Goal Statement

1. Select and develop 3 to 5 alternate future-state models for Enterprise IT Decision-Making and evaluate each model for its ability to close the gap between current state and desired future state.

2. Develop a comprehensive business case for the implementation of the selected future-state model.
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The University currently lacks a formal process for supporting IT decision-making; establishing a process to support IT decisions is a critical component of moving towards a managed IT environment.

**Decision Process in Current/Future IT Environment**

**Current Process**
- “Multiple paths” with no defined process for project requests
- Decision processes often made only for new services (i.e., no periodic review of service portfolio)
- Periodic review of the current portfolio of IT services conducted

**Process Under Future Decision-Making Model**
- “Single path” with defined points of access and entry for project requests
- Common characteristics gathered and analyzed before decisions are made
- “Life cycle” costs considered in decision making
- “Life cycle” costs considered in decision making

**Initiate**
- Option-set a function of local knowledge
- Informal networks currently inform option search
- Marginal and one-time expenses are often the only costs considered when evaluating options

**Analyze**
- Internal pricing impacts system choice
- Departments maximize local resource efficiency
- Decisions may or may not be aligned with IT strategy
- Decision authority may not be formalized

**Decide**
- No feedback loop for departmental innovation or for piloted services
- Lack of transparency regarding what IT services are provided where, by whom, and at what cost (both to the user and the University)

**Communicate**
- Project tracking may occur at the local level
- IT security considerations, and system maintenance costs are often secondary considerations

**Assess**
- Individual requests receive responses
- Status of current projects, including local pilots, are regularly reported
- Project tracking mechanisms are consistently employed for IT projects
AE – EITDM Future State

Work Team Approach

Establish Common Understanding of the Current State/Benchmarking

- Review EITDM Current State team findings
- Establish strengths and challenges of current state
- Select benchmark institutions, conduct interviews, and develop/review case studies

Completed

Develop High-Level Future State Structures

- Develop a list of desired future state characteristics
- Conduct listening session with campus stakeholders
- Identify 3 to 5 alternative future state models
- Develop high-level supporting process flows and conduct “straw man” evaluation

In Process

Finalize Proposed Structure

- Draft final recommendation and supporting business case
- Finalize deliverables

Executive Retreat – review alternatives and receive feedback

The team has focused significant effort on conducting benchmarking, and synthesizing findings.
Benchmark institutions were selected for interviews based on a variety of institutional characteristics, including membership in collaborative IT organizations and/or a reputation as an IT decision-making thought leader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>RUCC</th>
<th>CIC</th>
<th>CSG</th>
<th>Common Sense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California - Berkeley</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - Austin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 KEY:
 RUCC: Research University CIO Conclave
 CSG: Common Solutions Group
 "Common Sense": Opinion of UW IT Policy office & AE team members
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**Work Team Approach**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establish Common Understanding of the Current State/Benchmarking</th>
<th>Develop High-Level Future State Structures</th>
<th>Finalize Proposed Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Review EITDM Current State team findings</td>
<td>✓ Develop a list of desired future state characteristics</td>
<td>• Draft final recommendation and supporting business case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Establish strengths and challenges of current state</td>
<td>✓ Conduct listening session with campus stakeholders</td>
<td>• Finalize deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Select benchmark institutions, conduct interviews, and develop/review case studies</td>
<td>✓ Identify 3 to 5 alternative future state models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Develop high-level supporting process flows and conduct “straw man” evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed</strong></td>
<td><strong>In Process</strong></td>
<td><strong>Executive Retreat</strong> – review alternatives and receive feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team is transitioning its focus from benchmarking to discussions of what a UW-Madison structure and process might look like in each of the clusters identified.
Working Draft Future-State Characteristics

Process

- **Clear**: Establish clear process and entry points into the model
- **Transparent**: Document and communicate decisions and rationale
- **Consistent**: Principles, policies, and procedures are consistently applied
- **Agile**: Provide flexibility for quick response
- **Data-driven**: Focus on developing and leveraging high-quality data to support decision-making

Structure

- **Representative**: Provide for appropriate representation of various constituency groups across campus
- **Collaborative**: Enable “cross talk” across (and within) areas and stakeholders
- **Innovative**: Stimulate innovation as a common goal
- **Supported**: Invest in staff and resources to enable informed decision-making
- **Mission-based**: Align with the University’s strategic and mission-related goals
- **Accountable**: Each “organization” has goals and is measured against them on a periodic basis
The team currently has six draft characteristics for structure and five for process. This type of graphical representation may be used to assess the alignment of potential models with these characteristics.