on this plan.

Hess then presented the overarching University of Utah IT strategic plan. It showed the campus vision, campus mission, and the current state and problems that exist, along with seven top IT initiative categories (governance, finance, infrastructure, security, enterprise applications and integrations, people, and processes) and projects to be completed or started on within the calendar year. The goal is to work through this governance committee to realize those seven initiatives.

John Horel asked about enterprise solutions (e.g. cloud services), and Hess confirmed that the cloud is being considered, but there needs to be more data on the table before a decision can be made about how and when the cloud is appropriate to be used as a solution for the U.

Hess asked the committee for any other questions or suggestions to the plan; there were none. The committee voted to approve the plan as-is.

### **Governance submission web form approval**

Scott Sherman, the IT governance liaison and special assistant to the chief information officer, presented three web forms for submitting requests to the new governance groups. Holly Christmas pointed out that the add/change/retire a service form really only addresses adding a service, and that it's not clear to a user who wants to propose removal of a service. The committee discussed creating a different form for that purpose. Sherman suggested changing the wording of the current form to say, "add a service or product," with the intent of creating a separate form for retiring/changing a product. Christmas suggested having a business case example for users who fill out the form. Hess agreed.

There were no further suggestions, and the committee moved to approve the three forms as-is (with the wording tweaked to say "add" only), with the intent to create a fourth "Retire/Change" form that will be presented at the next governance meeting.

### **Campus IT financial model statement of work**

Cathy Anderson, associate vice president of Budget and Planning, said a committee has been assembled with a good representation of hospital and campus people to focus on and understand the IT spend on campus from year-to-year. Anderson said if we're really trying to determine our funding model, and how the U is using resources, we have to continue gathering the data from year to year so that it can be compared. The committee will collect data at the end of this fiscal year, similar to the data collected last year, and will be able to do its first comparison at that time. The committee will also focus on defining ubiquitous services and costs, which will be Phase 1 of the project. The committee voted to approve the project.

## **BI Center of Excellence**

Tom Howa (associate director for USS Business Intelligence), Mike Martineau (director of Institutional Analysis), and Mark Winter (director of institutional data management and visualization) presented on the Business Intelligence (BI) Center of Excellence proposal. Howa began by stating that this is not a massive organizational change – this is about building a community of all BI professionals across campus. Standard BI centers of excellence originated in the corporate environment, so it had to be modified for the U’s framework.

Howa said the costs are very prohibitive to have an advanced analytics platform without working together in a collaborative way. Every single group on campus already has someone managing BI in some form or fashion. This was one of the main issues Deloitte pointed out. To succeed going forward, user involvement, management support, clear requirements, proper planning, and IT support will all be vital. It’s important to be able to align what the business actually wants to do. What are we trying to improve on, and what are we trying to measure?

Howa said one area campus could really improve on is establishing what its BI maturity is. One way to make progress here is the implementation of a standard BI framework. Lower campus has already integrated very well with the hospital and data warehouse environments, which has saved on costs. The BI team has also implemented Tableau as one of the standard dashboarding tools in the BI framework.

Martineau presented a recent example of how this coordination effort has worked for his department (Budget and Analysis). The BI team (led by Howa), the Registrar’s Office, and the Office of Institutional Analysis (IA) collaborated with Budget and Analysis on a centralized resource supporting four colleges using the preexisting student data warehouse. One user per college has been appointed access to the tool. Martineau said this has worked out very well, and they now have an embedded relationship with these different groups that has been successful thus far.

Howa gave another success story, in which the BI team worked with HR to improve its annual transparency report process. It was initially a seven-week, five-person process that – with the BI team’s help – has been reduced to a half-week, one-person process simply by utilizing some of the existing technology the BI team already had in place.

Mark Winter said that to do BI across campus individually, it is expensive and doesn’t work well. Winter’s group has been working with the BI team and has been able to increase the amount of data that they have for decision-making. He said they have access to analysis that they simply didn’t have before, and emphasized that Howa’s BI team has very specific software and skill sets.

Howa said they have already made the budget request for the BI business case (including a request for 10 new positions on the business and IT sides), and are waiting on the results of that. Howa asked the committee for its support in building the BI community. Mary Parker asked, “How does this impact the current structure in place that involves the Registrar’s Office?” Howa explained they aren’t suggesting mass changes of any sort – they want to continue supporting whatever the current needs are. Howa said they want to determine the best practices for each group and grow those. The governance structure currently in place for students will stay the same.

Amy Wildermuth pointed out that priorities will have to be set and asked how the BI group will determine “who’s going to get what, and when?” Howa said this is part of the business case, figuring out how to prioritize what his team should be working on, and how they can start collaborating to get the data everyone needs. He mentioned that Winter’s group will provide training to any group on campus that would like to start using web intelligence.

