Presentation of CITI Sub-committee Recommendations of a Capital Investment Process
The Identification of the Available Funding

Vice Chancellor Olsen
Decisions Affecting the List of IT Investment Requests

- Funding previously committed:
  - Financial Systems Business Case Analysis
  - Student Records Database (SR2)

- Alternative source of funding required/identified:
  - Campus Security Program for Institutional Compliance
  - Effort Reporting System (maintenance)
  - 800 Mhz Radio System Upgrade
  - Math Sciences Data Center Upgrade

- Portions of the following projects have been funded by other sources but they may still be seeking additional campus funding
  - Financial System Upgrades / Enhancements*
  - Human Resources Information System (HRIS)*
  - Platform & Architecture Upgrade for Web Reports & Access*

- The following projects received campus funds for planning efforts that are expected to result in a request for additional campus funding
  - Disaster Recovery
  - Integrated Student Experience
Current List of Campus Investment Requests for CITI Consideration

- The following 13 projects represent the current list of proposed campus and enterprise level projects to be prioritized by CITI:
  - Financial Systems Upgrades*
  - Human Resources Information System (HRIS)*
  - Platform & Architecture Upgrade for Web Reports & Access*
  - Platform & Architecture Upgrade for URSA & Distributed Components*
  - Student Records Data Base (SRDB) Migration
  - Dossier Action Tracking (DAT) Phase II
  - EQM Equipment Management System
  - BruinCard System Upgrade
  - Enterprise Directory Phase II
  - Disaster Recovery Expansion & Business Continuity Planning*
  - Institutional Web for Administrative Information (Institutional Data Management)
  - Common Collaboration & Learning Environment (CC&LE)
  - IDRE/CNSI Data Center

* Portions of these projects are currently financed thru other sources and/or have received campus funds.
Projects Initially Termed “Emerging”

**Financial Systems Upgrades to Postpone Replacement and Increase Functionality**
- Ledger Enhancements
- Recharge System Process
- A/R System for Campus Use
- Payroll System Enhancements
  - Time & Attendance
- PAC/BruinBuy System Enhancements
  - BruinBuy Enhancements for Campus
- Billing & Receivables System Enhancements
  - BAR Subcode Attributes Expansion
  - BAR Tuition Calc
  - Shopping Cart Payment Option

**Express Travel Expense Mgt. System Lifecycle Replacement**
- Software Upgrades
- Hardware Periodic Replacement
- Incremental Maintenance
- Relocation Process System Support

**EQM Equipment Mgt. System Lifecycle Replacement**
- Software Upgrades
- Hardware Periodic Replacement
- Incremental Maintenance

**BruinCard System High Security Upgrade**
- Software/Services
- Hardware Periodic Replacement
During the RCM project the issue of whether the ledger and other central systems should be replaced with a new ERP was confronted.

The decision, which continues today, was that an information front-end should be developed for the ledger, QDB, and that other marginal system developments should be implemented to improve the IT environment at UCLA while avoiding the costs of a new ERP.

This policy has been represented by two previous planning documents, ISTIP and UTIPP, that spanned 8 years and resulted in the campus investing $66 million in IT improvements.

In 2005-06 Administration submitted a five-year plan, UTIPP2, that reaffirmed and continued this strategy while representing 16 “essential” projects and a total investment of $42.5 million, and 4 “emerging” projects for an additional investment of $5.5 million. Accounting for Administration’s proposed contribution of $16.5 million, UTIPP2 represented a budget request of $31.5 million.
Planning and Budget History

- The budget cuts from 2002-03 through 2004-05 together with the utilities crisis, have created a very different funding picture on the campus than existed when ISTIP and UTIPP were considered.

- As a result UTIPP2, even with a considerable contribution from Administration, significantly exceeds the available resources. In addition, there are a number of important academic IT initiatives that are in competition for scarce central resources.

- Facing the significant shortfall between requests and available funding, it became clear that CITI was an important element in the determination of UCLA’s strategy. However, the serial and extended process currently available through CITI has not resulted in a timely prioritization/recommendation process.
Current Developments

- A sub-committee of CITI was established with the mandate of developing a prioritized list of the UTIPP2 and academic projects so that funding decisions could be announced for 2007-08.

- The committee comprised:
  - Mitch Creem
  - Glyn Davies
  - Rick Greenwood
  - and Gary Strong
  - The committee was supported by Marsha Smith (OIT) and Craig Gill (APB).
The subcommittee met for a total of six hours across three meetings, and determined that its tasks fell into four categories:

- Having Executive Management announce the available funding for IT investment.
- The development of a process by which to review and prioritize the projects.
- A determination of which projects were to be reviewed.
- The creation of a prioritized list of projects against which the available funding could be compared.
The Sub-committee discussed the process developed and used in the Medical Center by Mitch Creem. The process was also similar to one used in New York by Gary Strong.

