

## **Background and Purpose:**

In 2009, recognizing the increasingly vital role that information technology plays in the achievement of the University's strategic and tactical goals, President Nellis created the Advisory Group for Information Technology (AGIT). It is the responsibility of this group to oversee, facilitate and coordinate institutional discussions and communication that relate to academic and administrative information technology and to be a value-added partner to UI units while providing advice and guidance, ensuring that information technology is aligned with the institution's mission and vision.

## **Benefits:**

There are a number of benefits to having a university-wide review of technology projects:

1. Reduces the probability of security and/or compliance problems
2. Maintains control, organization and knowledge of university data
3. Maximizes utilization of existing technology experts by avoiding duplicative solutions to similar problems
4. Improves integration between UI systems, providing a better experience for faculty, staff, students and others
5. Improves prioritization of UI technology work and the use of ITS and other technology resources towards the fulfillment of the UI Strategic Plan
6. Improves vendor management and contract terms as well as ensuring utilization of state and consortium pricing
7. Creates institutional financial savings through the utilization of economies of scale, better understanding of the total cost of ownership for technology and a reduction in the number of failed technology projects
8. Provides ability to view and budget for UI's technology and technology support spending

A typical concern with these types of central review structures is that they will slow projects down and not allow the necessary agility in meeting the ever-changing technology needs of a land grant, research university. On the contrary, a thorough review and prioritization process will allow a project to receive the university's support and resources while ensuring the complexities of the technical, compliance and resource realities are addressed up front, minimizing unnecessary implementation delays.

## **Process:**

1. As a UI unit identifies a need for which a technology solution might be applicable or where a technology-related policy is required, the unit contacts AGIT.
2. AGIT will assign representation to work with the UI unit in developing a proposal.
3. Using a transparent process with documented criteria, AGIT will, depending on the scope of the proposal:
  - a. Approve or deny proceeding with the proposal.
  - b. Report on the project proposal to the group made up of Provost Baker, VP Smith, VP Murray, VP McIver, and Executive Director Ickes.
    - i. This group will take action on the proposal as deemed appropriate (accept, deny or refer back to AGIT) and will communicate results to AGIT.
4. AGIT will document and clearly communicate the decision to the proposers and facilitate, as needed, work with General Counsel, Purchasing Services and ITS to finalize purchase and implementation details.

The project proposal form is presented in Appendix 1 and the recommendation criteria are outlined in Appendix 2. More detail on the proposal and analysis process is available in internal AGIT documentation and will be used to provide consistency in proposal development and evaluation. More information will also be developed as the process matures.

**Implementation and Communication Timeframe:**

Until the AGIT process goes into effect, all technology projects that are currently under discussion should go to the CIO for review and assistance. Projects that cannot wait until the AGIT process is in effect will then be forwarded by the CIO to the group of executives mentioned in 3.b.i above. The goal is to have the full process in effect by August 2012.

Task	Timeline
Finalize membership of AGIT (see Appendix 3)	Complete by 6/01/2012
Complete draft form and instructions	Complete by 6/01/2012
Present process to and get input from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- President’s Cabinet</li> <li>- Provost’s Council</li> <li>- Associate Dean’s Group</li> <li>- Faculty ITC</li> <li>- Faculty Senate</li> <li>- Vice President/Vice Provosts/Athletics</li> <li>- System Administrators Group</li> </ul>	Complete by 6/29/2012
Finalize proposal form and instructions based on input from UI units	Complete by 7/13/2012
Develop university announcement/notification in consultation with University Communications	Complete by 7/27/2012
AGIT Process in effect, communication complete	Complete by 8/6/2012

**Questions:**

Comments and questions concerning AGIT can be directed to Steve Neiheisel, Assistant Vice President Enrollment Management Services, at [steven@uidaho.edu](mailto:steven@uidaho.edu) and Daniel Ewart, Chief Information Officer, at [dewart@uidaho.edu](mailto:dewart@uidaho.edu).

