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Project Context

Background

Since 2004, the Information Technology Priorities Committee (ITPC) process has provided a common approach to solicit, review, prioritize and execute information technology projects involving University Administration (UA) information technology resources. After four years of experience with the process, the ITPC agreed that a review was in order, to determine where the process is working well and where improvements are needed. The goal was to complete a set of recommendations for review by the Academic Affairs Management Team (AAMT) and implement the results in FY09.

Scope

- Identify issues affecting the efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of the ITPC process.
- Propose recommendations for improving the process.

Methodology

The review was conducted in five phases.

1. **Preparation (November—December)**
   - Solicit feedback from ITPC and Subcommittees
   - Identify initial areas for discussion

2. **Information Gathering (January—May)**
   - Conduct interviews to identify issue details and options

3. **Focus Group (April—May)**
   - Discuss issues with a work group representing a balance of constituents
   - Outline initial recommendations

4. **ITPC Review and submit to AAMT (May-June)**

5. **AAMT Review and Approval (July)**

A common set of questions was developed for the interviews, but the discussion was flexible to allow sufficient time for issues of importance to the interviewee. Also some specific questions were only relevant for those familiar with the process. The question set is shown in Appendix 1.

The Focus Group represented a cross section of subject areas, campuses and ITPC committees. See Appendix 2 for a list of participants. The group met twice; the first meeting was split into two locations to accommodate schedules. In the first meeting, the group reviewed issues identified during the interviews and agreed on a set of issues and options. In the second meeting, the group agreed on a set of recommendations to be forwarded to the ITPC.

On May 28, the ITPC reviewed the Focus Group’s recommendations and made additions and modifications. This set of recommendations was summarized and again reviewed on June 25. The final set of recommendations will be presented to the Academic Affairs Management Team on July 11.
General Findings

From the first interviews to the last discussion with ITPC, there were some overall findings that represented common themes across many different individuals and constituencies. Below are findings and comments paraphrased from the interviews.

- **Overall, the ITPC process was perceived as a necessary process and an improvement over previous efforts to assign IT work.**
  - I continue to believe that there is value in the process. It’s not a perfect process but we will fine tune it and it will evolve.
  - The process has brought some order to the chaos that existed before.

- **Many people expressed appreciation for the communication/transparency aspects of the ITPC process for the ITPC community.** They appreciated that the process brings people to a common table to exchange information.
  - I’ve been pleasantly surprised at the level of collegiality. People feel free to express ideas and take positions.

- **The demand for administrative technology work is greater than the resources available.** Many expressed concern over the size of the current project queue and the wait for initiation of new projects.
  - The resources for ITPC are very inadequate. There is a need for increased resources to get on a more even ground with meeting demand.
  - In general there are not enough resources. We probably have 4 years of projects in all areas.
  - We are meeting some needs but it seems the needs are never-ending with technology changing constantly.

- **The Functional Subcommittees are key to the process.** Many people appreciated the extent to which the Subcommittees grapple with complex subject and technical issues. They noted the challenge of coming up with project rankings.
  - Decision making is at the Subcommittee level now.
  - The magic in the process is at the Subcommittee level.
  - The Subcommittee is very organized. We do the hashing out and moving forward.

- **Within the ITPC community, defined as the ITPC and the Functional Subcommittees, there was a general opinion that communications works well.** People cited the amount and frequency of information about projects as a positive. There was also recognition that the process is not widely known outside the ITPC community.
  - The information coming to ITPC is continually getting better.
  - Communication outside the committee structure is poor to nonexistent. It’s passive communication.
  - I don’t know if people don’t know the process exists or understand there is an opportunity to use it.
  - A lot of people don’t understand the process. There is misunderstanding about timing and schedule.
  - We need to make information broadly available – projects completed, pipeline, performance.

There were also a common set of concerns. These were captured as issues and addressed as recommendations in the section below.
Recommendations Summary

The outcome of the ITPC Process Review is the set of recommendations shown below. For more context on these recommendations see the section beginning on page 6.

1. Develop a charter of ITPC/Subcommittee responsibilities and scope that reflects scope and practices going forward. As part of the charter, clarify ITPC’s scope relative to administrative IT needs of front-line units.

2. Provide greater guidance on strategic elements. For discussion at AAMT, draft an administrative information technology strategy that is related to University strategic direction. At ITPC, for projects over a certain size, arrange for presentations and discussions on project value.

3. Develop a cross functional prioritization process that pulls the functional areas together. The process would review projects that do not fit well into the current structure. Related recommendations are:
   
   3a. Add Global Campus representation at each Functional Subcommittee, to provide full participation/approval of Global Campus projects in the ITPC process.
   
   3b. Continue to send single subject Data Warehouse/Business Intelligence projects to the appropriate Functional Subcommittee.
   
   3c. Add Capital and Utilities issues to the Finance Functional Subcommittee.
   
   3d. Create a review pathway for any unanticipated areas. Ensure that the process is not bypassing Functional Subcommittee review in an arbitrary manner by defaulting unanticipated areas to review only at the ITPC level.

4. On a trial basis, use the Functional Subcommittees to help manage the length of the queue by allocating resources (dollars and FTE) to each Subcommittee to approve/fund discretionary projects at Level 1. Related recommendations are:
   
   4a. Request funding for projects larger than 5,000 hours or $250,000 from outside the ITPC process (unit funding or AAMT request).
   
   4b. Request funding for mandatory projects from outside the ITPC process.
   
   4c. Request funding for ITPC project-driven ongoing maintenance costs from outside the ITPC process.
   
   4d. Provide a review of the current queue of projects approved but not yet started. Ask sponsors to confirm that their projects are still viable and required.

5. Ask the Subcommittees to facilitate cross-campus development of templates and to work with campuses on input processes. Include these responsibilities in the Subcommittees charter:
   
   5a. Task Subcommittee chairs with discussing cross-campus development of templates, among themselves and to share techniques for encouraging cross-campus coordination.
   
   5b. Set a time frame for cross-campus template review, so that there is sufficient time for review of templates that originate on one campus. Recognize that cross campus coordination adds to complexity of the discussion and require Subcommittees to adopt techniques like the “10 days of notification” guideline, which has succeeded in the Student Subcommittee.
Recommendations Summary (continued)

6. Hold a face-to-face meeting once a year, close to year end. This event would include a review of project accomplishments and benefits, address process issues, baseline the coming year’s tasks and issues. It may also include large project review. There would be a positive effect on cross-campus participation in the process. Related recommendations are:

6a. To encourage cross-campus participation, ensure that remote participants don’t miss parts of the discussion through careful attention to audio/visual connections and participation throughout ITPC/Subcommittee meetings.

