

To: Virginia Sapiro
From: DoIT Management IT Review Committee

11 April 2006

This report is the joint effort of a group of both senior and mid level managers within DoIT. Each member of the group read the entire package of submissions to the UW-Madison Information Technology Review submitted by Colleges and Major Administrative Divisions. In addition each member reviewed, in detail, the External Information Technology Review Committee's report of their visit 6-9 March 2006. The group then met for two separate discussions sessions before generating this report.

We have framed our report around the 4 basic questions you posed in your charge letter to all Internal review teams. In addition we comment where appropriate on some of the specific observations and recommendations of the External Review committee.

Our broad answers to the 4 basic questions
--

1. *Are we positioned to serve the IT needs we face as a first class public research University in the coming years? What are our primary strengths and the main problem areas we should address?*
 - In some areas the campus is very well positioned. (some examples)
 - Our core network capabilities are new, state of the art and enjoy a long term funding model that is sustainable and largely well received by the Campus.
 - Many of our infrastructure services (email, portal, on line learning, student information system as examples) are mature, stable and well supported.
 - We are blessed with highly skilled and motivated IT professionals both centrally and distributed among the colleges and divisions. By and large we have the talent to "do it right".
 - In other areas the campus is not well positioned at all. (some examples)
 - There is no campus wide vision or coordinated effort in the IT support of research. It is largely an "every ship own it's own bottom" model and as such is both overly expensive in the aggregate and puts much of our research data at an unknown and less than well managed level of risk.
 - The campus lacks an institutional plan for the delivery of IT services. While it is certain that some services are best delivered centrally and others delivered "locally" there is no oversight or strategic vision for how such decisions are made. The end result is

inevitably wasteful of our scarce resources and guarantees widely varying levels of service to our students, faculty and staff.

- Funding for IT (including the business model that governs DoIT as mentioned by the External Review Committee) is extremely complex, varies widely among Colleges and Divisions and is not at all linked to a Campus-wide strategic plan (IT or otherwise)
- System and campus initiatives in implementing administrative information systems (ERPs) are not consistently planned, coordinated, or managed. Leadership from functional areas often works to maximize the benefit to the functional area at the expense of sound technology decision-making and recognition of system integration requirements.
- Too often services that are proactively focused, such as standardizing systems' architecture and integration, providing necessary access to campus data for decision-making and security plans are left unfunded.

2. *What changes should we consider in preparing for our new CIO?*

- Campus leadership should begin now, before the selection of a new CIO, to inform the campus of how the new CIO will be positioned among campus leaders (details below under question 4).
- Campus leadership should consider sponsoring campus wide needs gathering sessions on central research computing support concepts.
- Campus leadership should consider bringing in “outside” professional consulting expertise to begin an in depth analysis of the existing campus IT funding model.

3. *What ideas and recommendations should we share with the new CIO to assist in formulating agendas for the future?*

- The campus needs to ensure that an IT strategic plan is intelligently crafted and is tied to the strategic goals of UW-Madison
- The campus needs to consider some method of institutional level oversight and guidance in the execution of that IT Strategic Plan so that IT services, both centrally and locally provided, are delivered evenly.
- The campus needs to give real thought to a redesign of the current Campus IT funding model. As suggested by the External Review committee we must find a way to identify “Core” services from a Campus perspective and then fund them centrally. This funding model must be an integral part of the Campus IT strategic plan. That is *not* an easy or short-term task and will need executive mandate and guidance from the very top.
- The campus needs to consider how it plans for and implements major administrative information systems. Of special concern is a governance and review process that mandates systems work within an approved technology architecture including meeting integration requirements for other systems while meeting the needs of both end users and “power

users” in the key functional departments. In addition, campus leadership needs to exercise its collective voice with UW System Administration to assure that UWSA initiated implementations meet those same standards and requirements.

- The above four recommendations will require a change in the most difficult thing to change – the culture of the place. As a campus we must stop thinking as individual financial entities and acting as wholly independent units.

