



UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE IT GOVERNANCE



INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

University of Delaware IT Governance

This is a living document. Information Technologies and the IT Steering Committee will modify it as necessary to reflect changes in IT and governance at UD.

Version	Date	Changes	Editor
Version 1	April 24, 2019	Draft Document	Susan Kennedy
Version 2-8	May 14, 2019	Draft Revisions	ITCG
Version 3-9	May 28, 2019	Member expansion	Susan Kennedy
Version 10	July 18, 2019	Nomenclature	ITCG
Version 11	September 5, 2019	Appendix C Revision	ITCG
Version 12	October 1, 2019	EITC Revision	ITCG

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Guiding Principles	1
Goals of IT Governance	1
IT Governance Structure	2
Executive IT Council	3
Operating Principles	3
IT Governance Steering Committee	3
Operating Principles	4
Term	4
Advisory Groups	4
Operating Principles	5
Term	5
Other Groups	5
IT Project Management Office	5
Operating Principles	5
Assessment of Projects	6
Project Business Drivers at the University of Delaware	6
Project Criteria Collected at the University of Delaware	7
Project Assessment Guidelines	7
Appendices	8
Appendix A: Advisory Groups - Committee Descriptions	8
Appendix B: Criteria	11
Appendix C: Project Portfolio Example	14



IT GOVERNANCE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IT governance at the University of Delaware establishes the decision-making process necessary to ensure innovative, reliable, and robust information technology. IT governance determines and defines campus-wide IT priorities in accordance with the University's Strategic Plan and is informed by the University's Information Technology Strategic Plan.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

A common set of guiding principles work to shape the overall approach of IT governance and are the foundation of the governance structure. Governance should convey:

- **Positivity:** interact as a collaborative and communicative team seeking success
- **Simplicity:** be straightforward and easy to navigate and avoid unnecessary bureaucracy
- **Accountability:** evaluate IT investments made by the IT governance body for results
- **Strategic alignment:** provide strategic oversight and guidance around IT to ensure the alignment of IT and the University business with respect to services and projects
- **Collaboration:** advocate for the adoption of common IT solutions and identify opportunities for innovation and improvement
- **Inclusion:** ensure that diverse perspectives and needs are represented
- **Responsibility:** ensure an efficient decision-making process
- **Value:** confirm that IT work drives maximum business value from IT in support of the University
- **Integration:** address issues spanning multiple domains holistically
- **Transparency:** provide transparent and open governance processes
- **Risk Mitigation:** ascertain that processes are in place to ensure that risks have been adequately managed

GOALS OF IT GOVERNANCE

The primary goals of the IT governance framework are to:

- Align the university's information technology direction with the University's Strategic Plan and the University's priorities
- Provide a consistent and fair approach that is integrated and aligned with the University's governance approach
- Ensure awareness of the decision-making process that determines where IT resources are applied
- Ensure IT-related processes are overseen effectively and transparently

IT GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

IT governance groups at the University may be one of four (4) types: Executive IT Council, IT Governance Steering Committee, Advisory Groups, and Other Groups.

- **Executive IT Council:** The top-level governance body approves overarching strategies and investments.
- **IT Governance Steering Committee:** The senior-level governance body recommends strategic initiatives, sequences strategic and major projects, and facilitates innovation. The IT Governance Steering Committee advises the Executive IT Council as appropriate.
- **Advisory Groups:** Groups coordinate initiatives, sponsor analyses, guide services, and sequence enhancement projects with a functional domain. These domains are focused on user communities (administrative systems, student experience, IT services, research computing, architecture, security & IT risk, and others ad-hoc domains as required).
- **Other Groups:** Other Groups include existing, or developing, technology-related groups at the University that are in position to inform the IT Governance Steering Committee on technology, projects, and processes. Examples include Data Governance, Digital Learning, and Learning Spaces.