7. Conduct post-project surveys related to project success. Require that project sponsors provide feedback on project success in response to these inquiries. Information from the surveys can be reported in an annual report or other communications effort.

8. Develop a communication plan that addresses the issues raised during the review. These include strategic issues, ability to fund single campus projects, the resource picture for projects and relationship to the project queue, how work requests affect the overall process, status of the queue and reasons for scheduling delay. Related recommendations were:

8a. Push information on the queue’s state and reasons for delays out to appropriate groups.
8b. Target those with questions about template development and communicate about the issue.
8c. Share information on resource capacity across Information Technology units on a regular (perhaps quarterly) basis.
8d. Assign a central resource to help the Functional Subcommittees with their communications responsibilities and to communicate on overall ITPC issues.
8e. Publish an Annual Report to share information on projects accomplished and in progress.

9. Clarify roles and responsibilities on project levels and approvals.

9a. Provide AAMT with a comprehensive report of all projects accomplished and in progress, on at least an annual basis, and whenever requested.
9b. Seek AAMT approval only for projects above 5,000 hours or $250,000. Provide AAMT with presentations and discussions of strategic value for these projects.
9c. Ask AAMT to delegate these responsibilities to ITPC:
   • Approve Level 2 projects less than 5,000 hours and $250,000.
   • Set project levels, i.e., thresholds for Level 1/Level 2 categorization.
9d. Change the Level1/Level 2 thresholds as follows:
   • Level 1 range to 250—849 hours, up from the current threshold of 80—400 hours.
   • Level 2 range would be 850+ hours, up from the current threshold of 400+ hours.
Issues and Recommendations Detail

The recommendations emerged from a process, as outlined below.

![Flowchart showing the process from Interviews to Review/Approval]

**Issues**

The initial set of issues identified in the Interview phase of the review were:

- Cross functional prioritization is not being adequately addressed.
- Cross-campus development of templates is problematic.
- Communication outside the process is sub-optimal and has effects on the process.
- Direct representation of the interests of front-line college/department units in the process is minimal.
- The current practice of approving a long queue of projects for which there are not resources is damaging to ITPC operation and perception.
- A strategic element is desired but there is uncertainty about how to achieve it.
- Some topics are not represented well in the 3 subject area structure.
- ITPC process does not have a current charter.
- Template development is seen as a barrier, particularly by those outside the process.
- Outcomes of ITPC projects are not evaluated.
- Campus participation is perceived to be out of balance.
- The resource picture for ITPC is unclear, particularly as it affects the queue and scheduling of projects.

The Focus Group analyzed these issues and added two additional issues:

