**Office of the Chancellor**

**Response to recommendations for the campus IT organization**

7. (Taken out-of-order from Recommendation document submitted) Establish a stakeholder group with broad representation from directors and students and a process to periodically evaluate performance.

    **Chancellor's Response:** I accept this recommendation as-is and moved to the top of the list. The full campus is impacted by and reliant on technology, therefore the campus must have a voice in its strategy. A stakeholder advisory group, within our university model and spirit of shared governance, must be established to advise the IT division on its performance on behalf of the university and to serve as a platform for accountability.

1. Give the CIO a central role in the leadership on campus with commensurate personnel and budgetary authority.

    **Chancellor's Response:** I accept this recommendation as-is. Information technology is embedded in every operation of the university. More than the support service it has historically been viewed as, IT is a strategic investment that is critical to our success and effectiveness as an institution. Having IT reporting directly to the Chancellor is a model I am used to having lived through this shift twice before in my career. Effective February 1, the role of the CIO will be a direct report to the Chancellor and no longer within the Administrative Services division.

2. Give CIO authority by policy over all IT systems and personnel, supplemented by centralization of reporting lines in the information and infrastructure layer (model 2/3).

    **Chancellor's Response:** I accept this recommendation as-is. Information technology poses significant risks to the university and requires significant levels of investment. It is important to me a role exists at the university that has oversight and accountability for all IT investments and operations, and particularly one of our most important assets, our institutional information. Not all individuals affected by this decision have been identified therefore I charge the CIO and unit leaders with identifying those roles and officially moving the reporting lines with appropriate planning to assure a smooth transition.

3. Establish a mechanism for ensuring innovation takes place.

    **Chancellor's Response:** I accept this recommendation as-is. While centralization of operations affords us greater efficiency in many ways, I recognize the potential for loss of innovation that has been a concern of many individuals. Innovation is an important strategy for our future growth and requires experimentation and agility that centralization can impede. IT must find measurable mechanisms to ensure innovation.

4.  Establish appropriate prioritization mechanisms to ensure a balance between unit and institutional priorities.

    **Chancellor's Response:** I accept this recommendation as-is. Each unit contributes to the mission of the university. We do not want unit missions that align with and contribute to the university mission to be compromised for the sake of operational efficiency. Yet at the same time, we cannot expand our IT division to meet all needs simultaneously, prioritization must occur and it must be transparent.

5.  Develop a centralized, independent, and predictable budgeting mechanism to ensure appropriate funding for IT.

    **Chancellor's Response:** I accept this recommendation as-is. As IT operations have evolved, a new model for funding and allocating the costs of IT investment is needed. We must develop this model in collaboration with stakeholders, university finance administration, and the budget model study group where appropriate.

6.  Establish Service Level Agreements (SLAs) with units outlining service levels responsibilities, and funding required.

    **Chancellor's Response:** I accept this recommendation as-is. I understand that SLAs are a standard practice in IT service management and have already been piloted with several units at the university. I charge our unit leaders and technology leaders with developing appropriate SLAs to outline service requirements, expectations, and funding required, incorporating lessons learned from these early pilots to continually improve our collaborations.

8.  Extend IT portfolio management to incorporate unit missions and innovation as priorities and to achieve more robust project management and communication practices.

    **Chancellor's Response:** I accept this recommendation as-is. These techniques will assure preservation of both innovation and unit missions as previously recommended. IT should continue refining and extending portfolio management to all IT investments and operations, including appropriate project management and communication practices. I welcome the introduction of a Portfolio Management Office, using available staff, to support and manage this practice and ensure its success.

9.  Centralize all IT infrastructure services with appropriate funding and life cycle management.

**Chancellor's Response:** I accept this recommendation as-is. Centralized IT must have authority over all IT infrastructure investments and operations, including approval of contracts and purchases, to ensure proper oversight. I charge unit leaders with responsibility for obtaining proper approval prior to purchasing equipment or engaging outside services involving technology. This recommendation also includes centralization of all individual roles supporting or managing infrastructure. As noted in recommendation #2, discussions must ensue to identify those individuals and develop transition plans.

10. Standardize equipment lifecycle management for all departments.

    **Chancellor's Response:** I accept this recommendation as-is. A lifecycle management model should be extended to all IT assets across the university, accompanied by central funding that needs to be determined once the predictive model can be fully developed. In this way we can better leverage volume pricing and operational efficiency while reducing the "haves and haves not" effect of disparate funding sources for technology investments.

11. Centralize reporting lines in the information layer for enterprise systems and integrations, providing appropriate staffing to meet business needs.

    **Chancellor's Response:** I accept this recommendation as-is. As recommended, information roles in the library and institutional research units will not be centralized at this time. However, I expect continued and even stronger collaboration with these units to improve our capabilities in serving the needs of institutional decision-making and student information literacy.

12. Regularly evaluate existing or proposed systems to reduce redundancy and risk.

    **Chancellor's Response:** I accept this recommendation as-is. IT should conduct an internal review of all IT systems, evaluate their risk and long-term viability, and develop appropriate mechanisms and solutions to reduce redundancy and risk across the institution. This charge includes both an upfront comprehensive effort and ongoing monitoring and management. I ask campus to be supportive in this endeavor.

13. Allocate space for Technology Centers at locations throughout campus to assist faculty, staff and students with IT issues.

    **Chancellor's Response:** I accept this recommendation as-is. This has been a well-received recommendation. Students, faculty, and staff need support with technology in different ways but all of them need to have that support easily accessible. Implementing this recommendation will require space, funding, and staff. I ask our IT division to pursue this recommendation and report back on needs and progress in the coming months.

14. Offer varying service level options to units for user support.

    **Chancellor's Response:** I reject this recommendation. While I understand and support the well-meaning intent to provide options to units that have invested their own funds in local IT support roles, at the expense of other priorities, I know from my own experience that IT will inevitably be called in to provide coverage when an individual is absent or overloaded or to solve problems beyond the capacity of a local unit to manage. I believe the plans to push support closer to distributed units, create SLAs, and retain embedded support roles offset the concerns of the units therefore these roles should also report to central IT. This will provide the lowest amount of risk for both the units and the institution.