**Appendix 1: Review Form**

**AGIT Review**

**Criteria Checklist and Proposal Form**

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Request Date</b>	<b>Submitted by (include contact information)</b>
<b>Short description of project / purchase (one sentence)</b>		<b>Request # (For AGIT Use Only):</b>

**ALL requested and/or recommended technology projects must complete the checklist below.**

**Definition:** A project is a temporary endeavor undertaken to create a unique product, service, change, or result. A project is different from “business as usual” activities (operational work) in that it has a number of distinguishing features: it brings about change, has unknown elements therefore create risk that must be managed, and has a defined start and end (is temporary). In contrast, “business as usual” activities are characterized by having known policies, processes, procedures or precedents which may be followed, virtually no risk is present, the activities are not new but repeated (albeit not necessarily very frequently) and therefore does not offer change.

**CHECKLIST**

YES	NO	CRITERIA
		1. Requires new ITS and / or other departmental information technology resources (including new or increased support needs)
		2. List amount of initial plus five-year on-going information technology costs for the project (i.e. first time hardware/software acquisition, professional services, annual maintenance, staffing, etc) \$ _____
		3. Requires new integration with existing information technology or electronic data systems such as Banner, FAMIS, R25, and ITS Identity/Access Management.
		4. Affects information technology aspects of multiple organizational components of the university.
		5. Has information security aspects with respect to implementation of the information technology (privacy, confidentiality regulatory or compliance).

- IF checking ‘NO’ to all criteria above, submit the completed checklist to AGIT for final review and approval.
- IF checking ‘YES’ to any of the criteria above, the Proposal form (below) must be completed and submitted to AGIT for further review and assessment.

## Proposal

### OVERVIEW

1. **University Responsibility** - *Identify the name, email and phone number for the following:*
  - a. **Sponsoring Department**
  - b. **Executive Sponsor** (*highest ranking person responsible for acquiring all required resources necessary to successfully complete this project as well as removal of barriers that would impede its progress*).
  - c. **Project Manager** (*individual responsible for the day-to-day coordination and management of this project*)
  
2. **Description** -- *Include in the description the following: the need, opportunity and/or the problem to be solved; the project scope including the definition of success; as applicable, describe the existing process that needs to be automated or enhanced; and for medium to large requests, provide a short description of each feature comprised in the project.*
  
3. **Required Costs and Resources**
  - a. **Budget estimate** -- *Include both one-time and ongoing for hardware, software, staff hours (both ITS and non-ITS personnel -- including within the sponsoring department and others), consulting /professional services.*
  
  - b. **Financial commitments /resources for above**

### PROJECT BACKGROUND

1. **Context** -- *Describe if it is a regulatory requirement, a mandate, supportive of a local tactical/operational plan, or supportive of a specific element of the University of Idaho strategic plan.*
  
2. **Value proposition** -- *Identify projected cost savings and/or efficiencies and/or profitability (if applicable) and the associated timeframe as well as related process or service improvements.*
  
3. **Beneficiaries** – *Identify who on campus or which off-campus constituent group will directly or indirectly benefit.*
  
4. **Risks** -- *Describe all risks associated with doing as well as NOT doing this project.*
  
5. **Alternatives Considered** -- *Document alternatives considered and why rejected. Changes in business processes to accommodate existing technology solutions should be considered and documented.*
  
6. **Timeframe and Urgency** -- *Identify relevant timeframes or related timelines. Do we need to do this right now or can it wait? Define the level of urgency and priority compared to other work, both project and operational.*
  
7. **Constraints** -- *Identify constraints such as budget, schedule, staff, equipment, facilities and infrastructure, etc.*

## CONNECTIONS

1. **System impacts / dependencies** -- *Identify any prerequisite projects as well as any related or connected processes or projects that will need modification or changes as a result of this project. Describe how existing systems and processes need to be modified or extended to accomplish this project.*
2. **Enterprise Systems Integration** -- *Requirements for interfacing to all institutional IT/ ERP systems including but not limited to: ITS Authentication (LDAPS), Banner – HR, Banner – Finance, Banner – Student, VandalCard, Document Imaging, Web Services, and Help Desk.*
3. **Stakeholders -- impact and/or buy-in** -- *Identify various stakeholders (both from within ITS and outside) whose support is required to make this project successful. Has their buy-in been secured? If not, what conditions or constraints have they placed on their support?)*

## AGIT Findings

1. **Criteria utilized in review process**
2. **Findings**
3. **Comments**

**Appendix 2: Recommendation Criteria**

When AGIT reviews a project proposal, the following criteria will be considered as recommendations are made. Decisions of this nature cannot be a purely mathematical decision based on weights and measures as there is variability in each process and in each project proposal. The criteria presented below represent the thorough nature of the information collected in order for AGIT, and by extension the institution, to make sound decisions on technology implementations.