Diagram for the IT Governance structure



Figure 1

Executive IT Council

The Executive IT Council, the top-level IT group committee, is comprised of:

- Executive Vice President
- Provost
- Vice President for Information Technologies and CIO
- Vice President for Strategic Planning and Analysis

In addition to championing IT governance activities, the Executive IT Council Role is to:

- Ensure business strategy and objectives are set, communicated, and aligned with IT and vice versa
- Approve strategies and investments
- Resolve any major conflicts in technology investments
- Stipulate high-level direction for sourcing and use of IT resources when demand creates conflicts
- Impart guidance for integration and collaboration between other university-wide governance practices

The Vice President of Information Technologies and CIO serves as the liaison to the Executive IT Council and the IT Governance Steering Committee.

Operating Principles

Meetings are held as needed and particularly toward the end of annual budget cycles to align IT investments with overarching institutional investments.

IT Governance Steering Committee

The IT Governance Steering Committee, chaired by the Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer, is primarily responsible for all major IT decision-making for the University. The committee provides guidance as well as sets IT priorities to enable the University to balance its improvement goals with available resources in alignment with the University's strategic goals and mission. The Vice President for Information Technologies and CIO chairs the IT Governance Steering Committee.

The IT Governance Steering Committee is comprised of:

- Associate Vice President Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness
- Associate Vice President IT Strategic Operations
- Associate Vice Provost, Chief of Staff
- College Deans
- Chief Budget Officer
- Faculty Senate Representative
- Vice President and General Counsel
- Vice President for Enrollment Management
- Vice President for Facilities, Real Estate, and Auxiliary Services
- Vice President for Finance

- Vice President for Human Resources
- Vice President for Information Technologies and CIO
- Vice Provost for Libraries and Museums
- Vice President for Research, Scholarship, and Innovation
- Vice President for Student Life

In addition to championing IT governance activities, the IT Governance Steering Committee role is to:

- Collaborate in IT governance
- Advise the Executive IT Council as a committee
- Recommend strategic initiatives and strategic projects for Executive IT Council review, sequence strategic projects, and facilitate innovation
- Review and assess projects that meet required strategic criteria
- Reject or hold requests, projects, and/or services especially if it is determined that the university already has a solution that achieves similar goals and objectives as the proposed project
- Provide clear charges to the Committees that define their purpose, scope, and authority
- Create ad hoc committee(s) as necessary to explore emerging University needs
- Administer the IT governance framework
- Monitor the IT Project Portfolio

Operating Principles & Term

Meetings are held every other month; meeting frequency may increase during annual budget review.

Vice provosts and vice presidents are permanent participants. College Deans and Faculty Senate representation are three-year (3) appointments that commence at the beginning of the fiscal year. Three (3) College Deans will be appointed by the Provost. Dean representation will be staggered.

Advisory Groups

Advisory Groups are comprised of a broad cross-section of technology, administrative, and operational staff who represent the University's needs. Advisory Groups represent functional domains, such as administrative systems, student experience, IT services, research computing, architecture, and security and IT risk. At the direction of the IT Governance Steering Committee, ad hoc committees may be formed.

The role of an Advisory Group is to:

- Champion IT governance activities
- Collaborate in IT governance
- Coordinate initiatives, sponsor analyses, guide services, and recommend the sequencing of projects
- Review proposed requests, projects, and/or services
- Recommend requests, projects, and/or services when believed beneficial to the University
- Reject requests, projects, and/or services if determined that the University already has a solution that achieves the same goals and objectives as the proposed project
- Communicate activity to the IT Governance Steering Committee on a monthly basis
- Advisory Groups are time-bound and have a clear charge and deliverables

The Assistant Vice President of IT Strategic Operations, or designee, serves as the liaison to the IT Governance Steering Committee and Advisory Groups Chairs.

Operating Principles & Term

Meetings are held monthly. Chairs meet monthly with the Assistant Vice President of IT Strategic Operations and report activity monthly.

Most Chairs of the Advisory Groups are aligned with appropriate institutional positions and are permanent participants. All other members will serve terms of two (2) years. Details for the following committees can be found in Appendix A:

- Student Experience Committee (SEC)
- IT Services Committee (ITSC)
- Research Computing Committee (RCC)
- Architecture Committee (AC)
- Security and IT Risk Committee (SIRC)
- Administrative Systems Committee (ASC)

Other Groups

Other Groups are considered technology-related groups, existing or developing at the University, that are in position to inform the IT Governance Steering Committee on information technologies, projects, and processes. Example groups include Data Governance, Digital Learning, and Learning Spaces.