Hess asked if the current data management policy is adequate, and all three presenters said it is not. It’s difficult to determine who is the official steward of the data, to get access to data, and to understand how clean or reliable that data is. Hess suggested rewriting the policy, and Winter said this was a top recommendation. Parker agreed and said we need a truly tight policy that protects student data. Hess suggested adding it to the committee’s agenda.

Jon Thomas brought up the fact that the U is more prone to build custom applications rather than look at third-party products. Howa clarified that the BI developers are focused on the data (not building new applications), and that for the most part, the BI tools are already in place.

There were no further questions or comments, and the committee moved to approve the proposal.

### **Holistic Web strategy proposal**

Deputy CIO Ken Pink first stated that this presentation was a direct result from the Deloitte recommendation. Barb Iannucci, content & usability manager for University Support Services in UIT, then presented on the recommendation to create a holistic web strategy. She said the current state of the web on campus is very decentralized and undefined. Many resources are being spent around campus to create websites (Deloitte found a total of 36 web staff on campus), and there are duplicated efforts across the board, including two centralized teams on campus – Iannucci’s team of four and University Marketing and Communications (UMC) who also has four.

Many of these individual websites are on old versions of Wordpress, which is a big security vulnerability. Additionally, there is confusion about where to go to find web service help. The duplicated efforts leads to an inconsistent university web presence, which has the potential to contribute to a poor perception of the U if a user ends up on an outdated website.

Iannucci showed a slide comparing two current University websites – one that was created a long time ago by an outside contractor, and one created by USS. The older website was on a very old template that is not mobile-responsive; the USS site was on the most recent template and had a modern look and feel.

The benefits of a holistic strategy include: decreased security vulnerabilities, decreased resource-spending needs, elimination of confusion for units seeking web help, and an improved University web presence. Iannucci said they would like to create one front door for people to come to and find help for their websites. One recommendation by Deloitte was to create a seamless student experience, and Iannucci said the University websites are a huge opportunity to provide that experience, as well as to attract and support students.

UIT's recommendation is to establish a collaborative relationship between UMC and UIT, with clearly defined roles and responsibilities. In this proposal, UMC would focus on the creativity and messaging, while UIT would focus on the enterprise tools and support. This would create one front door for centralized web services, and build an effective and sustainable centralized web operation model around one set of tools.

An animated discussion followed Iannucci's presentation. One member made the point that it's been very confusing to figure out who owns his department's website, and he expressed concern over whether this proposal could be successfully implemented across the University. Iannucci said USS has over 150 sites on its system; they are very responsive and usually respond to help requests within four hours, if not sooner. Iannucci said their users' experiences and feedback have been generally positive.

Another member made the point that her department has invested a lot into web and marketing employees, and expressed concern that this new proposal would ultimately result in having to let those employees go. Iannucci said they would leave the bigger units some freedom to continue managing their own web presence, but another member pointed out that approach could still lead to an inconsistent University web presence.

Hess said there should be a common design, and in order to do that, some general web guidelines must be established that all departments should follow, to ensure security, unified design, and web-accessibility across all University websites.

One member asked if this proposal would include health sciences, and Iannucci clarified that it would only include the academic side of health sciences (e.g. not clinics or hospital departments). Hess said that at this time, they were simply looking for an approval of the concept of a unified web experience and presence. UIT would then work with UMC to come back with a more defined proposal.

Rob White said that Continuing Education would not be able to fit into this idea, as their website runs more like Amazon rather than strictly informational-only. White added that for informational websites, this proposal would work well and that it would be good to actually have consultation on general practices.

Ken Pink mentioned that UIT has had six meetings with UMC to talk about this proposal, but have not come to a clear conclusion yet. John Horel suggested UIT come back to the committee after both parties have signed off on the proposal.

Holly Christmas said that many colleges and campus departments do have good websites, and that the example comparison showed earlier was an extreme. Christmas also stated that accessibility should be a central part of the unified vision and proposal. She also mentioned being unable to apply security updates to campus-run website servers, which can leave websites vulnerable. Jim Livingston offered to discuss solutions with her at a later time regarding this topic.

The discussion went over the meeting time, at which point Amy Wildermuth decided to end the meeting without a vote on the web strategy proposal. She said given the concerns of the committee, the web strategy proposal would be brought back at the next meeting as one of the first items on the agenda for further discussion and review before a decision could be made.

Three agenda items were not discussed due to lack of time, and will be added to next month’s agenda. Those items were:

- UIT Project Management Office
- UIT service management platform
- UShop implementation timeline

Action summary			
Action	Topic	Person/Group	Next step
Approved	University of Utah IT Strategic Plan	Portfolio	The plan will move forward as outlined in the document.
Approved	New governance submission web forms	Portfolio	The forms were approved as-is, with the condition that a fourth is created for requesting to change/retire a service. This form will be presented at the next governance meeting.
Approved	Financial model statement of work	Portfolio	The plan will move forward as outlined in the presentation.
Approved	BI Center of Excellence	Portfolio	The plan will move forward as outlined in the presentation, with the decision made to begin revising the U’s current data management policy.