Committee on IT Infrastructure (CITI)

June 6, 2006
Meeting Summary

CITI Attendees: Sue Abeles, Neal Axelrod, Mitch Creem, Glyn Davies, Jim Davis, Vijay Dhir, Rick Greenwood, Nick Hernandez, Kathleen Kiser, Tom Lifka, Janina Montero, Sam Morabito, Steve Olsen, Roberto Peccei, Terry Ryan, Albert Setton, Gary Strong

Guests: Nick Reddingius (OIT), Mike Schilling (CTS), Esther Woo-Benjamin (OIT, Don Worth (AIS)

Agenda

1) **Expectation on the Role of CITI in campus decisions**

The expected role of CITI is to make recommendations on investments made by the campus as a whole, not just investments related to administrative systems. Recommendations are based on consideration of: inter-relationships between projects, architecture, and timeframe and include identification of priorities for the campus.

2) **Establish new tools and governance process for CITI to address its institutional role**

The OIT has spent several months meeting with groups and individuals involved in IT governance to clarify roles and responsibilities, determine criteria for institutional IT projects, and improve the overall process. This process of self review is expected to be ongoing; however, improvements have already been made through the addition of new membership: 1) Library, 2) Medical Enterprise, and 3) Deans (Professional Schools and College). All units that provision a campus-wide system are now represented.

Recommendations for further improvement in three areas were introduced and briefly discussed:

- Clarify recommending, endorsement and decision making roles and responsibilities within the governance process
  - ‘Input’ - is sought in a formal fashion and then taken as recommendations to other governance groups
  - ‘Decision’ - is made by Executive Sponsors (VCs, Deans, EVC, Chancellor, Budget and Finance)
‘Final Endorsement’ - is final authority on endorsement after coalescing input to make a recommendation
OIT has a joint advocacy role. It makes recommendations from an architecture and IT infrastructure perspective as well as from consideration of coalesced input. Its role is ‘Final Endorsement’ rather than ‘Decision’ (note: this is a suggested change to the Governance Decision Domain chart).

- Develop institutional criteria, in addition to size of funding request and independent of funding source, to determine which IT initiatives and associated investment decisions will benefit from the governance process.
  - Not all projects go through all parts of the governance process
  - ‘Triggers’ have been identified that influence what part of the governance process gets invoked

- Clarify how IT projects enter and are tracked and managed through the governance process. Create flexible pathways to ensure the governance process remains responsive.
  - Projects are identified through self reporting in the Strategic Planning process. There was a recommendation to strengthen communication of the need for self reporting. A proposed strategy is to identify gaps in a Strategic Plan and reporting back to the unit, asking for clarification.
  - Human interaction is the mechanism to ensure flexibility in moving projects through the process in a timely manner.
  - The process ensures accountability for (at minimum) tracking institutional projects and some local projects that have impacts.

**Actions:**
There was agreement to return to these topics at the next meeting:
- Review recommendations to surface any major issues
- Approve recommendations
- Paint the landscape of projects currently on the table
- Get a sense of budgetary constraints
- Discuss how to look at priority ratings