- Level 1 thresholds
- How AAMT participates in the process

They agreed on a set of options and, from those, a set of recommendations that were passed to the ITPC for consideration. Appendix 3 provides a full list of issues, options and recommendations from the Focus Group. After a review and prioritization of the Focus Group input, the ITPC arrived at a final set of recommendations. The table on the following page details the recommendations, associated issue and some context for the issue.
# Issues and Recommendations Detail (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Issue(s)</th>
<th>Importance of the Issue(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develop a charter of ITPC/Subcommittee responsibilities and scope that reflects scope and practices going forward. As part of the charter, clarify ITPC’s scope relative to administrative IT needs of front-line units.</td>
<td>ITPC process does not have a current charter. The Subcommittees were launched without a set of guidelines or charter. The ITPC committee has evolved in its functions and understanding. Direct representation of the interests of front-line college/department units in the process is minimal. It is not clear to what extent the scope of ITPC should encompass the general administrative IT needs of front-line units.</td>
<td>The review process has shown a number of gaps and misunderstandings about the ITPC process. Without a clear charter, it’s difficult to have consistent effort across many groups or have clear communication. The current process is often perceived as a &quot;central office&quot; process with little relevance to front-line units (colleges and departments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide greater guidance on strategic elements. For discussion at AAMT, draft an administrative information technology strategy that is related to University strategic direction. At ITPC, for projects over a certain size, arrange for presentations and discussion on project value.</td>
<td>A strategic element is desired but there is uncertainty about how to achieve it. The current process is operationally oriented, structured to be responsive to operational pain in functional units.</td>
<td>Technology should support the direction of the University as well as operational needs. There may need to be connections to campus plans, the President’s input, Provost’s initiatives, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Develop a cross functional prioritization process that pulls the functional areas together. The process would review projects that do not fit well into the current structure. Related recommendations were:</td>
<td>Cross functional prioritization is not being adequately addressed. Some topics are not represented well in the 3 subject area structure. The three Subcommittee structure is sometimes assumed to encompass all areas. However, there are several areas that are not clearly slotted within a Subcommittee.</td>
<td>There is a great deal of cynicism by those whose projects are pushed out, and lack of communication. Also timing is cited as a reason for not participating in the process and is possibly an opportunity cost for identifying more important projects than those in the queue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Add Global Campus representation at each Functional Subcommittee, contingent on full participation/approval of Global Campus projects in the ITPC process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Continue to send single subject Data Warehouse/ Business Intelligence projects to the appropriate Functional Subcommittee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>Add Capital and Utilities issues to the Finance Functional Subcommittee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>Create a review pathway for any unanticipated areas. Ensure that the process is not bypassing the Functional Subcommittees in an arbitrary manner by defaulting unanticipated areas to review only at the ITPC level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Issues and Recommendations Detail (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Issue(s)</th>
<th>Importance of the Issue(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>On a trial basis, use the Functional Subcommittees to help manage the length of the queue by allocating resources (dollars and FTE) to each Subcommittee to approve/fund discretionary projects at Level 1. Related recommendations are: 4a. Request funding for projects larger than 5,000 hours or $250,000 from outside the ITPC process (unit funding or AAMT request). 4b. Request funding for mandatory projects from outside the ITPC process. 4c. Request funding for ITPC project-driven ongoing maintenance costs from outside the ITPC process. 4d. Provide a review of the current queue of projects approved but not yet started. Ask sponsors to confirm that their projects are still viable and required.</td>
<td>The current practice of approving a long queue of projects for which there are not resources is damaging to ITPC operation and perception.</td>
<td>There is a great deal of cynicism by those whose projects are pushed out, and lack of communication. Also timing is cited as a reason for not participating in the process and is possibly an opportunity cost for identifying more important projects than those in the queue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ask the Subcommittees to facilitate cross-campus development of templates and to work with campuses on input processes. Include these responsibilities in the Subcommittees charter. 5a. Discuss cross-campus development of templates, among themselves and to share techniques for encouraging cross-campus coordination. 5b. Within the Subcommittees, set a time frame for cross-campus template review, so that there is sufficient time for review of templates that originate on one campus. Recognize that cross campus coordination adds to complexity of the discussion and require Subcommittees to adopt techniques like the &quot;10 days of notification&quot; guideline, which has succeeded in the Student Subcommittee.</td>
<td>Cross-campus development of templates is problematic.</td>
<td>Projects identified in a “hurry up” context are potentially less constructive than thoughtful consideration by all affected parties. A more strategic focus in the ITPC process overall may help with this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hold a face-to-face meeting once a year, close to year end. This would include a review of project accomplishments and benefits, address process issues, baseline the coming year’s tasks and issues. It may also include large project review. Related recommendations are: 6a. Ensure that remote participants don’t miss parts of the discussion through careful attention to audio/visual connections and participation.</td>
<td>For varied reasons, there is a strong perception of imbalance in participation among campuses.</td>
<td>An imbalance in campus participation creates the impression that ITPC is an “Urbana process,” which then affects positive functioning of the committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Conduct post-project surveys related to project success. Require that project sponsors provide feedback on project success in response to these inquiries. Information from the surveys can be reported in an annual report or other communications effort.</td>
<td>Outcomes of ITPC projects are not evaluated</td>
<td>Data on outcomes would provide information useful for evaluating future projects and for improving the process. Measurement does incur costs, but the common business wisdom is that you can’t manage what you don’t measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Recommendation From ITPC</td>
<td>Addresses Identified Issue(s)</td>
<td>Importance of the Issue(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Develop a communication plan that addresses the issues raised during the review. These include strategic issues, ability to fund single campus projects, the resource picture for projects and relationship to the project queue, how work requests affect the overall process, status of the queue and reasons for delay. Related recommendations are: &lt;br&gt; 8a. Push information on the queue’s state and reasons for delays out to appropriate groups. &lt;br&gt; 8b. Target those with questions about template development and communicate about the issue. &lt;br&gt; 8c. Share information on resource capacity across all IT units on a regular (perhaps quarterly) basis. &lt;br&gt; 8d. Assign a central resource to help the Functional Subcommittees with their communications responsibilities and to communicate on overall ITPC issues. &lt;br&gt; 8e. Publish an Annual Report to share information on projects accomplished and in process.</td>
<td>Communication outside the process is sub-optimal and has effects on the process. Within the committee structure there is strong communications. Outside the committee structure, there are misunderstandings about the process and misconceptions of how to work with it. &lt;br&gt; Template development is seen as a barrier, particularly by those outside the process. &lt;br&gt; Units said they lacked in-house staff to develop templates or negotiate the process. Some were not aware that template development was an option. Almost none were aware that assistance is available. &lt;br&gt; The resource picture for ITPC is unclear, particularly as it affects the queue and scheduling of projects. &lt;br&gt; The focus of many discussions is on the $1.5M dollar resource.</td>
<td>Almost everyone agrees that having an ITPC process is desirable, but accomplishments are not readily recognized. Information should help the process be better understood and more effective. &lt;br&gt; The issue of capability to develop templates may be understood as a filtering mechanism (and therefore valuable) or as one that negatively affects representation. &lt;br&gt; Funding is critical, as it is used to purchase outside resources. However, delays are often related to availability of in-house, existing staff. &lt;br&gt; Where staffing is discussed, the focus is often on AITS. AITS is critical, but almost equally important are staff in Functional Offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Clarify roles and responsibilities on project levels and approvals. &lt;br&gt; 9a. Provide AAMT with a comprehensive report of all projects accomplished and in progress, on at least an annual basis, and whenever requested. &lt;br&gt; 9b. Seek AAMT approval only for projects above 5,000 hours or $250,000. Provide AAMT with presentations and discussions of strategic value for these projects. &lt;br&gt; 9c. Ask AAMT to delegate these responsibilities to ITPC: &lt;br&gt; • Approve Level 2 projects less than 5,000 hours and $250,000. &lt;br&gt; • Set project levels, i.e., thresholds for Level 1/Level 2 categorization. &lt;br&gt; 9d. Change the Level1/Level 2 thresholds as follows: &lt;br&gt; • Level 1 range to 250—849 hours, up from the current threshold of 80—400 hours. &lt;br&gt; • Level 2 range would be 850+ hours, up from the current threshold of 400+ hours.</td>
<td>The threshold for Level 1 projects should be raised. &lt;br&gt; AAMT review of large ITPC projects</td>
<td>The threshold for Level 1 projects results in a mismatch between the cost of developing the business case and implementation costs. &lt;br&gt; AAMT’s time would be better focused on larger projects, rather than all Level 2 projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Scenarios

Though the recommendations are presented separately, the recommendations are related to each other. The next section provides a scenario for implementation of the entire recommendation set.

Recommendation 1 - Develop a charter (In progress)

1. Draft a charter for the ITPC process covering the responsibilities of the ITPC, Subcommittees and new cross-functional group. Include major process points as well as incorporating where appropriate the recommendations of this process review. (In progress)

2. Review and finalize charter with ITPC and AAMT.

Recommendation 2 - Provide guidance on strategic elements.

In order to improve the alignment of ITPC project selection with the strategic plans and initiatives of the campuses and university administration the following steps are suggested:

1. Analyze the campus and UA strategic plans in order to get to the actionable level of the strategic initiatives.

2. Meet with AAMT to show them current and future initiatives that support the strategic plans. Solicit areas of interest from AAMT among those identified in #1 above to focus on in the coming year to support strategic initiatives. Commit to selecting a number of projects in those areas.

3. Communicate to ITPC, Subcommittees, and constituents regarding strategic areas of focus. Solicit projects in those areas.

4. Set a target for either number or percent of strategic projects selected in the fiscal year. Consciously select projects in those areas and give preference to their approval.

5. Report back to AAMT project selection and execution in these areas.

6. Include in project templates some discussion of project alignment with strategic initiatives. Do not make this overly complex. Only solicit where there is alignment and provide details. It is appropriate for some projects to not align with the strategic initiatives.
Implementation Scenarios (continued)

Recommendation 3 - Develop a cross functional process.