The role of these groups is to:

- Inform the IT Governance Steering Committee on IT, projects, and processes under consideration that could impact the information technology strategy or the University's technology.

IT Project Management Office

The IT Project Management Office (PMO) receives IT-related project requests from the University community. The PMO provides support to the IT Governance Steering Committee by providing data and decision-making mechanisms. Each project request is reviewed, assessed, and scored by the PMO as prescribed by project criteria (see Appendix B). Each request is assigned a potential time frame for completion. Each request will indicate whether it competes with other projects for IT staff resources for deployment. Project requests that meet the defined measures are submitted to the IT Governance Steering Committee.

The PMO administers the University's IT Project Portfolio (see Appendix C). As the University begins its implementation of this IT governance framework, increased attention will be given to the front-end of the project management lifecycle (e.g., how to choose the correct projects, prioritize them, track their progress, and ensure adequate resources) versus the planning and execution of individual projects. The PMO's role is to include these fundamental practices for project prioritization recommendations and the balancing of the University's IT project portfolio to optimize results. The PMO provides a holistic view of all existing and planned IT work for the university.

Operating Principles

Meetings are held monthly.

ASSESSMENT OF PROJECTS

As projects are received by the PMO, business drivers and criteria are assigned to each requested project and then assessed by UD IT senior staff. Project drivers help UD IT determine what projects will be forwarded to IT governance committees for approval. Projects that represent innovations or support institutional strategy will be reviewed through the IT governance process. Projects that are associated with enhancements, facilities-related capital projects, internal and external mandates, cybersecurity, and operations, and maintenance will not be reviewed by IT governance committees. Such projects will be presented as part of the IT project portfolio and shared with IT governance committees for advice.

Project Business Drivers at the University of Delaware

IT project drivers can represent strategic investments, innovation, enhancements, capital, mandates, risk avoidance, operations, and maintenance.

Project Driver	Definition	Guidepost Questions	Criteria
1. Strategic/ Innovative	Positions UD as a leader in a core mission area with alignment to the University's priorities	Strategic: Will it: Impact more than 1 college/division? Require significant funds to be expended? Have a large impact? Implement new technology/processes that promote transformative change? Represent major risk? Heavily utilize staff time? Innovative: Will it: Optimize performance and accommodate incremental growth/improvement? Represent a competitive investment for UD?	Meets 2 or more of the criteria: Will impact > 1 department/unit outside of the requester Requires university funds to be expended Has a large university impact Implements new technologies and processes that promote transformative change
2. Enhancement	To improve or increase an existing capability	Will the request significantly expand or impact an existing system or capability?	Meets 2 or more of the criteria: Will impact 1 department Is specific to an existing app/system
3. Capital	A major or expensive project to create or improve a capital asset	Will the request support an approved capital project that is on the FREAS project listing?	Meets these criteria: Has an approved capital project/budget Exists on the FREAS project listing
4. External/ Internal Mandate	An official order or commission to do something	Is the request in direct support of an internal or external mandate?	Meets these criteria: Has an associated internal or external mandate
5. Security/Risk Avoidance	Mitigates risk: compliance, financial, operational, reputational, strategic	Will it: Advance the cybersecurity program or address security risks? Support an effort to improve the current state as part of a risk assessment response?	Meets all of these criteria: If not fulfilled, has adverse security/risk impacts Has > 1 of the Strategic Project criteria
6. Operation/ Maintenance	Optimizes performance or gains efficiencies; necessary to keep systems running	Will it: Only impact 1 department? Require no University funds? Optimize performance and accommodate incremental growth and improvement? Be part of regular updates to maintain a system/application?	Meets all of these criteria: Is in support of 1 department Does not require University funds to be expended Does not have a large impact Will optimize performance and accommodate incremental growth and improvement

Project Criteria Collected at the University of Delaware

- Risk
- Benefit
- Impact on Competing Priorities

Project Assessment Guidelines

Holistically, the relationship between these factors and their values govern the level of review and approval that are depicted as follows:

Project Driver *	Criteria* * Reference Appendices for definitions	PMO and Requestor	IT Committee	IT Governance Steering Committee	IT Executive Council
1. Strategic	Risk: 1-5 Benefit: 3, 4 Competing Priorities: 1 - 5	✓	✓ as required	✓	✓
1. Innovative	Risk: 4, 5 Benefit: 3, 4 Competing Priorities: 4, 5	✓	✓ as required	✓	✓
	Risk: 1, 2, 3 Benefit: 1, 2 Competing Priorities: 1, 2, 3	✓	✓ as required		
2. Enhancement	Risk: 4, 5 Benefit: 3, 4 Competing Priorities: 4, 5	✓	✓ as required	✓	✓
	Risk: 1, 2, 3 Benefit: 1, 2 Competing Priorities: 1, 2, 3	✓	✓ as required		
3. Capital	Risk: 4, 5 Benefit: 3, 4 Competing Priorities: 4, 5	✓	✓ as required	✓ Information purposes	✓ Information purposes
	Risk: 1,2,3 Benefit: 1, 2 Competing Priorities: 1, 2, 3	✓	✓ as required		
4. External or Internal Mandate	Risk: 4, 5 Benefit: 3, 4 Competing Priorities: 4, 5	✓	✓ as required	✓ Information purposes	✓ Information purposes
	Risk: 1, 2, 3 Benefit: 1, 2 Competing Priorities: 1, 2, 3	✓	✓ as required		
5. Security	Risk: 4, 5 Benefit: 3, 4 Competing Priorities: 4, 5	✓	✓ as required	✓ Information purposes	✓ Information purposes
	Risk: 1, 2, 3 Benefit: 1, 2 Competing Priorities: 1, 2, 3	✓	✓ as required		
6. Maintenance	Risk: 4, 5 Benefit: 3, 4 Competing Priorities: 4, 5	✓	✓ as required	✓ Information purposes	✓ Information purposes
	Risk: 1, 2, 3 Benefit: 1, 2 Competing Priorities: 1, 2, 3	✓	✓ as required		

Table 1

* **Project Driver Related Notes:** "Capital" projects, which are approved via a different institutional governance process, will be shared in IT governance for information purposes. Similarly, projects identified as "Mandated," "Security," or "Maintenance" will be shared in IT governance for information purposes.

APPENDIX A: ADVISORY GROUPS — COMMITTEE DESCRIPTIONS

Committees are comprised of a broad cross-section of technology, administrative, and operational staff who represent the University's need. Committees represent the functional domains of administrative systems, student experience, IT services, research computing, architecture, and security and IT risk. At the direction of the IT Governance Steering Committee, ad hoc committees may be formed. Detailed information is available in the companion reference: *IT Governance Structure - Committee Design*.

Student Experience Committee (SEC)

The Student Experience Committee (SEC) focuses on the student experience, from potential student to graduate, including decision-making, matriculation, on-boarding, advising, communications, tutoring, retention, support services, graduation preparation, etc. The committee is asked to think holistically about how technology can support the student experience throughout the student lifecycle.

The SEC will support the IT Governance Steering Committee by overseeing student experience technologies across the university. Specifically, the SEC will:

- Identify, prioritize, and recommend areas for expansion of technology utilization for the enhancement of student experience programs and support activities
- Monitor and recommend sustainable technology strategies
- Identify, prioritize, and recommend University technology resources that can be leveraged to meet student experience related goals in keeping with the University's mission
- The committee meets for 90 minutes each month to review and discuss relevant initiatives and projects

IT Services Committee (ITSC)

The IT Services Committee (ITSC) supports the IT Governance Steering Committee by identifying IT services needs of the University. Specifically, the ITSC will:

- Define a “now, near, future” state of IT services that is technically leading, supportive of University goals, and transparent where appropriate to foster broad collaboration
- Support service lines as defined in collaboration with UD IT
- Monitor initiatives in each supported service line and advise service line managers when course corrections are needed
- Support the ITSM department in the development of new services
- Ensure development of plans for the continuation and/or sunset/replacement of a service
- The committee meets for 90 minutes each month to review and discuss relevant initiatives and projects

Research Computing Committee (RCC)

