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Meeting Notes

Participants: Rosemarie Rae, Patrick Schlesinger, Amber Machamer, Heidi Wagner, Rosemarie Kim, Suzanne Sutton, Peggy Huston, Andrew Goldblatt, Liz Marsh, Lyle Nevels, Jon Conhaim

Opening Remarks (Rosemarie Rae)

- We’re at a point of capacity, not just financially but also in terms of human capital. We have a limited amount of resources (both money and staff) to invest in IT projects.
- Some staff members are experiencing change fatigue from the number of IT projects that have recently been completed and new systems rolled out.
- We need to have clearly defined goals for our investment in enterprise IT systems, and we need to evaluate the five-year life cycle cost when considering new investments.
- Equally as important is to make sure we have the right human resource capacity when looking at new projects/systems.
- We also need to understand how external factors such as UCPath impact the work that we need to perform.
- Greatest concern is about the campus budget three years from now.
- Investment dollars in the next few years are limited.
- For 15-16, big decisions about priorities have already been made: SIS, Caltime, PI Portfolio, T&E.
- That gives us (the group) time to assess existing portfolio, think about resource mapping
- Will be critical to figure out what we can stop doing.

Discussion Themes

- Importance of being able to prioritize our IT projects against clear objectives.
- Desire for a sustainable workload for staff, to reduce manual work across multiple systems. Transaction/process costs are still very high.
- Reducing the cost of administrative services to enable the campus to invest more in teaching and learning.
- Identifying and reducing duplication of both systems and workload is critical. Consolidation of investment to attain greatest value of systems for campus.
- Need to clarify relationships with other committees to leverage the model and reduce redundant work. Oversight of data is a key area where this will be necessary.
- Lots of interest in/discussion about data: data security, minimizing risk/exposure; need for better data integration to meet business needs (e.g., in University Relations the ability to tell donors about the progress of the programs and projects to which they have contributed is challenged due to the lack of integration of data between the center and distributed units); access to reliable data.
- Not a consensus on what the scope of data should be considered (e.g., one suggestion was for enterprise data only; others see a fuzzier line: faculty and acad depts. have data needs and they will grow.
- Interest in investing in data integration projects to promote the more effective use of existing campus data.
- The committee needs to think carefully about how to encourage units and departments to bring information to the committee about the projects and other IT enterprise activities they are
engaged in conducting or are planning to conduct. Will need to think carefully about the incentives, both carrots and sticks, and create a clear value proposition to help people see why they should use governance.

**Ideas for Additional Information to be Developed/Discussed**

- Develop the definition of an enterprise system
- Create a portfolio of enterprise systems, with a profile for each system. Include a high level description of what they do, some detail about population served, technologies involved, operating cost.
- Create a catalog of the larger implementation projects: what did we spend, benchmark against peers (PH has costs for OE) (data could be combined with the portfolio described above)
- Development of an IT roadmap/pipeline.
- Requirements for getting data into the EDW: How does the data in ES need to be available to ease transition to EDW?
- Develop a set of case studies where $$ were well spent (low/high) and where $$ were not as well spent or project was problematic
- Interest in performing staff resource (capacity) mapping to determine if the campus currently has the necessary resources to successfully complete enterprise system projects that it is currently conducting or will be conducting in the future.

**Additions to IT Governance success criteria list**

- Need something about data: access to it, integration of it, records management
- Enable campus to manage administrative operations more efficiently and effectively.

**Feedback on Topics / Criteria for Committee review**

- On project proposal expense criteria list, have each option be an ‘or’
- On service abatement, interest was expressed in seeing anything that we could stop doing; don’t put constraints on what might come to committee.

**Actions / Follow up**

1. Rosemarie Rae will propose a work plan including topics described today as a starting point for determining meeting frequency.
2. All committee members: send any updates to charter to Liz, RMR, PS