In order to facilitate improved review of cross-functional projects and the prioritization of all projects, a new cross functional group will be formed. Project proposals that previously went directly to ITPC will proceed through one of the existing Subcommittees or the new cross-functional group. These steps are suggested:

1. Ask ITPC to endorse the creation of a cross-functional group to facilitate some pieces of the ITPC process. The membership is proposed to be three members from each existing Subcommittee, including the chair, plus two members each from AITS and Decision Support. The chair of this committee would be functionally neutral and represent ITPC and the process. The group once formed would come up with its own charter to define its responsibilities and processes. Among those would be:
   - Provide review of ITPC project proposals. The results of these reviews will be recommendations to ITPC on approval and prioritization. Projects subject to this review include:
     ⇒ Cross-functional templates where the scope of the project crosses the lines of Student, Finance and Human Resources.
     ⇒ Technology projects that are not mandatory.
     ⇒ Decision Support projects that span more than one functional area.
     ⇒ Any other project that does not have a direct route through one of the established functional Subcommittees. No templates would proceed directly to ITPC without preliminary review.
   - Prioritize for review/approval – On a quarterly basis, prior to the scheduled ITPC meeting, provide to ITPC a prioritization across all projects scheduled for ITPC review at its next meeting.
   - Prioritize for scheduling – On a quarterly basis, utilizing the prioritizations provided by the functional Subcommittees, prioritize the top 10 projects for scheduling among all projects in the queue. This information is to be provided to ITPC for informational purposes and to the project scheduling offices to be utilized in scheduling.
   - Communicate to Subcommittees – As this group reviews all projects for prioritization purposes, the chairs of the Subcommittees will provide summary overview information from the cross-functional group back to the Subcommittees to raise awareness of other initiatives.

2. Direct Capital and Utilities projects to review through the Finance Subcommittee. The Finance Subcommittee will determine appropriate committee representation from these areas.

3. Add representatives from Global Campus to the Finance and Student Subcommittees. All Global Campus projects not already identified as mandatory and foundational will flow through the ITPC process.
Implementation Scenarios (continued)

Recommendation 4 - Manage the queue

Implementing process changes to better manage the queue will be multifaceted and will need to be adjusted along the way based on future decisions and resource availability. Once those decisions are made and resource availability is clear, a proactive plan to set expectations and work within constraints is possible. A starting set of implementation steps would be:

1. Notify the ITPC community that projects may seek a maximum $250K in ITPC funding. Anything more must be self-funded or will become a special request to AAMT for funding. This step will align with the large project review process in the spring.

2. Provide AAMT with the prior year actual and future year projections of the resource usage/requirements for mandatory projects. Based on this information, request base funding outside of the ITPC process to support this work. If funded, this work remains in the ITPC process for tracking purposes, but these projects will not consume project funding. The funding will be used to hire full-time staff to address this work. Current ITPC funding ($1.5M) remains for discretionary and strategic projects.

3. Provide final project approval authority to the Subcommittees for a predetermined amount of resources. Working within the constraints of this resource allotment, the Subcommittees would select the best mix of projects during the year. All level 1 projects would fall into this category. Level 2 operational projects could be approved within these resource allotments as well. Only projects with an identified direct and clear tie to strategic initiatives would be permitted to proceed to ITPC review and not be counted against the Subcommittee allocation. The cross-functional group would have to endorse these projects as strategic in nature in order to proceed to ITPC.

4. First verify the existing queue of projects with the subcommittees and sponsors. On an ongoing basis, become more methodical about resource allocation on an annual basis. Much of what is described below and the larger decisions regarding the next fiscal year (FY 10) would be an agenda item for the annual ITPC retreat. Use a model with the following features:

   a. Begin by identifying a resource pool for a year’s time.

   b. Determine a desired length of the project queue. A one-year queue is a suggested target. Based on this value, adjust the beginning resource pool values to move the length of the queue in or out.

   c. Identify all mandatory projects for the next fiscal year. Allocate funding and staffing for those projects. Unexpected projects that arise in the course of the year will be deducted from a reserve pool. Mandatory projects arising during the year that are not unexpected will be deducted from the Subcommittee allocation by functional area or in general based on the nature of the project. If mandatory projects are funded separately by AAMT, modify this recommendation somewhat.

   d. Select large projects for the next fiscal year and deduct these from the resource pools.
Implementation Scenarios (continued)

Recommendation 4 - Manage the queue (continued).

e. Based on the remaining resources, allocate resources to the functional areas. It is suggested that an even split be made between the functional areas of this allocation. This allocation will be a low percentage of the overall resource pools so it is important to not overanalyze the allocation. The focus on allocation between functional areas should be on the large and strategic projects.

f. Based on the remaining resources, allocate resources to a pool reserved for strategic projects. The allocation to strategic projects versus the Subcommittee allocation may be reversed if desired.

g. A remaining reserve is set aside for unexpected projects or project overruns.

h. ITPC and the Subcommittees work within the allocations and constraints of the model.

The table below is for illustration purposes only. The amounts in the table would need to be determined at some future point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>Resource Pools</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Recurring Funding</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c,d</td>
<td>Project Types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Mandatory Projects</td>
<td>$(300,000)</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Large Projects</td>
<td>$(350,000)</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Subcommittee Allocation</td>
<td>$(450,000)</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Strategic Allocation</td>
<td>$(250,000)</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>$(150,000)</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remaining Resources</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 5 - Facilitate cross-campus development of templates and work with campuses on input processes.

1. Include responsibilities outlined in Recommendation 5 in the new ITPC charter.

2. Charge the cross-functional group with investigating issues and pass along analyses to Subcommittees for action.
Implementation Scenarios (continued)

Recommendation 6 - Hold an annual ITPC retreat.

One of the constraints on the ITPC process is the availability of time from its members and the value of that time needed for other operations. Devoting an entire day of face to face interaction to work through project selection and process decisions will be a valuable investment in the process.

1. Schedule an annual full-day ITPC retreat including all ITPC members, Subcommittee chairs and other targeted attendees.

2. Include the following topics on the agenda:
   a. ITPC current year in review.
   b. Discussion of strategic focus for next year. This discussion may take the form of a panel with targeted special guests and/or presentations from the ITPC community.
   c. Planning for next fiscal year.
      - Large project presentations and selection
      - Overview of mandatory projects and resource requirements
      - Review remaining resource availability
      - Determine Subcommittee and strategic allocations
   d. Review and confirm membership.
   e. Discuss process issues.

Recommendation 7 - Create a process to measure project success.

1. Review the drafts of the post-project surveys that have already been developed. Have the cross-functional group discuss and finalize. This group may want to suggest modifications for the process of post-project surveys.