4. *Is the position of the CIO designed appropriately for this Campus? Is the position sufficiently attractive to allow us to recruit the best possible person for our Campus?*

- The position’s current design, if reporting arrangements are adjusted, is appropriate to the Campus. The CIO must be, as now, the leader of the Campus’ Central IT resource (DoIT). It must also be formally recognized as the Chancellor’s / Provost’s senior IT planner and advisor for the entire Campus. The incumbent has personally moved into this latter role but it must be formally recognized prior to her replacement’s arrival.
- Matters of pay notwithstanding the position as CIO at UW Madison will certainly be attractive to exceptionally qualified candidates *provided* it is correctly positioned to report to the Chancellor / Provost *and* controls the Central IT resource (DoIT). To fail to do either of those will severely limit our ability to recruit appropriately. {In reviewing our Peer Institution’s practices we were unable to find a single successful instance of the CIO not also controlling central IT resources}

Our responses to (selected) portions of the External review

1. *“Top Two Opportunities for Action”*
 - We strongly concur that in the areas of business model clarity and Campus IT governance structure there is a great need for improvement and much important work the new CIO should lead the Campus through.
2. *“Observations and key findings”*
 - We strongly concur in the comment “The 21st Century Network Project is an example of what can be accomplished when campus leaders decide to work together to achieve a common goal”. We feel that the success of this major campus wide project can and should be used as a template for future IT planning and governance efforts.
 - We strongly concur with the committee’s analysis of the evolution of the position of CIO from the role of Director of DoIT and furthermore believe

strongly that that evolution is on the right track and should be endorsed formally by executive level campus leadership.

- We agree that there is a noticeable gap in DoIT's support of the Campus' missions, specifically in the area of research activities, and we believe that the campus needs to centrally conduct a need's analysis in this area to determine where it would be appropriate for DoIT to actively participate.

3. “*Recommendations*”

- We concur most strongly in the committee's recommendation that the CIO report directly to the Chancellor and have the title of Vice Chancellor and CIO.
- We concur with the comments contained under the CIO Role and CIO Position Description sections with the following amplifications:
 - We strongly believe that the CIO must also serve as the director of DoIT. Without that relationship the position would be both unattractive to potential candidates and in a position of responsibility without commensurate authority.
 - We strongly feel that the comment “*Support and work with the UW system to the extent that it supports the strategic IT goals of the Madison campus*” is ambiguous and diminishes the incredible benefit the Campus realizes from the CIO's (and DoIT's) leadership in this critical area. Were DoIT (and thus this Campus) not to provide the level of service to UW System that it currently does the campus would forfeit a degree of control and direct support of central IT systems that it cannot afford to lose
- We are not clear on what specific point the committee was trying to make in it's comments on “Enterprise Systems Orientation”. We believe the core issue here is that Central Business systems should be just that, systems that serve business functionality centrally that meet the needs of both the central business offices *and* business offices in schools colleges and administrative units. This would preclude the current perceived (and very costly) need for those other units to either purchase or create their own “shadow” systems.
- We are confused by the committee's comments concerning classroom technology. The Space Management Office, Timetable and Classroom Scheduling Office and DoIT Academic Technology routinely review usage and feedback on the availability of instructional technology tools in classrooms. We think that already meets the need the committee describes. Perhaps this issue surrounds the classrooms that are managed by the colleges and academic departments.
- We most strongly concur with the final sentence in the committee's paragraph on “Culture”. If the University is to truly maximize it's total investment in IT it absolutely must find a way to eliminate duplicative services / purchases whenever it makes sense to do so. We must change the current culture which

allows individual “unit” spending on any number of IT services even if they are already adequately provided elsewhere.

We are very encouraged by the effort and input from so many different schools and offices and by the determination to use this CIO recruitment process as a way to evaluate and improve IT services on this campus across the board. DoIT does not believe that it should provide all IT services for this campus. It does believe that where it is called upon to deliver central services it is wasteful for the campus to allow duplicative services to be purchased and / or built in other units. The campus wide resolution to those problems and other core IT funding and planning issues clearly depends on the acceptance of a Chief Information Officer who serves the Chancellor directly, directs the central resources and coordinates the collaborative efforts and decision making of all IT resources on the campus.

Signed:

Jack Duwe

Ron Kraemer

John Peterson

Perry Brunelli

Jim Lowe

Chris Holsman

Kathy Christoph

Tom Scott

Joanne Jones

Dana Bunner

Diane Mann

Cathy O’Bryan

Klara Jelinkova

Roger Hanson