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Driver of Change 1:
The Division of IT’s Engagement Model
Over the past couple of years we began to change the way we engage with our customers and within the Division of IT.
Drivers of Change 2: The University and Division’s Strategic Plans
The educational, research, and service goals of this strategic plan engage four broad themes that reflect our vision of the future as well as the current strengths of the university.

**THEME I**
- Innovation through Cross-disciplinary Collaboration

**THEME II**
- Globalization

**THEME III**
- Governance & Policy

**THEME IV**
- Citizenship & Leadership
The Division of IT leadership team of directors and managers worked to create an updated strategic plan that is aligned to the university’s 2021 strategic plan and builds on the Division’s past accomplishments.

The 2021 Division of IT strategic plan will be used for priority and goal setting to ensure alignment with the university. The plan will be regularly revisited, assessed and adapted as IT trends and the university’s needs evolve.
2021 Division of IT Strategic Planning Process and Prioritization Model

**Mike**

**Vision**

**Mission**

**Themes**
1. Communicate and Anticipate
2. Meaningful Services, Value that Matters
3. Prepare, Protect and Mobilize Data

**Focus**
- Optimize Structure
- Enhance Processes
- Prioritize

**Strategic Themes and Actions**

**Communicate and Anticipate**
- Engage stakeholders to become a trusted strategic advisor
- Collaborate and align with university priorities
- Better manage demand for capability and capacity
- Become more transparent
- Work with partners to move forward together

**Meaningful Services, Value that Matters**
- Evaluate and streamline product mix and cost models
- Maximize the value and capabilities that the GW community receives from the Division of IT

**Prepare, Protect and Mobilize Data**
- Take steps to advance the way the Division of IT handles and presents data
- Invest to keep up with the university and market demands
Drivers of Change 3: Budget Constraints
Financial Challenges are impacting us all

- Falling Graduate Enrollment
- Rising Costs

2014 EAB report cites: “Facing increasingly tighter budgets, universities are exploring any and all principled methods to control costs.”
These three drivers led to a time of opportunity to put governance in place at GW!
The Tactical Approach: Our Intake Process
Intake Process: Demand & Resource Management Overview

**Process**

**Align Enterprise**
With Architecture, Technical Capability, Customer Portfolios, Roadmaps, Services

**Prioritize**
With Customers, Roadmap Owners, Councils, Committees (Only pre-flight resources applied if needed, no updates provided to EGRB until in prioritized position)

**Align Resources**
With colleagues across the Division (Resource Lab)

**Commit Resources**
With Executive team approval of prioritized, funded, resourced effort

**Collaboration**

**BAAS:**
- Collaborate with relevant Technical Experts for input, agree alignment
- Provide heads up to Security
- Acknowledges Receipt to Customer & provide contact
- Provide Awareness to the Executive Gate Review Board EGRB

**Demand Owners collaborate with:**
- Customer to prioritize Portfolio of requests
- Roadmap owner to prioritize
- Council to Prioritize

**Demand & Resource Owners collaborate with each other to align resource needs & timing**

Resource Managers should prepare by having their teams complete the Lightweight Resource Estimation spreadsheet to revise their forecast and know available bandwidth.

Demand Owner bring prioritized resource requests

**Demand Owners:**
- Overview the Request, concerns/issues, next steps or any unresolved resource constraints
- Executive GRB
- Provides approval to proceed
- Provides prioritization to resolve resource constraint
- Provide any additional guidance

**Information Builds for Artifacts**

- Business Need
- Business Impact
- Complexity
- Value
- Funding
- Key Dates or Timing Considerations
- Additional Notes / Attachments
- Technical Capability
- Demand Owner Assignment

Add information as discovered:
- Description of proposed solution
- Concerns/Issues
- Estimate pre-flight or in-flight required roles/resources depending on maturity of effort

Add agreements reached for estimates roles/resources and timing to the Resource Lab Form needed for EGRB presentation.

Once approved, committed and additional pre-flight resources will contribute to complete proposal or mature effort will advance to project.

*Note: No date commitments are made to the Customer until resources are aligned and Exec Team approves*

*Note: Utilize Lightweight Resource Estimation Worksheet (Appendix)*
Moving from project to portfolio to enterprise architecture -
Introduction of the **On-demand Technical Review Board (TRB)**

Taking the Enterprise View allows us to:

- Provide awareness of common solutions across Division of IT and our Customers
- Promote re-usability
- Deliver Faster
- Lower Cost
- Deepen expertise in a smaller number of tools

With the perspective of reusable technical capability across the enterprise
We devised a way to focus and provide perspective.

---

Why these Portfolios:
1. Engage with major demand sources to strategically plan and prioritize.
2. Collaborate with subject matter experts across functional silos by design.
3. Recognize there is demand on limited resources coming from Research, Academics, Administration and a rapidly changing technology-based world.