2. Modify ITPC templates to solicit measures of success.

3. Begin the practice of post-project surveying on a regular basis.

4. Provide feedback to ITPC and constituents as part of communication plan. Also follow up on responses where negative feedback is received.
Implementation Scenarios (continued)

Recommendation 8 - Create and execute a communication plan.

1. Draft a communication plan for ITPC review to include:
   a. Identify audiences
   b. Identify deliverables/media
   c. Identify communications schedule
   d. Identify responsible parties

2. Roll out and monitor the communication plan, making adjustments and improvements where needed.

Recommendation 9 - Modify project sizes and review paths and AAMT oversight.

1. Provide AAMT with a comprehensive annual report.

2. Request AAMT to delegate responsibility to ITPC to:
   a. Provide final approval for all projects under 5,000 hours and $250,000. In lieu of AAMT review of these projects, ITPC will provide to AAMT summary information on all projects reviewed/approved.
   b. Set project levels, i.e. thresholds for Level 1/ Level 2 categorization.

3. Modify templates and the ITPC website to reflect template thresholds. Communicate the change to all constituents.

4. Enforce use of new templates and levels for all new project submissions. Only new projects (un-reviewed) are affected; existing approved projects proceed as approved.
### Proposed Timeline for Implementation

The following is based on the discussion above and is provided as a tentative timeline for implementation of the ITPC Review Recommendations. A number of the initiatives must occur in stages to be fully operational by the end of FY09. A formal detailed implementation plan is a deliverable for ITPC in the first quarter of FY09.

#### FY 09 – Quarter 1

- Draft and approve ITPC charter.
- Analyze University and Campus strategic plans.
- Modify ITPC templates for project size, success measures and strategic alignment information. Enact new standards for all new projects.
- Charge subcommittees with validating existing projects in queue with project sponsors.
- ITPC endorse and form cross-functional group.
- Capital and Utilities projects flow through Finance Subcommittee.
- Appoint Global Campus representatives for Student and Finance Subcommittees.
- Provide request to AAMT for recurring funding for mandatory projects.
- Cross-functional group review/approval of post-project surveys.
- Draft communication plan.
- Obtain AAMT review regarding scope of their review and desired materials.
- ITPC meeting – 8/27/08 – Review implementation plan / project review.

#### FY 09 – Quarter 2

- Strategic initiatives / IT discussion with AAMT – 10/10/08.
- Begin post-project surveys.
- Approve and execute communication plan.
- ITPC meeting – 11/19/08 – Review AAMT discussion / no project review.

#### FY 09 – Quarter 3

- Communicate strategic areas of focus and set goals to support.
- Plan for ITPC annual meeting
- ITPC meeting – 2/25/09 – Preview annual meeting agenda / project review.

#### FY 09 – Quarter 4

- Utilize strategic areas of focus for FY10 annual planning.
- ITPC Annual Meeting – date TBD
- Large project selection for FY10
- Resource allocations for FY10
- Subcommittees begin operating with functional allocations for FY10.
- ITPC meeting – 5/27/09 – Agenda TBD.
## Proposed Timeline for Implementation (continued)

### Ongoing

- Report back to AAMT on strategic project selection and solicit further input.
- Cross-functional group executes per ITPC Charter and group developed processes.
- Large projects may only seek $250K in ITPC funding.
- Provide survey feedback to ITPC / constituents.
- Execute communication plan.

As suggested by the above timeline, implementing these recommendations means that FY09 will be a transition year. There will be a change in ‘business as usual’ for the ITPC and subcommittees, as they transition from old process to new in several logical stages.

Specifically, there will be some time dedicated to process discussions, new procedure review and implementation deliverables. And, until all the recommendations are in effect near the end of FY09, ITPC will operate with a reduced template review schedule to accommodate the process transformation.

Due to the length of the current queue, this reduced schedule should not cause any net negative effect to overall project cycle time and will subject more projects to the new procedures being implemented. Quarterly implementation updates will be provided throughout the process to all committees and will be posted on the ITPC website.
Other Observations from the Process Review Team

The Process Review Team has these additional observations and comments.

- We believe that significant progress can be made on these recommendations within current funding levels and with a reasonable level of effort. Most of the proposed recommendations do not require additional funding. (There are exceptions, such as the possibility of needing increased funding for mandatory and large projects.) Also, the level of effort to implement the recommendations varies. Some recommendations require effort throughout FY09; others are fairly routine changes that can be implemented quickly.

- The University may need a discussion of administrative IT (information technology) needs with a particular focus on front-line colleges and departments. In interviews and discussions, there was general agreement that the University has a large unmet demand for administrative technology projects. Some of the demand is probably related to ITPC’s scope and the recommendations in this report may help identify those projects. However, some of the unmet demand is probably not in ITPC’s current scope. One known gap is administrative IT support for front-line colleges and departments. With some exceptions, individual colleges and departments have to address their needs, one by one, if they have the funds. In an era of increasing fiscal constraints, a broader discussion may identify ways to provide better service to front-line units.

- ITPC should examine and broaden the conception of how subject matter experts can contribute to broader priority decisions. A number of ITPC participants talked about their inability to prioritize outside their subject areas. Such comments may be based on an assumption that subject matter expertise is the primary enabler for making priority decisions. However, even someone with perfect knowledge of all subject areas would still need a broader University perspective to make priority decisions. There may need to be a balance between subject expertise and a shared knowledge of University objectives. Since ITPC is a University-wide process, participants may need assistance in tying their expertise to University objectives.

- Another observation was that committee members perceive their role primarily as advocates for their departmental interests. The departmental advocate role needs to be balanced with each person wearing a “University hat” in priority decisions. As noted in the report, having presentations from sponsors or others who advocate for a project or a departmental interest may free up those making priority decisions.
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Appendix 1—Interviewee Questions

Below is the common set of interview questions. Some questions were not asked, depending on the flow of the discussion, the interviewee’s knowledge of the ITPC process or constraints of interview time.

