In the past year, CITI’s primary focus has been on the review of existing and proposed investment requests for institutional and enterprise-level information technology systems and initiatives for FY 2007-2011. A total of 19 projects/initiatives were brought forward to CITI for their review and endorsement.

The Committee heard detailed presentations of investments being made towards enterprise administrative systems as represented in the April 2006 UTIPP2 (University Technology Infrastructure and Productivity Plan 2) Report. They also reviewed other academically-focused institutional projects and initiatives requesting campus funds which were not included in the UTIPP2 Report. These projects/initiatives included CCLE (Common Collaborative & Learning Environment); Integrated Student Experience (MyUCLA and Student Records Database); IDRE (Institute for Digital Research & Education) Data Center; DAT II (Dossier Action Tracking); and the Campus Security Program.

There was a need for CITI to rapidly make decisions about the proposed IT projects since investment recommendations were to be forwarded to the Chancellor’s office by May 2007. Funding recommendations were made for three projects to advance their planning - the Integrated Student Experience, Disaster Recovery (part of UTIPP2), and the business case study for UCLA’s financial systems. However, it was determined by CITI’s Subcommittee that a more structured approach to evaluating and prioritizing the project was necessary to further CITI’s endorsement of any remaining and future project funding requests.

The CITI Subcommittee was formed in April 2007 to review and analyze the list of IT projects and initiatives that were requesting allocation of campus funds for FY 2007-11. The members were carefully selected to minimize conflict of interest. This Subcommittee comprised of Mitch Creem, Glyn Davies, Rick Greenwood, and Gary Strong, with support from Craig Gill and Marsha Smith, reviewed all institutional projects and discussed how the investment requests should be evaluated and prioritized. An existing review process, the UCLA Healthcare Capital Budget Request Process, implemented by Mitch Creem, was suggested and then subsequently and enthusiastically supported by the subcommittee as the review model to bring back for CITI endorsement. Given that the model was not in place prior to this year’s project presentations the subcommittee recommended that the model be adapted to an abbreviated process through the summer for full CITI review and recommendations across two to three meetings in September 2007.

Subcommittee Recommendations:

- Adopt the criteria represented in the project scorecard for evaluating and prioritizing the current list of proposed projects requesting Campus(FY2007-11) funds.
- Implement the proposed IT investment review process for current and future requests.
- Only appointed CITI members in attendance can submit project scorecards at the end of each presentation. No proxy or substitutes will be permitted.
- Available funds and their source must be identified in advance of the decisions.
IT Investment Prioritization Process for FY 2007-2011 Requests

CITI Prioritization Process / Timeline:

Project Requests:
- Instructions for requests will be sent to departments no later than June 30, 2007. These instructions will include a set of forms to be completed by their project owner / manager. To assist with this process, these forms will be populated with information that was already documented during the CITI review process.
- All completed/revised request forms must be submitted to the CIO & Assistant Vice Chancellor for Office of Information Technology (OIT) no later than August 15, 2007. Incomplete or late requests will not be considered during this process.

CITI Review & Scoring:
- Up to four CITI meetings (2 hours in length) will be scheduled during the month of September. Project owners will be invited to present their request(s) to CITI during one of September meetings.
- Each project will be allowed 20 minutes to present their request, allowing 10 minutes for deliberation and discussion. As many as four (4) projects may be presented and scored at a single CITI meeting.
- “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
- The following six criteria will be used by CITI members to score each proposed project:
  - Strategic Impact
  - Compliance Requirement
  - Systems Lifecycle Necessity
  - User Impact
  - Workload Impact
  - Fiscal Return
- CITI members must be present during the presentation in order for their project scorecard to be counted. CITI members will complete a scorecard after each presentation. Scorecards will be collected at the end of each CITI presentation meeting.
- The scorecard values for each request/project will be tallied. Each project will receive a score that will range in value from 0 to 24. The project’s final score will be calculated based on an average score (i.e., total score divided by number of eligible scorecards).