The essential elements of the process are:

- A request process based upon presentations of constrained length that facilitated a fast decision process.
- An evaluation process that was dependent only upon the number of evaluators who attended the meeting with no substitutes allowed.
- A project request form that was used for all proposals and that was understood by each unit making a request.
- A scoring worksheet that was also understood by all participants in the process; both requestors and evaluators alike.
- A structure that allowed the accumulation of the project scores and the establishment of a prioritized list of projects.
- An agreement that the prioritized list resulting from the process would remain unchanged.
The Development of the Prioritization Process

- Once the Sub-committee had discussed and had a good understanding of the Medical Center model, it discussed modifications that might be necessary for its process.
- As a result of these deliberations the following criteria, definitions, and form were finalized for the Sub-committee’s use in creating the campus IT investment prioritized list.
Rating Form Definitions

**Strategic Impact:**
Decide whether the project has an impact on the overall campus strategic direction and/or the strategic direction of teaching, research or public service. The points awarded in this section should range from zero for “None” to four for “Significant”.

**Compliance Requirement:**
Evaluate whether the project is one being required of the campus by campus, Regental, State or Federal policies/regulations. Also the cost of non-compliance should be considered in this category.

**System Lifecycle Necessity:**
Consider whether the proposal is predicated upon the potential for the vendor to no longer support the program language and the consequences of this change, or whether this is the need to upgrade to a new(er) release and the additional utility to the campus users provided by the upgrade. Again the grading scale should range from zero to four.

**User Impact:**
Evaluate the number of individuals in the four categories that are positively impacted by the proposed project. In each category the rating scale should be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 – 200</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 – 500</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 +</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workload Impact:**
Evaluate the savings produced by the implementation of the project. Examples could be that these savings would result from:
- a reduction in processing time;
- a reduction in effort through the implementation of edits built into the new system;
- or a reduction of duplicative effort at the departmental and central level. Again the grading scale should range from zero to four.

**Fiscal Return:**
Evaluate the potential for generating cash savings/return for the departments and/or the campus. Such savings could materialize from cost reductions generated by better purchasing decisions resulting from the addition of catalogs/vendors in the purchasing system; direct costs savings from the reduction of “shadow systems” currently maintained by departments; and a reduction of maintenance costs through the implementation of a new system that requires less attention than a current aging system. Again the grading scale should range from zero to four.
## Project Rating Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>_</th>
<th>_</th>
<th>_</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Impact</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance Requirement</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Lifecycle Necessity</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>User Impact</strong></td>
<td>None - too difficult to measure</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workload Impact</strong></td>
<td>None - too difficult to measure</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Return</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Sub-Committee’s Process Review

- With these tools in hand, the Sub-committee began its process by using the 800mhz radio system upgrade proposal as a test case.
- During this test a number of issues became apparent:
  - A number of technical questions arose that required an expert to answer.
  - The issue of technology advancement in emergency communication that was being used by UCLA’s partners to the Mutual Aid agreement.
  - The projects criticality and the possibility that CTS had already proceeded with the project.
  - The fact that the proposal, and in fact most of the UTIPP2 document, could be 12-18 months old.
- As a result of this test, the Sub-Committee made the following recommendations to Jim Davis and Steve Olsen.
The Sub-Committee’s Recommendations

- That CITI be charged with implementing the investment prioritization process as developed by the Sub-Committee. The essential elements of the process being:
  - A request process based upon presentations of constrained length that facilitates a fast decision process.
  - An evaluation process that is dependent only upon the number of evaluators who attended the meeting with no substitutes allowed.
  - A project request form that is used for all proposals and that is understood by each unit making a request.
  - A scoring worksheet that is understood by all participants in the process, both requestors and evaluators alike, together with a structure that allows the accumulation of project scores and the establishment of a prioritized list of projects.
  - An agreement that the prioritized list resulting from the process will remain unchanged.
The Sub-Committee’s Recommendations

- That the available investment resources be announced to CITI.
- That the evaluation process be housed with Jim Davis and OIT.
- That the following calendar be established:
  - June: Finalization of the criteria, request form and scoring form and the discussion of all with CITI and managers of requesting units.
  - July through August: Completion of request forms and submission to OIT by August 29th.
  - September: A series of CITI meetings of 2-3 hours duration to hear the presentations and evaluate projects.
  - October: Announcement of prioritized list by October 15th.
Proposed Prioritization Process for CITI

Jim Davis
Karen Ribback
-- Key Points --

- Committee endorsement and feedback
  - CITI’s endorsement of the general framework - **today**
  - Feedback on details - **June 19th**

- Decision-making process
  - CITI’s advisory role regarding campus IT investments through a formalized project prioritization process
  - Final decisions based on prioritized list

- Management of process
  - Develop support materials
  - Instruct project owners regarding criteria and format
  - Provide support for September CITI presentations
  - Score and prioritize projects
**-- Proposed Process and Timeline --**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITI Meeting (June 12th)</strong></td>
<td><strong>CITI Meetings (TBS)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Finalized Prioritized List of IT Investment Requests</strong></td>
<td><strong>CITI Meeting (Oct 9th)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/07: CIFI feedback on process details</td>
<td>Request Forms</td>
<td>Scorecards</td>
<td>Prioritized List</td>
<td>-Review prioritized list - Endorsement of final investment decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/30/07: Distribute Instructions &amp; IT Investment Request Forms to Dept</td>
<td>-Review of proposed IT Investment requests -- Scoring of IT Investment requests</td>
<td>10/1/07: Finalized Prioritized List of IT Investment Requests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/07: Submit IT Investment Request Forms to CIO / OIT</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/15/07: Final Investment Decision – List of Endorsed Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Present IT Investment Review and Approval Process
- Endorsement of Subcommittee Recommendations
Proposed Prioritization Process