- What roles have you played in the ITPC process? Which was your primary role?
- How would you describe your knowledge of the ITPC process?
- How would you describe ITPC’s purpose today? Has ITPC’s purpose changed over time?
- How successful has the ITPC process been in meeting its current purpose?
- Do you think there is appropriate representation of the major groups in the ITPC process?
- What feedback do you hear from the campuses about the ITPC process?
- What should the criteria be for project selection/funding via the ITPC process?
- What do you think about the distribution of ITPC resources, both labor and financial, across the areas of Finance, Student and Human Resources? How should the distribution be changed, and why?
- How well do you think the ITPC process handles prioritization across functional areas, i.e., Student, Finance, Human Resources?
- Should approval and funding of smaller projects be moved from the ITPC committee down to the Functional Subcommittees? Should approval and funding of Level 2 projects (except for Large Projects (>5,000 hrs. / $250K)) be moved down from the AAMT committee down to ITPC?
- How much of the existing demand is being met? That is, how much of the demand for "administrative IT development" on the campuses or in central offices?
- The resources that ITPC has available are finite. The demand exceeds the resources.
- How should ITPC prioritize within those constraints? (Currently there is a long queue of approved projects.) Should projects that are in the queue, but not yet started, be re-reviewed as new projects come in? Why or why not?
- How should mandatory projects be handled in the ITPC process?
- Do you have any thoughts on the optimal review cycle for prioritizing projects: quarterly, annually, or other? (Currently, the cycle is quarterly.)
Appendix 1—Interviewee Questions (continued)

- How efficiently and effectively does ITPC operate with respect to....
  - Overall timing or turnaround of projects from inception to delivery?
  - Intake of project ideas (such as via the campus feeder process)?
  - Is the appropriate level of information available at the various review levels for the participants to make informed decisions regarding project evaluation?
  - Functional Subcommittee review and prioritization?
  - Scheduling of work after prioritization?
  - Communication about projects (e.g., web site)?

- The ITPC process is accomplished via a central ITPC Committee, 3 Functional Subcommittees and Campus-based “feeder” committees. Do you have suggestions for improving this structure?

- We might think about the set of IT projects (past, current and future) as a group, or a portfolio, in which the University has invested resources. For example 159 projects have been completed since 2005 and today there are about 65 projects in process. Today, the process is driven by project proposals representing current need, somewhat bottom up. Another approach might be to think about a broader set of strategic needs that drive down a series of projects over time, to reach a broader goal. These might come from the campuses or from senior management or other sources. Should the University consider additional ways to address the entire set of needs for administrative IT?

- We’ve discussed a number of items and identified areas for improvement. Are there any other areas that you’d like to comment on?

- Is there anything you have already discussed that you’d like to recommend as an improvement to the process?
Appendix 2—Process Review Participants

Project Team

Kelly Block, Application Portfolio Coordinator, Administrative Information Technology Services
Linda Bair, Assistant Vice President for Planning and Administration

Interviewees

UIUC

Linda Katehi                    Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Keith Marshall                Associate Provost for Enrollment Management
Elyne Cole                    Associate Provost for Human Resources
Alison Schmulbach             Executive Assistant Dean for Administration, College of ACES
John Rossi                    Assistant Dean, College of Law
Ginger Winkler                Assistant Dean, Administration, College of Veterinary Medicine

UIC

Michael Tanner                Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Carole Snow                   Vice Provost for Academic and Enrollment Services
Heather Haberaecker           Executive Assistant Vice President for Business and Finance, OBFS
John Loya                     Vice Chancellor for Human Resources
Rob Dixon                     Registrar, Office of Registration and Records
Mike Kamowski                 Director of Student System Services
Todd Van Neck                 Director, Budgeting and Program Analysis
Ed Valentine                  Coordinator, Business Systems Users

UIS

Harry Berman                  Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Marya Leatherwood             Associate Vice Chancellor and Director of Enrollment Management
Aaron Shures                  Associate Provost
Wes Weisenburn                Assistant Vice President for Human Resources
Ted Mims                      Professor, Computer Science
Brian Catherwood             Technical Analyst, Enrollment Management
### Appendix 2—Process Review Participants (continued)