Prioritization & Final Decision:
- CITI’s October meeting will focus on the final endorsement of the prioritized list.
- The list of projects will be prioritized based on the project’s final score.
- A prioritized list of projects will be generated based on the project score. Funding decisions will be finalized based on the prioritized list and available funds. Each project will result in one of four decisions:
  - Approved, in full.
  - Approved, partially. With explanation for why not fully funded.
  - Deferred. Returned with specific recommendations for resubmission.
  - Rejected. With explanation for why request was denied.
- CITI will complete the prioritization process by September 30, 2007.
- Funding decisions will be finalized by October 15, 2007.
Proposed Schedule / Timing
CITI should complete the scoring, prioritization and investment decisions by October 15, 2007. As a result, the following schedule has been developed to meet this timeline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Notification to departments</td>
<td>June 30, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Completed request forms submitted to CIO &amp; OIT</td>
<td>August 15, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Summarizing of all requests to CITI membership</td>
<td>August 21, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Scheduling of CITI presentations</td>
<td>August 21, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CITI Presentations / Rating Sessions</td>
<td>September 1-30, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Finalize scoring and prioritization of all requests</td>
<td>October 7, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Final investment decisions</td>
<td>October 15, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Project Scorecard**

**Scoring Requirements:**
CITI members must attend the presentations in order to be eligible to submit a scorecard for the request/project. CITI members will complete a scorecard after each presentation. Completed scorecards will be collected at the end of each CITI presentation. Each project will be provided a final score once the scorecards of the eligible CITI members have been tallied.

**Scorecard Definitions & Points:**
The definition for the six scoring categories within the project scorecard are as outlined below. The points awarded in each category will range from zero (None) to four (Significant).

1. **Strategic Impact:**
   Each request will be evaluated on the expected impact it will have on the overall campus strategic direction and/or the strategic direction of teaching, research or public service.

2. **Compliance Requirement:**
   Each request will be evaluated on whether the project is a requirement of the campus by campus, Regents, State or Federal policies/regulations. The cost of non-compliance should be considered in this category. The points awarded in this section will range from zero for “None” to four for “Significant”.

3. **System Lifecycle Necessity:**
   Each request will be evaluated on 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 a need to upgrade to a new(er) release and the additional utility to the campus users provided by the upgrade.

4. **User Impact:**
   Each request will be evaluated on the number of individuals that are positively impacted by the proposed project.

5. **Workload Impact:**
   Each request will be evaluated on the savings produced by the implementation of the project. Examples could be that these savings would result from one of the following:
   - Reduction/improvement in processing time
   - Reduction/improvement in effort through the implementation of edits built into the new system; or
   - Reduction of duplicative effort at the departmental and central level.

6. **Fiscal Return:**
   Each request will be evaluated on the potential for generating cash savings/return for the departments and/or the campus. Such savings could materialize from any one of the following:
   - 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;
   - Reduction of maintenance costs through the implementation of a new system that requires less attention than a current aging system.
CITI Committee Members

CITI members are appointed by the Executive Vice Chancellor on behalf of the Deans and Vice Chancellors. Members of the committee are academic and administrative directors responsible for business and fiscal aspects of IT applications and infrastructure. The Committee is responsible for strategic and tactical planning, operational policy and business and cost allocation models. There are currently twenty committee members, as listed below:

Co-Chairs:
Steve Olsen, Vice Chancellor, Finance & Budget
Jim Davis, Associate Vice Chancellor, Information Technology & CIO

Members:
Academic Planning and Budget
   Glyn Davies, Assistant Vice Chancellor

Business and Administrative Services
   Sam Morabito, Vice Chancellor
   Sue Abeles, Assistant Vice Chancellor-Corporate Financial Services

College of Letters and Science
   Patricia O’Brien, Executive Dean
   Nick Hernandez, Assistant Executive Dean-Finance & Administration

External Affairs
   Rhea Turteltaub, Interim Vice Chancellor
   Neal Axelrod, Assistant Vice Chancellor

Graduate Division
   Claudia Mitchell-Keman, Vice Chancellor
   Albert Setton, Assistant Vice Chancellor

Libraries
   Gary Strong, University Librarian
   Terry Ryan, Associate University Librarian

Medicine/Medical Center
   Mitch Creem, Associate Vice Chancellor & CFO Medical Sciences

Professional Schools
   Vijay Dhir, Dean, Henry Samueli School of Engineering & Applied Science
   Kathleen Kiser, Associate Dean, School of Public Health

Research Administration
   Roberto Peccei, Vice Chancellor
   Rick Greenwood, Assistant Vice Chancellor Research Administration

Student Affairs
   Janina Montero, Vice Chancellor
   Tom Lifka, Assistant Vice Chancellor

In terms of the IT investment prioritization process, committee members must attend the project presentation in order to be eligible to submit their rating. No proxy or substitutes will be allowed.

---

1 It originated as the Enterprise Computing Committee (ECC) bringing together the Vice Chancellors involved in Information Systems Transitional Infrastructure Plan (ISTIP) funding and projects.