**IT Gov Notes**

August 2, 2023

Via Zoom

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

**Guest:** None

1. CIO Updates
	1. None.
2. IT Strategic Plan: Prioritization of Initiatives and Actions (John Stringer)
	1. Two major items for evaluation rubric and two lesser (but important) items related to strategic alignment.
		1. Focus URI Plan: how does this project align with Focus URI
			1. Alignment can happen at different levels that broadly support one of or multiple priorities but none of the goals under the priorities directly; or projects that directly support goals but none of the identified actions; or things that support identified actions of Focus URI
			2. These levels of alignment deserve different kinds of weightings. Perhaps like this:
				1. Priority 10 points
				2. Goals 20 points
				3. Action 30 points as it strongly supports the university
			3. Unit strategic plans that support Focus URI also follow the priority, goal, action structure. This includes IT.
				1. As such prioritization rubric structure can be followed through all.
			4. Thoughts?
				1. Michael: If there’s something that in enabling for accomplishing many things not tied to an action or goal, does it get under weighted or higher weighted because it assists with actions & goals? Does it directly align with or map to Focus URI and the unit initiatives? Or is it broadly defined as supportive to URI?

Karlis: there becomes the question of alignment versus support, but it can become mass confusion on what that means and how to develop them. Enabler versus an alignment.

Noah: It’s easy to be confused about that, especially as IT goals relate to the Focus URI plan.

John: not sure we have to draw a distinction between alignment versus support as they are equally important. IR and IT work supports and aligns multiple areas – building out infrastructure that others need to make decisions across the board. It's more important to find the scale of the impact (high medium low) and define rubric clearly with respect to the individual goals. Spoke with University of Illinois Chicago (UIC) CIO who implemented the Gartner ROAR model and found success.

Karlis: MPM33 new directive from White House regarding federal funding, grant support, and security requirements around that. It’s a lot of what we’ve been talking about at URI. Failure to comply results in loss of funding. Has this been shared with faculty? There’s a separate task force charged with this rollout.

Groups agrees that Karlis will put together something for the strategic rollout of rubric.

* + 1. Operational aspects are very important and breakdown into two different groups:
			1. Operational efficiency gain: are we going to become faster, quicker, more productive by implementing this project/goal/etc.
			2. Compliance: we need to be careful with compliance because URI has a long history of claiming compliance by local interpretations of rules. Therefore, compliance part of rubric must say give me federal or state law that requires that we take this action (link to document / paragraph) and tell me if URI Legal concurs with your opinion on this.
				1. It is harsh and onerous thing to ask, but let’s put the burden on the front end.
				2. Noah: we need to respect academic freedom of scholars (faculty & students) and making sure that’s balanced with the compliance requirements.
				3. Mike K: the requirements are all clearly spelled out, so they are easy to follow, even if they require a lot. URI Legal is very supportive of this.
		2. Population Impacted is a bit trickier (everyone, students, staff, faculty)
			1. Is it all, some, few and how do we weigh the impact?
			2. John: in IR we weigh by positive outcome and potential risk with failure & the implications of failure. All scored 1-5 with examples given in rubric. There is no differentiation among students, faculty, staff. It is based on units / departments on up to entire university impact.
			3. Noah offered to talk to professionals who can help measure and weigh the impacts on populations (faculty compared to students when there is failure on faculty software versus student software).
			4. Michael G: is this really necessary? John’s scale seems to be a very reasonable and sensible approach to this.
		3. Effort / Risk Costs Bundle
			1. A lot of moving parts from project to project, including risk of project failure due to various factors on previous projects that force these failures.
			2. These are challenging to evaluate before a project starts because often times we just don’t know – we have to guesstimate. How likely is it we will run into a brick wall on a 1-5 scale.
			3. Sensitive data transmission, integration difficulty, support modern identity and access system, and other deeply technical questions that can be viewed as “T-shirt sizing” – small problem, medium problem, large problem.
				1. John: we also have to view ongoing support with cost and effort.
			4. Karlis: thinking we may want to add something (not universally applicable, mostly to administrative areas and tasks): ask for documentation on research on item wanting to implement – why have other universities done, why, what other option did they examine. We do not have to invent the wheel; we can look at comparable universities to see what they’ve done and why. It saves us time, effort, and money.
				1. John: we need to approach it from solving the problem rather than implementing a solution for a problem that we do not necessarily have (example: Salesforce and it’s implementation)
				2. Michael G: do we need to seek THE best? Maybe we need something that’s pretty good.
	1. Next Steps:
		1. Karlis will take a first pass at a rubric and then circulate to the group for edits and refinements.
1. Open Forum
	1. Upcoming Meetings
		1. Next meeting is WED 09/06/2023 at 9 AM via Zoom.