#### UA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doug Vinzant</td>
<td>Senior Associate Vice President for Planning and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Beckmann</td>
<td>Senior Associate Vice President for Business and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hites</td>
<td>Associate Vice President for Administrative Information Technology Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Stewart</td>
<td>Interim Associate Vice President, University Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Mann</td>
<td>Executive Assistant Vice President, Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tolar</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President, Administrative Services, OBFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Ballinger</td>
<td>Interim Assistant Vice President, Decision Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Krol</td>
<td>Chief Technical Officer, Global Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Keeley</td>
<td>Executive Director, Business Information Systems, OBFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Fruit</td>
<td>Director of Information Technology Audits, Office of University Audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Kerber</td>
<td>Director of HR Management Systems, University Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Dable</td>
<td>Director of Technical Application Management, AITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Courtney</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Business Development, Decision Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared Ross</td>
<td>Information Technology Auditor, Office of University Audits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Focus Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marya Leatherwood</td>
<td>Associate Vice Chancellor &amp; Director of Enrollment Management, UIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristi Kuntz</td>
<td>Assistant Provost for Undergraduate Education, UIUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wes Weisenburn</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President for Human Resources, UIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rossi</td>
<td>Assistant Dean, College of Law, UIUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Keeley</td>
<td>Executive Director, Business Information Systems, OBFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Kamowski</td>
<td>Director of Student System Services, UIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Kerber</td>
<td>Director of HR Information Systems, University Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Valentine</td>
<td>Coordinator, Business Systems Users, UIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Courtney</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Business Development, Decision Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Block</td>
<td>Application Portfolio Coordinator, AITS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Appendix 3—Focus Group Issues, Options and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Recommendations From Focus Group</th>
<th>Other Options Considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cross functional prioritization is not being adequately addressed.  | • Provide cross functional input to ITPC on massive/strategic projects by creating a cross functional group that draws on membership of the Subcommittees plus other key representatives (e.g., AITS and Decision Support). Ensure appropriate representation and discussion of how to resolve differences. Strategic elements may inform the charter, structure and representation of this group.  
• Where cross functional prioritization is not an issue, allocate resources (dollars and FTE) to each Subcommittee to approve/fund discretionary projects at Level 1. | • New cross functional group  
• Strategic, issue-oriented cross functional task forces  
• Single cross functional committee.  
• Explicit funding and resourcing by subject area.  
• Review only of large projects at ITPC level.  
• Detailed criteria for prioritization at ITPC level.  
• Cutting the queue according to resources available. |
| The current practice of approving a long queue of projects for which there are not resources is damaging to ITPC operation and perception. | • Provide separate funding for massive projects. Identify funding up front, rather than push other projects out into the future. Funding from non-ITPC sources or AAMT.  
• Fund mandatory and ongoing maintenance outside the process, reserving ITPC funding for discretionary projects. These are relatively predictable and can be planned.  
• Push information on the queue’s state and reasons for delays out to appropriate groups.  
• If a long queue continues, periodically ask sponsors to confirm that a project is still viable. Provide a way for sponsors to retract a project, with possibility for resubmitting it later. Communicate better with sponsors and improve credibility of the process.  
• Allocating resources to each Subcommittee to approve/fund discretionary projects at Level 1  
• Increase awareness of non-technical solutions where appropriate. | • Change practices at all levels to approve fewer templates.  
• Move to an annual review cycle. Only approve a predetermined amount of project dollars/hours.  
• Seek additional funding to wipe out the current backlog.  
• Pushing out information on the queue’s state and reasons for delays. |
| A strategic element is desired but there is uncertainty about how to achieve it. The current process is operationally oriented, structured to be responsive to operational pain in functional units. | • Provide Subcommittees with greater guidance on strategic elements that they should take into account in their deliberations.  
• At ITPC, for projects over a certain size, arrange for presentations on project value and discussion of value.  
• Include within each project an evaluation of outcomes/impacts on strategic benefits identified when the template was proposed. Benefits identified must realistic, not just used to advocate for the template  
• In communications from ITPC to stakeholders, include the strategic elements that the ITPC process is focusing on. | • Campus-based direction on how ITPC process can address campus goals, thrusts and measures.  
• ITPC to seek input of academic leadership at each campus  
• AAMT to focus on large scale projects, including presentations on value.  
• A strategic input committee consisting of planning leaders from each campus helps to translate issues into viable proposals.  
• Subcommittees each develop strategic plan for their area.  
• Projects better identify strategic outcomes. |
| Direct representation of the interests of front-line college/department units in the process is minimal. It is not clear to what extent the scope of ITPC should encompass the general administrative IT needs of front-line units. | • Clarify what ITPC’s scope should be relative to administrative IT needs of front-line units.  
• Encourage campus mechanisms, where needed, for addressing front-line IT needs to feed into the existing ITPC/Subcommittee committee structure.  
• Task Subcommittees with continuing to work systematically with campus mechanisms to solicit front-line input | • Acknowledge ITPC as oriented toward central units and systems.  
• Add a review of front-line unit input and needs into current templates and template review.  
• Committee for campus front-line unit representation in the ITPC structure  
• Develop initiative(s) to focus on front-line unit business processes. |
## Appendix 3—Focus Group Issues, Options and Recommendations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Recommendations From Focus Group</th>
<th>Other Options Considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Communication outside the process is sub-optimal and has effects on the process. | • Communications solutions should be developed after this review, so that the communications can be aligned with the improved process.  
• The goal of communications about ITPC should be clarified so that appropriate solutions can be developed.  
• Subcommittees should be asked to develop targeted communications plans, including identifying audiences and content appropriate for those audiences.  
• A central resource should be assigned to help the Subcommittees with their communications responsibilities and to communicate on overall ITPC issues. | • Continue current level of communications.                                                                                                                               |
| Outcomes of ITPC projects are not evaluated                           | • Set a foundation for future evaluation of outcomes by requiring metrics for success in templates. Metrics would indicate how benefits would be measured.  
• Conduct post-project surveys related to project success. Require that project sponsors provide feedback on project success in response to these inquiries. | • Requiring metrics for success in template.  
• A limited post project review with surveys or sampled auditing.  
• Continue to not measure project outcomes.                                                                                                                                 |
| Cross-campus development of templates is problematic.                 | • Subcommittee chairs discuss cross-campus development of templates among themselves and share techniques for encouraging cross-campus coordination.  
• Subcommittees set a time frame for cross-campus template review.  
• Clarify the status of single campus projects across the process.  
• Work with campus level committees that can help Subcommittees to identify business issues important to front-line units. | • Subcommittees identify business issues first, then work on templates as a team.  
• Campus level committees identify business issues.                                                                                                                                 |
| Some topics are not represented well in the 3 subject area structure. | • Form a cross functional group to cover technology, cross functional data warehouse/business intelligence projects and any other project that does not fit well into current Subcommittees. Draw membership from current, other key representatives (e.g., AITS, Decision Support) and other experts as needed. Discuss appropriate representation and how to resolve differences.  
• If a cross functional group is not formed, send single subject data warehouse/business intelligence projects to the appropriate Subcommittee and multiple subject projects to all Subcommittees with a subject area impact. Similarly, if a cross functional group is not formed, send technology projects to all Subcommittees.  
• Add Global Campus representation at each Subcommittee and at ITPC, contingent on full participation/approval of Global Campus projects in the ITPC process.  
• Add Capital issues to the Finance Subcommittee.  
• Create a review pathway for any unanticipated areas. Do not default any unanticipated areas to review only by ITPC. | • Technology projects could go to a cross-functional committee.  
• Data Warehouse/Business Intelligence - Single subject templates could go to appropriate Subcommittee. Multiple, cross-functional subjects could go to cross-functional committee...or....to all Subcommittees with a subject area impact. |
### Appendix 3—Focus Group Issues, Options and Recommendations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Recommendations From Focus Group</th>
<th>Other Options Considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITPC process does not have a current charter.</td>
<td>- Develop a charter of ITPC/Subcommittee responsibili- ties and scope that reflects scope and practices going forward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Subcommittees were launched without a set of guidelines or charter. The ITPC committee has evolved in its functions and understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Template development is seen as a barrier, particularly by those outside the process. Units said they lacked in-house staff to develop templates or negotiate the process. Some were not aware that template development was an option. Almost none were aware that assistance is available. | - Target those with questions about template development and communicate about the issue. Raise awareness that assistance is available from the AITS TAM group and campus resources on template development. Increase general communication on the opportunities for template development. | - New intake process to initiate template development.  
- Provide better avenues for input into what templates should be, combined assistance.  
- Proactively increase capacity for developing templates where there are issues. |
| Campus participation is perceived to be out of balance. For varied reasons, there is a strong perception of imbalance in participation among campuses. | - Hold a face-to-face meeting once a year. This retreat-like event would improve communication across campuses. Include a review of project benefits and what had worked or not worked well during the year. It could also provide a baseline of expectations for the coming year.  
- Reevaluate membership of ITPC/Subcommittee committees. Replace members who are not attending and/or participating.  
- Ensure that remote participants don’t miss parts of the discussion through careful attention to a/v connections and participation throughout the meetings. | - Rotate Subcommittee moderator between locations.  
- Central location for ITPC quarterly meetings and/or rotate the location of the meeting.  
- Work proactively with campuses on balance.  
- Subcommittee chairs clarify campus representation versus University Administration representation based at Urbana.  
- ITPC reviews campus representation and seeks ways to encourage participation by other campuses. |
| The resource picture for ITPC is unclear, particularly as it affects the queue and scheduling of projects. The focus of many discussions is on the $1.5M dollar resource. Global Campus, as an unknown quantity, made it difficult to put dates on schedules. Prior to Global Campus, there were better schedules and functional units could better | - Develop better visualizations of the true resource picture for use during prioritization.  
- Push out information on the people-resources-queue connection. Also provide some higher level information on generally what affects progress.  
- Clarify how work requests are related to the resource picture.  
- Share information on resource capacity across all IT units on a regular (perhaps quarterly) basis. | - Full-resources model  
- Continue with current level of information. |
| The threshold for Level 1 projects should be raised. | - Change the Level 1 range to 250 hours. (Current threshold is 80 hours.)  
- Change the Level 2 range to 850+ hours. (Current threshold is 400 hours.)  
- Consider how raising these levels will affect incentives and behavior throughout the system. Develop appropriate communications and expectations as the change is announced. | - Discussion of various possible levels and options and the impact on the process. |
| How AAMT’s time is spent on ITPC projects. | - Push approval of most Level 2 projects to ITPC. Seek AAMT approval for massive projects (above 5000 hours).  
- Consider presentations and discussions of strategic value for massive projects at AAMT.  
- Provide AAMT with information on all lower level projects, in summary form. | - Discussion of relationship of change in Level 1 thresholds and AAMT members feedback during the interviews. |
Appendix 4—ITPC History