The Research Computing Committee (RCC) supports the IT Governance Steering Committee by identifying technology needs of the University research community and evaluating direction and progress of current technology initiatives directly related to supporting research. Specifically, the RCC will:

- Identify, prioritize, and recommend areas for expansion of technology utilization for the enhancement of University research programs
- Identify University analytic and integration services and technologies that can be used to enhance the research mission

- Identify, prioritize, and recommend University technology resources that can be leveraged to meet research goals in keeping with the University’s mission
- The committee meets for 90 minutes each month to review and discuss relevant initiatives and projects

Architecture Committee (AC)

The Architecture Committee (AC) focuses on architecture technologies across the University and is asked to think holistically about how the technology architecture for the University can best support all aspects of the University’s mission. Specifically, the AC will:

- Define a “now, near, future” state of IT architecture that is technically leading, supportive of University goals, and transparent where appropriate to foster broad collaboration
- Support the technical roadmap for supported service lines, as defined in collaboration with UD IT
- Monitor initiatives in each supported service line and advising service line managers when course corrections are needed
- Partner with IT Service Management to ensure development of plans for the continuation and/or sunset/replacement of a service
- The committee meets for 90 minutes each month to review and discuss relevant initiatives and projects

Security and IT Risk Committee (SIRC)

The Security and IT Risk Committee (SIRC) is responsible for ensuring alignment between the program and the University’s information security program. SIRC provides expert counsel to guide security assurance, technology, compliance, and policy directing reasonable and appropriate actions are taken to protect the University’s electronic information resources. Specifically, the SIRC will:

- Identify, prioritize, and recommend areas for expansion of technology utilization for the enhancement of University’s security program
- Monitor and recommend sustainable security technology strategies
- Identify, prioritize, and recommend University technology resources that can be leveraged to meet security goals in keeping with the University’s mission
- Evaluate, author, and review information security policies that address risk and align with applicable federal and state regulations, University policy, risk, insurance, and compliance requirements (All policies will follow the University’s approval policy)
- The committee meets for 90 minutes each month to review and discuss relevant initiatives and projects

Administrative Systems Advisory Group

The Administrative Systems (AS) Advisory Group supports the IT Steering Committee by identifying administrative and business technology needs of the university community, and evaluating direction and progress of current technology initiatives directly related to creating an improved and streamlined administrative infrastructure. An underlying foundation of the AS is support redesigning of administrative processes and to reduce the complexity of the application portfolio.

Systems under this group’s purview include:

- Finance
- Human Resources
- Student and Enrollment Services (In collaboration with the Student Experience Advisory Group)
- Research Administration

The AS will support the IT Steering Committee by overseeing administrative and business technologies across the university. Specifically, the AS will:

- Identify, prioritize, and recommend areas for expansion of technology utilization for the enhancement of university administrative and business technology needs
- Monitor and recommend sustainable administrative technology strategies
- Identify, prioritize and recommend university technology resources that can be leveraged to meet education goals in keeping with the university's mission
- The committee meets for 90 minutes each month to review and discuss relevant initiatives and projects

APPENDIX B: CRITERIA

This appendix includes the following information:

1. Risk (Table 2)
2. Risk Assessment Matrix (Table 3)
3. Benefits (Table 4)
4. Impact of Competing Priorities (Table 5)

Risk

	1 Acceptable	2 Tolerable	3 Likely Tolerable	4 Generally Unacceptable	5 Unacceptable
Financial Loss	\$1 to \$5 Million	\$5 to \$10 Million	\$10 to \$15 Million	\$15 to \$20 Million	> \$20 Million
Interruption of Services	½ day to 1 day	1 day to 1 week	1 week to 1 month	1 month to 3 months	> 3 months
Reputation and Image	Unsubstantiated, low impact, low profile or no news items	Substantiated, low impact, low news profiles	Substantiated, public embarrassment, moderate impact, moderate news profile	Substantiated, public embarrassment, high impact, high news profile, third-party actions	Substantiated, public embarrassment, very high multiple impacts, high widespread news profile, third-party actions
Injuries	No injuries	First aid treatment	Medical treatment	Death or extensive injuries	Multiple deaths or severe permanent disabilities
Legal Compliance	No issues	Substantiated, low compliance impact	Substantiated, moderate compliance impact	Substantiated, high compliance impact	Substantiated, very high, multiple compliance impacts, third-party actions

