



**University of Wisconsin – Madison**  
**Enterprise IT Decision Making – Future State Team**  
**Charter Document**  
**June 28, 2012**

Approved June 28, 2012 (v6.1)

<b>Team Name</b>	Enterprise IT Decision Making – Future State
<b>Business Process Owner(s)</b>	UW-Madison <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Provost</li><li>- Vice Chancellor for Administration</li><li>- University CIO</li><li>- Divisional CIOs and IT organizations</li><li>- Division of IT (DoIT)</li><li>- Divisional finance and decision-support staff</li><li>- Departmental IT professionals</li><li>- Department Chairs</li></ul>
<b>Objective</b>	<p>The objective of this project, as prioritized by the Advisory Committee and approved by the Steering Committee, is to model 3 to 5 potential alternate future-state structures for improved Enterprise IT Decision Making (EITDM) and to develop a comprehensive business case for the implementation of a selected model.</p> <p>Team members will be responsible for developing an understanding of the gaps between the current state and desired future-state; brainstorming the possible approaches to closing the gap; contributing to a team-decision to select 3 to 5 potential models; building out those models so that their related pros and cons can be understood and, where possible, quantified; supporting the decision-making for selecting a single model; and building a comprehensive business case that facilitates the implementation of a selected model.</p>
<b>Goal</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Select and develop 3 to 5 alternate future-state models for EITDM and evaluate each model for its ability to close the gap between current state and future state</li><li>2. Develop a comprehensive business case for the implementation of a selected future-state model</li></ol>
<b>Scope</b>	<p>The work of this team is focused on understanding the current state and possible future state of IT available to meet the needs of EITDM and on developing an understanding of the related pros and cons of moving toward one future model. This team will not be asked to implement a new system but are charged with understanding options and moving the University towards a decision to implement.</p> <p>The scope of work for this project work team includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Benchmarking peer institutions</li><li>• Brainstorming the potential models to meet the needs of future-state EITDM at UW-Madison</li><li>• Selecting potential alternate models to evaluate</li><li>• Evaluating selected models</li><li>• Supporting selection of a single model from the alternates</li><li>• Creation of a business case to implement the selected model</li></ul>
<b>Critical Assumptions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Team members will be able to dedicate 2 to 8 hours per week for a concentrated period of approximately 20 weeks.</li><li>• The team leader will be able to dedicate at least 4 to 8 hours per week for</li></ul>



a concentrated period of approximately 20 weeks.		
Timeline	<p><b>Weeks 1 through 10</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Team formation</li><li>• Evaluate the high-level (theoretical) gap between current state and ideal future state</li><li>• Brainstorm possible models for meeting the needs of the future state</li><li>• Select 3 to 5 alternates from the set of models to pursue in more detail</li><li>• Develop a high-level understanding of each of the models for EITDM selected</li><li>• Analyze pros and cons of the 3 to 5 alternate future-state models</li></ul> <p><b>Weeks 11 through 14</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Prepare materials for a retreat with senior University leadership on each of the future-state models</li><li>• Work with AE leadership to plan for facilitated discussion with leadership on pros and cons of each model and on overall priorities regarding IT decision making</li><li>• Conduct facilitated retreat with senior leadership</li></ul> <p><b>Weeks 15 through 20</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Based upon outcome of leadership retreat, build a business case for the selected decision model</li><li>• Build implementation and roll-out plan for business case</li><li>• Present structured business case on selected model to the AE Steering Committee</li></ul>	
Deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Benchmarking assessment of peer IT decision making</li><li>• 3 to 5 alternate future-state models for decision making</li><li>• Materials in support of a facilitated retreat with senior leaders from across the University</li><li>• Business case and implementation plan for selected future-state model</li><li>• Weekly status updates in the appropriate template</li></ul> <p>Additional interim deliverables may be required as the Working Group identifies additional needs for Advisory Committee and/or Steering Committee review during the course of the project.</p>	
Team Members	<p>Team Leader – Steve Hahn (Graduate School) UW CIO – Bruce Maas DoIT representative – John Krogman Faculty representative – Phil Barak (CALS) Faculty representative – Greg Moses (Engineering) Division CIO – Rhonda Davis (Vet Med) Division CIO – Dan Jacobsohn (Education) Division CIO – Mike Pitterle (Pharmacy) Dept IT representative – Dave Parter (L&amp;S – Comp Sci) Budget Office representative – Jennifer Klippel (OBPA) Administrative Unit representative – Bobby Burrow (AIMS) Academic Services representative – Karen Hanson (EM) Student representative – to be named</p>	
Project Members	<p><b>Member Name</b></p> <p>Working Team Member</p>	<p><b>Member Role</b></p> <p>Evaluate gap between current and future state; brainstorm models for future state; select 3-5 models to pursue in detail; contribute to development of business case and presentation to senior leaders; assist in</p>



		communication effort and stakeholder engagement.
	Working Team Leader	In addition to the responsibilities of a working team member, the team leader will be responsible for partnering with Huron and AE to develop agendas and facilitating team meetings; identify task owners and assign relevant tasks and responsibilities to the group; support deliverable creation.
	Administrative Excellence Project Staff	Provide overall project management and guidance through the development of agendas, tracking of team progress, and escalating issues as needed; build the communication plan, stakeholder engagement, and support business case development process and presentation of deliverables to Advisory Committee and Steering Committee.
	Business Process Owners	Vet proposed solutions, business cases, policy language, and initiative communication, stakeholder engagement, and step-by-step implementation plans.
	Huron Consulting Group	Contribute to data collection process and perform necessary data analysis; assist in gap analysis and development of models; partner with AE project staff to provide project management and guidance through the development of agendas, tracking of team progress, and escalating issues as needed; support business case development process and presentation of deliverables at the leadership retreat and to Advisory Committee and Steering Committee.
	Advisory Committee	Perform initial review of business case and implementation plan and provide feedback.
	Steering Committee	Review business case and implementation plan and provide feedback; provide decision to implement.