**IT Gov Notes**

July 11, 2023

Via Zoom

**Attendees:** Noah Daniels, Brenton DeBoef, Melissa Frost, Brandon Fuller (absent), Marta Gomez-Chiarri, Michael Greenfield, Amanda Izenstark, Shaun Kavanagh, Karlis Kaugars, Michael Khalfayan, Kara Larsen, Ian Lester, Dean Libutti, Matt McDonald (absent), Sanjay Kumar Mupparapu, John Stringer, Kathleen Torrens (absent)

**Guest:** None

1. CIO Updates
	1. National Student Clearing House and TIAA CREF appear to use the same data transfer package and there is a flaw therefore there’s been a data breach.
	2. Karlis will email in the next week or so on TLS wanting to set up a faculty advisory group, much like RC. He will share the proposed charter with this group and ask for feedback via email.
2. IT Strategic Plan: Prioritization of Initiatives and Actions (John Stringer)
	1. Karlis: We settled on building a rubric by example.
	2. John: In June, after our meeting, shared some of the Gartner materials, focusing on the conceptual framework rather than content.
	3. For this meeting, will go through IR framework to start to build off of that and the Gartner frameworks.
		1. We need to determine the business value of efforts and it is not always easy to tell what the right priority is, and there are only 3.5 FTE in IR juggling nearly 200 projects / requests.
		2. Prioritization Frameworks
			1. Types (all valid, all flawed)
				1. First in, first out
				2. What the analyst thinks is important
				3. What the director thinks is important
				4. What the Pres / Provost thinks is important
				5. Steering committee
			2. Gartner’s ROAR Model
				1. (Risk, Opportunity, Appetite, Return)

Based on strategic business focus

Explicitly addresses risk.

Allows for multiple (competing) priorities.

Data and analytics scoring rubric is easily adapted to IT.

* + - * 1. Three core elements

Missions’ critical priorities (MCPs) what keeps you up and running

Strategic business focus

Initiatives to be prioritized.

* + - * 1. Modifying it for IR

Framework is built for private industry with a focus on pecuniary returns.

Business value criteria scoring is needed.

IR example:

Request comes in, looks at it based on criteria, URI SP (with criteria weighting), data & analytics specific criteria, risk criteria (data available, clean, ready to use?), technological platform (have it, ready to use, cost, training needed to support others)

Scoring rubric with links to KPI which then gives value proposition scores to determine whether to move forward or not.

Can map net values against the total cost of ownership which would help us prioritize.

For IT Gov, we should focus on defining criteria and determine the weights on for review to provide more of a framework and help to directors to determine the net business value.

* + - 1. Questions:
				1. Noah: how do you validate the scoring rubric? We are at this point now and suggests that during IT Gov meetings, we build this in as regular business. We need to determine how complex of a rubric we want.
				2. Marta: who fills the value rubric as we all value things differently? The role of IT Gov is in designing the rubric, not assigning the values, rather it’s the person taking the request. IR asks questions to determine this in their own work.

Both Mike K and Sanjay agree that this is useful for our purposes, and also on a daily basis in their own areas.

* + - * 1. Noah: is this considered a roadblock to faculty research? Does the rubric consider when two goals are potentially in conflict? You need to weigh the risks and values to determine to move forward or not.

Brenton: it’s about getting the rubric right as well as the process (equally important) so the risks and values are considered from all sides. JS: it’s all about the rubric design and the program manager has all the information, including the negative impact, and additional conversations may need to happen to get the scoring right.

There is not a scoring committee in IR right now, but they are considering a steering committee.

* + - * 1. Michael: are projects scored independently or are the cross compared to other projects under consideration? Criteria they currently use in IR rubric includes this.
				2. Michael: does the 3.5 FTE in IR seem like it’d work well in IT? The larger organization in IT actually would work better.
				3. Marta: what are the alternatives if IT Gov does not move forward with this idea? The group can meet each time there is an initiative to consider and walk through all these same steps. It didn’t include a lot of strategy; it was really just responsive to an issue. For us to do this method, it’d be time consuming and overwhelming, not impossible.

Karlis: one page max with three questions that governance rates from 1-10 (money, value, importance) used at another institution. Worked okay but missed a lot of nuances. Not sure that’s the right approach here.

Marta: it feels like the data driven approach in the rubric is the first pass at it and then have conversation to make final decisions.

* + - 1. Karlis: can we reach consensus on rubric or individual project rating?
				1. Rubric: Brenton (but it’s our job to weight certain things in that rubric), Kara, Amanda, Marta, Ian (but wants to understand the whole workflow), Noah
				2. Project Rating:
			2. Funded and Unfunded projects need value analysis, and can sometimes funding can be sought successfully, or not.
				1. Projects with funding attached to them will get more traction because of the money in place.
		1. Next Steps:
			1. Karlis and John will take a first pass at a rubric tomorrow and then circulate to the group.
1. Open Forum
	1. Upcoming Meetings
		1. Next meeting is WED 08/02/2023 at 9 AM via Zoom.