- **Submission of Initial Requests**
  - Instructions for requests will be sent to departments no later than June 30, 2007.
  - All completed request forms must be submitted to the CIO & Assistant Vice Chancellor for Office of Information Technology (OIT) no later than August 15, 2007.

- **CITI Annual Review & Scoring Sessions**
  - CITI will not meet during the months of July and August.
  - **Up to four CITI meetings (2 hours in length) will be scheduled during the month of September.**
  - Project owners will be scheduled to present their requests to CITI during one of September meetings.
  - Each project will be allowed 20 minutes to present their request, allowing 10 minutes for deliberation. A total of 4 projects will be presented at one CITI meeting.
  - CITI members will score each project presented. CITI members must be in present during the presentation in order for their score on a project to be counted.

- **Prioritization process**
  - The list of projects will be prioritized based on the project’s averaged score.
  - **CITI will complete the prioritization process by September 30, 2007.**

- **Final investment decisions**
  - CITI’s October meeting will focus on final endorsement of the prioritized list and funding recommendations.
  - **Funding decisions will be finalized by October 15, 2007.**
-- “Rules of the Road” --

- Stay within timeframe
- Be respectful of presenter and each other
- Do not debate the “rules of the road” during presentations
- Attend meetings -- No absentee voting
- Do not coach or criticize presenters
- No substitutes
Committee Feedback

- Requirements for scoring & prioritization process – committee feedback by June 19th
  - Proposed forms / templates
  - Commitment by CITI members
    - To attend three or four 2-hour review sessions during the month of September
    - To use the scorecard’s pre-defined standard / criteria to score each of the proposed requests
  - Submission of scorecards at the end of each CITI presentation
    - No proxy or substitutes
    - Only appointed CITI members can submit a scorecard
  - Prioritization is final
    - No reprioritization of projects once the prioritized list is completed
    - Prioritization of partially-funded projects will be based on availability of funds
Samples of Documentation
(currently under construction)
**UCLA IT Investment Request Rating & Justification Form**

Please complete yellow-shaded areas. Do not delete or add rows or columns. Do not move, or cut and paste cells.

1. **Strategic Impact:** Describe the impact this project will have on the overall campus strategic direction of teaching, research or public service:

   [Text area]

   **Check the appropriate box:**
   - 1. None - No strategic impact
   - 2. Low - Minimal strategic impact
   - 3. Moderate - Some strategic impact
   - 4. Significant - Necessary and significant strategic impact

2. **Compliance Requirement:**

   2a) Specify the campus, Regental, State or Federal policies and/or regulations that are being met:

   [Text area]

   2b) Describe how this project will meet the stated policies and/or regulations requirements, the measurable impacts and any non-compliance issues or costs.

   [Text area]

   **Check the appropriate box:**
   - 1. None - No measurable impact on compliance requirements.
   - 2. Low - Small impact on compliance requirements.
   - 3. Moderate - Necessary to maintain current compliance requirements.
   - 4. Significant - Demonstrates measurable improvement and necessity for compliance.

3. **System Lifecycle Necessity:** Describe any system lifecycle issues and its impact:

   [Text area]
# CITI IT Investment Request Prioritization Process

## PROJECT SCORECARD

**Proposed Project:** Financial Systems Upgrades  
**CITI Presentation Date:** September 6, 2007  
**Amount Requested:**  
**CITI Member Name:**

### 1) Project Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Categories</th>
<th>Requestor 's Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Lifecycle Necessity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Return</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score:** 0

### 2) Investment Recommendation

Select One:  
- Full Funding  
- Partial Funding  
- Defer  
- Rejct  

**Rationale:**

### 3) General Comments/Notes:
CITI IT Investment Request Prioritization Process

Summary of Final Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project Requests (FY2007-2011)</th>
<th>Initial Request</th>
<th>CITI Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Justification Score</td>
<td>Total Amt Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/15/07</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Systems Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Information System (HRIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform &amp; Architecture Upgrade for Web Reports &amp; Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Systems Business Case Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform &amp; Architecture Upgrade for URSA &amp; Distributed Components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Records Database (SRDB) Migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dossier Action Tracking (DAT) Phase II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Reporting System (Maintenance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express Travel Expense Management System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;I Equipment Management System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrainCard System Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrainCard System High Security Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Directory Identity Management Initiative-Phase II (EDIMI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Recovery Expansion &amp; Business Continuity Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Web for Administrative Information (Institutional Data Management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800MHz Radio System Upgrades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Collaboration &amp; Learning Environment (CC&amp;LE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDRE/CNSI Data Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Security Program for Institutional Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>