



**University of Wisconsin – Madison, Administrative Excellence Initiative
Enterprise IT Decision Making – Current State Assessment
Charter Document
March 15, 2012**

v 1.6

Approved by the Steering Committee: February 1, 2012

Presented to the Advisory Committee: February 2, 2012

Team Name	Enterprise IT Decision Making (EITDM) – Current State Assessment
Business Process Owner(s)	UW-Madison <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provost - Vice Chancellor for Administration - University CIO - Divisional CIOs and IT organizations - Division of IT (DoIT) - Divisional finance and decision-support staff - Divisional Human Resources - Departmental IT professionals - Department Chairs
Objective	<p>The objective of this project, as prioritized by the Advisory Committee and approved by the Steering Committee, is to conduct a comprehensive current state assessment of the processes of decision making regarding Information Technology investment across all categories (e.g., people, software, hardware) and to collect a comprehensive set of data about the current IT services provided across the University and associated costs across campus.</p> <p>Team members will develop data definitions for components of IT expenditure, refine data requests to collect the data required in the appropriate format, distribute and follow-up on data requests, collect service information to develop a University-wide service catalog, and build a model of the current state of decision making for IT across the University.</p>
Goal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop and communicate a comprehensive understanding of the current state of decision making related to Information Technology across the University 2. Develop a comprehensive understanding of the current state of IT investment across the University including services provided, constituencies served, FTEs allocated, and costs incurred by category to support Enterprise IT Decision Making (EITDM)
Scope	<p>The work of this team is focused narrowly on establishing frameworks for considering the current state of Enterprise-wide IT decision making, costs, and services and then collecting the data required to populate the frameworks. While this team will be asked to provide recommendations that emerge from this process, its scope will not include making decisions on pursuing opportunities nor will it be pursuing specific efficiency opportunities.</p>



	<p>The scope of work for this project work team includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluating the current process for deciding on IT investment from the departmental level through the Enterprise level • Defining data definitions appropriate to categorize IT investment across the University • Defining data categories that may be relevant to EITDM groups once formed • Collecting data using the definitions and categories defined regarding the current state of IT investment across the University
Critical Assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team members will be able to dedicate at least one day (8 hours) per week for a concentrated period of approximately 20 weeks. • The team leader will be able to dedicate at least 10 hours per week for a concentrated period of approximately 20 weeks.
Timeline	<p>Weeks 1 through 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team formation • Creation of decision making framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review of types of IT decisions possible ○ Review of the places within the organization where IT decisions could be made ○ Description of the information required to inform decision making and the location in the organization where that information is held • Application of decision making framework to the current IT environment • Collection of existing policies related to IT decision-making at the departmental, school, and institution-wide levels • Graphical depiction of the current state of decisions • Financial estimation of the current costs of the current state, insofar as this is possible <p>Weeks 6 through 9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description and articulation of opportunity statement / case for change <p>Weeks 6 through 20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of data definitions for IT expenditures and services • Creation of an appropriate categorization of Information Technology expenditures by "use" (e.g., Academic, Administrative, Research) • Creation of an appropriate categorization of IT expenditures by type (e.g., direct, indirect, hardware, software, FTE, utilities, space) • Creation of an approach to data collection for costs within each of the types of expenditure categories defined that permits an allocation of the costs to the types of uses established • Creation of a categorization of IT services that are meaningful to UW-Madison including the identification of constituents who consume the service • Identification of appropriate meta-data categories to be included in collection of IT services (e.g., service provider, service type, software, source, constituent) • Initiation of data collection for each category of data • Processing, assessment, and categorization of data within each category • Aggregation of data across all categories • Cross referencing of service data collected with cost data collected • Analysis of all data across all categories



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of initial opportunities for improved service and/or improved efficiency • Draft high-level report on the current state of IT expenditures to be delivered to the Administrative Excellence Steering Committee and other appropriate individuals, committees, and organizations across the University (template to be provided by Huron) 				
<p>Deliverables</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive description and depiction of the current state of IT decision making and attendant support structures across the University • Recommendation regarding the appropriate categorization of IT expenditure by use (e.g., Academic, Administrative, Research) and by type (e.g., direct including hardware and software, indirect including space, utilities, administration) • Structure of categories for collecting service information by provider and by constituent or customer (data collection plan) • Collection and categorization of all IT-related services provided across the University within the approved structure • Quantification, within an appropriate degree of accuracy, of the current full-costs of information technology across UW-Madison in a format that allows for analysis by organizational unit, category, type, etc. • Report on the current state of IT (template to be provided by Huron) • Recommendations of efficiency opportunities based on findings (if applicable) • Weekly status updates in the appropriate template <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>				
<p>Team Members</p>	<p>Team Leader – Barb McPherson (Engineering) Team Member - Bruce Maas (Information Technology) Team Member - John Krogman (DoIT) Team Member - Bruno Browning (L&S) Team Member - Derek Tessmann (International Studies) Team Member - Dave Towers (SMPH - Biostatistics) Team Member - Brenda Spychalla (Education) Team Member - Jennifer Klippel (OBPA) Team Member - Steve Ackerman (Grad School, L&S) Team Member - Theresa Regge (UHS) Team Member - Phil Saunders (EM) Team Member - Matt Moehr (Student Representative) Subject Matter Expert - Serena Matsunaga (Huron Consulting Group) Project Support - Adam Fennell (Huron Consulting Group) Project Support - Peter Rubow (Huron Consulting Group)</p>				
<p>Project Members</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="391 1608 841 1671">Member Name</th> <th data-bbox="841 1608 1385 1671">Member Role</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="391 1671 841 1852">Working Team Member</td> <td data-bbox="841 1671 1385 1852">Provide feedback for data collection and analysis activities; assist in data gathering; contribute to development of proposed solutions, business case and implementation plan; assist in communication effort and stakeholder engagement</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Member Name	Member Role	Working Team Member	Provide feedback for data collection and analysis activities; assist in data gathering; contribute to development of proposed solutions, business case and implementation plan; assist in communication effort and stakeholder engagement
Member Name	Member Role				
Working Team Member	Provide feedback for data collection and analysis activities; assist in data gathering; contribute to development of proposed solutions, business case and implementation plan; assist in 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 step-by-step implementation plans and policy language; support business case development process and presentation of deliverables to Advisory Committee and Steering Committee.
	Business Process Owners	Support data collection activities; 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; provide project management and guidance through the development of agendas, tracking of team progress, and escalating issues as needed; partner with AE project staff to build communication, stakeholder engagement, and step-by-step implementation plans and policy language; support business case development process and presentation of deliverables 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