In January 2004, the University adopted a new process for prioritizing administrative systems initiatives. The scope of this process was designed to encompass all human resource, payroll, finance or student administrative systems as well as related technical initiatives. The major tenets are a common approach for submitting and evaluating project proposals, and an open, representative process.

The Information Technology Priority Committee (ITPC) is the primary body that is responsible for evaluating administrative information technology initiatives from project inception through the end of a project’s lifecycle. For large initiatives, the ITPC forwards its recommendations on to the Academic Affairs Management Team (AAMT), which will make the final approval decision. This review and approval process authorizes both labor and financial resources for selected projects.

The ITPC formed three functional groups (Finance, Human Resources and Student Administration) that make recommendations for projects that fall within their respective domains. Projects that do not fit into one of the three functional groups (e.g., capital programs) are handled directly by the ITPC.

**Project Levels**

Projects are subject to increasing levels of scrutiny based on their resource requirements.

1. Projects with total budgets less than $20,000 and involving less than ten (10) person days of effort do not require the completion of a project proposal template. Work is prioritized based on the date of submission, urgency of the request and the availability of appropriate resources.

2. Projects with total budgets between $20,000 and $100,000 or involving between ten (10) and fifty (50) person days of effort require the completion of a Level 1 project proposal template. The ITPC reviews the proposal, and if there are no questions, will typically provide an approved/denied response within one (1) to four (4) months.

3. Projects with total budgets greater than $100,000 or involving greater than fifty (50) person days of effort require the completion of a Level 2 project proposal template. The Level 2 template is more detailed than a Level 1 template and if requested, a technical application manager is assigned to assist filling out the Level 2 project proposal template. Completed Level 2 templates are evaluated at the end of August, November, February and May, so that the relative merits of these larger initiatives can be compared.

**After Approval**

Once approved, projects are prioritized by the functional Subcommittees and ITPC. The actual scheduling takes place in the UA information technology units in cooperation with the functional units and is based on the assigned priority and resource capacity in both the technology and functional units.

In progress projects are tracked for performance and project portfolio reporting is reviewed by ITPC periodically. Projects with material variances in budget and schedule may be re-reviewed by ITPC.

**Project Information**

Information regarding the disposition of all projects submitted to ITPC, since inception of the process, is available on the ITPC website. See below for a diagram of the process.
Appendix 4—ITPC History (continued)

Information Technology Priorities Committee
Project Proposal Process Flow

Level 1 or 2 Template submitted to ITPC@illinois.edu

Template posted to ITPC website

As appropriate, AITS / DS / Others review template estimates for reasonableness.

← Finance

ITPC - Finance Subcommittee (FSC)

ITPC - Human Resources Subcommittee

ITPC - Student Subcommittee

Student →

Template Approved

Template Rejected

Level 1 Template Approved

UI Information Technology Priorities Committee (ITPC)

Level 2 Template Approved

Template Rejected

Academic Affairs Management Team (AAMT)

Template Rejected

Discard or resubmit template

Discard or resubmit template

Level 2 Template Approved

PROJECT APPROVED TO PROCEED

Discard or resubmit template

AITS Architecture Review Committee (ARC)

University Technology Management Team (UTMT)
Appendix 4—ITPC History (continued)

History of Modifications to the ITPC Process

Since the original rollout of the process in 2004, there have been some notable changes to the process.

Calendar

2005  The project level thresholds were raised from their original levels.  
      Level 1: Original – 5-25 days effort or $10,000-$50,000; Revised – 10-50 days effort or $20,000-$100,000  
      Level 2: Original – 25+ days effort or $50,000+; Revised – 50+ days effort or $100,000+

2006  The ITPC meeting schedule was changed to quarterly from monthly.

2006  The functional Subcommittees provide a numerical prioritization of projects in the scheduling queue on a quarterly basis which is utilized to schedule projects.

2006  Large projects over 5,000 hours or $250,000 are reviewed on an annual basis in March for the next fiscal year.

2006  The requirement for an initial Level 1 template submission for projects of Level 2 size was eliminated.

2007  ITPC funding guidelines were modified to allow for increased situations to fund backfill staffing for ITPC projects.

2008  ITPC Process Review completed.
Appendix 5—Committee Membership

Four committees were formed within the ITPC process to review, approve and prioritize projects. Those bodies are the ITPC (central committee) and three functional Subcommittees: Finance, Human Resources and Student, which feed project proposals and prioritization information to the central committee. The membership of these committees is detailed as follows:

Information Technology Priorities Committee

Andrea Ballinger, Assistant Vice President, Decision Support

Doug Beckmann, Senior Associate Vice President, Office of Business and Financial Services

Michael Hites, Associate Vice President, Administrative Information Technology Services

Marya Leatherwood, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs & Director of Enrollment Management

Larry Mann, Executive Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs

Keith Marshall, Associate Provost for Enrollment Management, UIUC

Ted Mims, Chair, Department of Computer Science, UIS

Maureen Parks, UA, Assistant Vice President, Human Resources

Carole Snow, Vice Provost for Academic and Enrollment Services, UIC
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