Table 2

Risk Assessment Matrix

RISK RATING KEY	RARE	UNLIKELY	POSSIBLE	LIKELY	ALMOST CERTAIN
	1 Acceptable	2 Tolerable	3 Likely Tolerable	4 Generally Unacceptable	5 Unacceptable
	OK to Proceed	OK to Proceed	Take Mitigation Efforts	Seek Support	Place Effort on Hold and Seek Executive Approval
IMPACT →	1 Acceptable	2 Tolerable	3 Undesirable	4 Likely Unacceptable	5 Unacceptable
	No effect on event	Little effect on event	Effects are felt, but not critical to outcome	Serious impact to the course of action and outcome	Could result in multiple severe or catastrophic events
LIKELIHOOD					
Rare Risk is not expected to occur in next 5 years	VERY LOW - 1 -	LOW - 6 -	MEDIUM - 11 -	HIGH - 16 -	VERY HIGH - 21 -
Unlikely Risk could occur at some time in next 5 years	VERY LOW - 2 -	LOW - 7 -	MEDIUM - 12 -	HIGH - 17 -	VERY HIGH - 22 -
Possible Risk might occur in the next 1-5 years	VERY LOW - 3 -	LOW - 8 -	MEDIUM - 13 -	HIGH - 18 -	EXTREME - 23 -
Likely Risk will probably occur at least once per year	VERY LOW - 4 -	LOW - 9 -	MEDIUM - 14 -	VERY HIGH - 19 -	EXTREME - 24 -
Almost Certain Risk expected to occur more than once per year	LOW - 5 -	MEDIUM - 10 -	HIGH - 15 -	VERY HIGH - 20 -	EXTREME - 25 -

Table 3

Benefits

BENEFIT	1	2	3	4
Stakeholder/User Impact (Number who would benefit) – students, faculty/staff, external constituents, alumni, community partnerships, cultural, athletic, lifelong learning, etc.	0	< 10K	< 25K	> 25K
Business Process Improvement	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
Time Savings	0	< 25 hours/month	< 50 hours/month	> 50 hours/month
Reduction in Application	0	1 application	2-3 applications	> 3 applications
Financial Impact Results in substantial positive financial impact	0	Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Revenue Generation
Discretionary Other Benefits An extra credit type of question, provides an additional couple of points to the overall rating	0	TBD	TBD	TBD

Table 4

Impact on Competing Priorities

	1 Acceptable	2 Tolerable	3 Likely Tolerable	4 Generally Unacceptable	5 Unacceptable
Financial & Budget	Within approved budget	Within approved budget	Approved budget; exceeds budget by 10%	Lack of approved budget; exceeds budget by 25%	Lack of approved budget; exceeds budget by 50%
Interruption of Services	½ day to 1 day	1 day to 1 week	1 week to 1 month	1 month to 3 months	> 3 months
Reputation and Image	Unsubstantiated, low impact, low profile or no news items	Substantiated, low impact, low news profiles	Substantiated, public embarrassment, moderate impact, moderate news profile	Substantiated, public embarrassment, high impact, high news profile, third-party actions	Substantiated, public embarrassment, very high multiple impacts, high widespread news profile, third-party actions
Human Resources	No impact to existing human resource schedule; no impact to VP goal	< 10% impact to existing human resource schedule; limited impact to VP goal	> 10% but < 20% impact to existing human resource schedule; moderate impact to VP goal	> 20% but < 40% impact to existing human resource schedule; impact to VP goal	> 40% but < 50% impact to existing human resources schedule; impact to VP goal

Table 5

APPENDIX C: PROJECT PORTFOLIO EXAMPLE

This appendix includes the following information:

1. IT PMO Project Dashboard Example (Figure 2)
2. Priority Calculations IT Governance (Table 6)
3. Priority Calculations IT Governance Template (Figure 3)

