Administrative Excellence Advisory Committee

Date: Thursday, February 7, 2013
Start/End Time: 10 am to 11:30 am
Location: 260 Bascom Hall

Present: Members: Brad Barham (Chair), Irwin Goldman, Heather McFadden, Erik Paulson, Bethany Pluymers, Julie Underwood
Ex Officio: Bill Elvey, Martha Kerner, John Krogman, Bruce Maas, Kim Moreland
Invited Guest: Steve Hahn
Staff: Alice Gustafson (Project Manager), Scott Hildebrand, Maury Cotter

Unable to attend: Mark Bugher, Anne Mekschun, Tamara Walker, Bob Lavigna

----- MEETING NOTES-----

Welcome, Agenda Review, Announcements
Brad Barham welcomed the Advisory Committee. He said the only agenda item is a review of the Enterprise IT Decision-making initiative. Alice Gustafson added that the Computer Bundles initiative is moving along nicely and that the team negotiating with Dell has negotiated good prices. Erik Paulson distributed an article with the title, “Congress Being Stupid on Technology is a Bigger Problem than You Think.”

Enterprise IT Decision-making
Steve Hahn, team leader of the IT Decision-making Future State Project Team, said the team has made a lot of progress since he last met with the Advisory Committee. Steve said the messages he heard from the Steering Committee and Advisory Committee were: (1.) Put the work in the context of campus strategic planning; (2.) Present case studies showing how decisions would be made within the proposed model; and (3.) Preserve infrastructures and do not needlessly introduce new structure. The result should be a clear and transparent process.
Steve presented the committee with a “Case for Change” document. He noted that the document’s fact-finding section included “call outs” from the Enterprise IT Decision-making Current State team. The Future State team is recommending that UW-Madison explore a Uniform Process model for the campus, with some modifications. Under this model, a significant portion of IT decisions would flow through an IT Planning Board of high-level faculty and staff. Major decisions would route up to an Executive Board. Steve said the Planning Board would meet monthly and have oversight over IT spend. The Information Technology Committee would be advisory to the Planning Board instead of or in addition to the University Committee. Irwin Goldman said removing the University Committee from the chain would be a mistake. Julie Underwood said the make-up of the Executive Board would be similar to the current Leadership Council so the board could be plugged into an existing structure. Brad Barham said a decision on whether to tie the Executive Board into an existing structure like the Leadership Council most likely would depend on the new chancellor’s vision for the Leadership Council.
A discussion of the roles of the planning and executive boards ensued. Steve said the Planning Board would deal with decisions on how we make IT investments. The Executive Board would consider broad statements of strategy and give direction to the Planning Board. Irwin said he is concerned that if a School or College does not get an answer it wants from the Planning Board, the School or College may proceed on its own. That’s part of our campus culture, he said. Kim Moreland said the “agility piece” is her main concern. She said the proposal would build a lot of infrastructure. She is concerned that we would have a university standard on so many things that it would inhibit the ability of local units to innovate. Despite questions about the proposed model, Advisory Committee members complimented Steve and his team for the document they produced.

NEXT MEETING WILL BE:
10 a.m. Thursday, March 7, 2013 Room 260 Bascom.