Criteria	Potential Measures <sup>1</sup>	Importance to Recommendation Process <sup>2</sup>
<b>Institutional Priority</b>	High, Medium, or Low	High
<b>Institutional Impact</b>	High, Medium, or Low	High
<b>Unit Priority</b>	High, Medium, or Low	Medium
<b>Unit Impact</b>	High, Medium, or Low	Medium
<b>Supports Specific Element(s) of the UI Leading Idaho Strategic Plan</b>	Yes or No	High
<b>Data Security Risk</b> – requires PII or SPI to be stored or transmitted outside of core ITS-supported data systems	High, Medium or Low	High
<b>Regulatory Compliance Risks</b> – does the completion of the project bring about potential compliance risks	High, Medium, or Low	High
<b>PCI Compliance Risk</b>	Yes or No	Medium
<b>Required Timeframe for Implementation</b>	Immediate, Near Term or Next 12 Months	Medium
<b>Cost Savings</b>	High, Medium, Low or None	High
<b>Revenue Generation</b>	High, Medium, Low or None	High
<b>Efficiency Improvements</b>	High, Medium, Low or None	High
<b>Budget Situation for 5 Years</b> (or project lifetime if less than 5 years)	Budget Available, Budget Based on Anticipated Revenue or New Central Funding Request	High
<b>Regulatory Requirement</b>	Yes or No	High
<b>Collaboration Opportunity with</b>	Yes or No	Low

Criteria	Potential Measures <sup>1</sup>	Importance to Recommendation Process <sup>2</sup>
<b>Other Idaho Institutions</b>		
<b>ITS Resources Required for Project</b>	Yes or No	Medium
<b>Requires New UI FTE for Implementation, Maintenance or End-User Support</b>	Yes or No	High
<b>Requires On-Going Maintenance by a Third Party Provider</b>	Yes or No	Medium
<b>Requires Integration with Existing UI Data System(s)</b>	Yes or No	High
<b>Business Process Changes Considered and/or Implemented in Support of Technology</b>	Yes or No	High

1. "Potential Measures" represent a relative measure by which AGIT can compare multiple projects competing for the same resources ; more detail on how these measures will be assigned is available in the detailed AGIT process documentation.

2. "Importance to Recommendation Process" represents the relative weight of the criteria to the overall recommendation. Criteria rated as "High" will be given higher consideration in the recommendation process over criteria rated "Medium" or "Low" though some case-by-case analysis will be required

## **Appendix 3: AGIT Membership**

In order to accurately represent the needs of UI as a whole, AGIT will have the following membership:

Steve Neiheisel – Chair

Chris Cooney – University Advancement

Rick Fehrenbacher – Academic Liaison

TBD – Center and Outreach Liaison

TBD – Faculty Liaison

Daniel Ewart - ITS

Trina Mahoney – Planning and Budget

Nancy Krogh – Admin Systems Liaison

Lynn Baird – Research/Library Liaison

TBD - ASUI Liaison

AGIT also has a number of subcommittees to represent technology, administrative software, academic pursuits and research concerns. The members of AGIT can call on the experience of any of the subcommittee members when assisting UI units with project proposals.

In order to function as expeditiously as possible, there are certain expectations of the members of AGIT:

1. While the AGIT members have been selected to represent the main constituencies of UI, it is critical that all members will perform their functions in the best interest of UI as a whole.
  - a. The UI Centers, faculty and students will each need to nominate people who are at the appropriate decision-making level to represent the respective constituencies while also representing the overall needs of UI.
2. AGIT members must commit to reaching out to their constituency to gain input on project proposals and to provide feedback to their constituency on outcomes. It is critical that two-way communication is maintained between the UI community and AGIT.
3. In order to provide a consistent and responsive process, AGIT membership cannot be delegated. New appointments, as required, will be accompanied by training in AGIT processes.