IT PMO PROJECT DASHBOARD												
PMO Office						Li Lin, Sarah Meadows, Amy Shultz, Richard Atkins			DATE		2/1/19	
PROJECT DETAILS							Project Health		Milestones			
Phase	Project Driver	START DATE	END DATE	Sponsor	College/Unit	Scope	Status	% DONE	DATE	Description		
PROJECT: Electronic Health Records								25%				
Planning	Strategic	7/2/18	8/30/19	Kathleen Matt	CHS	Modernization of CHS's manual/paper health record process with a cloud solution, NextGen		25%	2/15/2019	Project team from CHS actively working on the business tasks.		
PROJECT: RFP9021 - IT Service Management								20%				
Planning	Strategic	6/1/18	TBD	Sharon Pitt/Joe Kempista	Central IT	RFP to find a replacement enterprise solution for IT Service Management that will provide Project Portfolio Management, Asset Management, Service Desk		20%	2/1/2019	TeamDynamix contract redline negotiations ongoing with the vendor		
PROJECT: PCI Compliance								35%				
Planning	Security/Risk Avoidance	9/9/18	3/15/19	Augie Maurelli	Finance	Planning, execution and process modifications to increase PCI compliance across the University		35%	2/14/2019	Web Developer estimates Mid/Late Feb for development on UDeposit File completion for Testing		
PROJECT: FREAS O365 Migration								50%				
Execution	Strategic	8/29/18	3/8/19	Sharon Pitt/Peter Krawczyk		Migration of FREAS to central O365 for standardization and risk avoidance		50%	2/18/2019	Dining Services will be migrated		
PROJECT: HR PageUp Recruitment								66%				
Execution	Strategic	9/9/18	4/1/19	Jared Aupperle	HR	Procurement, planning and execution of PageUp recruitment module.		66%	2/15/2019	UAT completed		

Figure 2

Priority Calculations IT Governance (*Priority Calculations IT Governance Example*)

Order	Scorecard Criteria Name	% Multiplier	Criteria Selection	Value
1	Number of Users Impacted	5	0-1000	0
			1001-2000	1
			2001	2
2	Law, State, Federal Mandates	15	None	0
			State Mandate	1
			Federal Mandate	2
			State and Federal Mandate	3
3	Payback Period (Business Process Improvement)	10	Less than 1 Year	0
			1 to 2 Years	1
			More than 2 Years	2
4	Strategic Impact	10	0	0
			1	1
			2	2
			3	3
			4	4
			5	5
5	% Grant Fund	5	No	0
			Partial	1
			Yes	2
6	% Total Fund	5	No	0
			Partial	1
			Yes	2
7	Critical Risk	10	Yes	1
			No	0
8	Priority	10	Yes	1
			No	0
9	Project Phase	10	Initiation	0
			Planning	1
			Execution through Closing	2
10	Project Duration	5	< 3 Months	3
			3 – 6 Months	2
			6 – 9 Months	1
			> 12 Months	0
11	Strategic Plan	15	Yes	1
			No	0
12	Prerequisite Projects	5	Yes	0
			No	1
13	Executive Upgrade/Downgrade	5	None	0
			Upgrade	1
			Downgrade	-1

Table 6

Project Name: Example Project A				
Criterion Name	% Multiplier	Criterion Selection	Value	Score
Number of Users Impacted	5%	0-1000	0	0.00
Law - State or Federal Mandate	15%	State and Federal Mandate	3	0.15
Payback Period (Business Process Improvement)	10%	1 to 2 Years	1	0.05
Strategic Impact	10%	1	1	0.02
% Grant Fund	5%	No	0	0.00
% Total Fund	5%	Yes	2	0.05
Critical Risk	10%	Yes	1	0.10
Priority	10%	Yes	1	0.10
Project Phase	10%	Initiation	0	0.00
Project Duration	5%	6 - 12 months	1	0.02
Strategic Plan	15%	Yes	1	0.15
Prerequisite Project	5%	No	1	0.05
Executive Upgrade/Downgrade	5%		0	0.00
Score:				0.69

Figure 3



FOR MORE INFORMATION

UD INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

www.udel.edu/it

UD IT STRATEGIC PLAN

sites.udel.edu/it-strategicplan/

UD IT PROJECT MANAGEMENT OFFICE

sites.udel.edu/it-pmo/