---

Align Resources

Focus & Commit Resources on Prioritized, Resource-Aligned Efforts

Improved pace & quality of higher priority deliverables
**Introduction of the Resource Lab**

- We previously utilized resource management functionality in our PPM tool
- Resources weren’t being requested or fulfilled
- Decision to move to a more manual process
- Led to good conversation and collaboration, one meeting mid-month
- Demand Owners bring their requests to the lab for fulfillment
- Resource Manager should bring their revised bandwidth estimate
- Conversations can take place outside of the lab

### Lightweight Resource Estimation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-flight:</th>
<th>In-flight:</th>
<th>Operations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Research/Consult Innovate/Analysis</td>
<td>Ideas/Proposals Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Groups 10% Compliant Env. 25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Path to Improvement – Metrics
We appear to be trending in the right direction

Technical Review Board Metrics

8 Months of Process in Practice

40 Ideas Reviewed

7 Ideas to Proposals

3 Ideas for Further Review

10 Ideas Waiting for Prioritization

17 Ideas Prioritized

3 Ideas Cancelled
The Strategic Approach: Planning, Prioritization and Engagement with our Customers
Engaging our Customers Through Portfolio Meetings

• Check-point on current efforts
  • Summary of all customer requests by phase
  • Review of recent closed initiatives
• Provide an avenue for feedback, discussion, communication and relationship building
• Collaborate on business priorities and how technology can support and align
• Set priorities for the portfolio area
• Provide input into where resources should be expended
• Partner on goal setting/strategic initiatives that involve IT
• Serve as a funnel to the Information Technology Initiatives Committee (ITIC)

Customer Portfolio Meetings in Progress

• Compliance and Privacy Office
• Dean of Students
• Development and Alumni Relations
• Division of Operations
• Enrollment Management
• External Relations
• Gelman Library
• Human Resources
• Office of Safety and Security
• OVPR
• School of Public Health
Engaging our Customers through Governance – The Information Technology Initiatives Committee (ITIC)

- Represent key areas across the University
- Bring forward requests for prioritization
- Focus on forward planning and prioritization for initiatives requiring investments in technology, rely on IT resources, or impact how technology supports current operations
- Review and propose a comprehensive, prioritized IT portfolio
- Provide input into development of an IT Governance model
## Our Prioritization Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Impact/Risk:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some faculty/staff/students, saves $/time</td>
<td>weight = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many faculty/staff/students, saves $$/time</td>
<td>weight = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All faculty/staff/students, saves $$$/time</td>
<td>weight = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal risk to the university if project is not done</td>
<td>weight = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium risk to the university if project is not done</td>
<td>weight = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major risk to the university if project is not done</td>
<td>weight = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complexity:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant exploration/change management/change in technical approach</td>
<td>weight = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves process/system impacting more than one group</td>
<td>weight = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves change within a process/system/group</td>
<td>weight = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No funding available</td>
<td>weight = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding currently available/funding not needed</td>
<td>weight = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Readiness:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/process/owner yet to be identified</td>
<td>weight = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role clarity needed, adjustment to a policy/process required</td>
<td>weight = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has strong leadership/policies/process/support</td>
<td>weight = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value Alignment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operationally aligned</td>
<td>weight = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategically Aligned</td>
<td>weight = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance/Regulatory</td>
<td>weight = 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aligning with the University Calendar

- **July/August/September**: Individual goal setting and prior fiscal year Budget Review
- **October/November**: Budget Call/Budget Planning/Update roadmaps
- **December**: Prioritization exercises; Conduct review of current year’s planned vs. actual spend
- **January**: Five Year Budget plans submitted
- **March/April**: Departments work on goal cascades
- **April/May**: Goal cascades presented; finalize divisional goals
- **June/July**: Closeout of current fiscal year budget

*We are here*
All of this Leads to . . . GW’s Shared Governance Model
## Current vs. Future State Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current State</th>
<th>Future State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance committee (ITIC) comprised of individuals at varying levels in the organization who don’t necessarily have the authority to prioritize efforts</td>
<td>Governance committee consists of university senior leadership who can provide strategic direction on what should be prioritized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance committee (ITIC) does not have full university representation</td>
<td>Evolve governance committee to have representation from all areas (including academic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization of current and next year efforts</td>
<td>Forward looking prioritization (3-5 years in the future)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance discussions and prioritization activities not necessarily aligned with the University cycle</td>
<td>Continue evolving to align with the university planning calendar – align prioritization efforts with specific timelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“In progress” prioritization criteria</td>
<td>Define prioritization criteria that can be utilized university-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization efforts center around initiatives with cost only</td>
<td>Prioritize initiatives based on cost and internal resource needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Takeaways

• Keep it Simple – For Intake we are down to 4 steps and still working for everyone to be able to say it.

• Provide for variability – Provide bumpers, a.k.a Providing for situational adaptation

• Start slow – you cannot force governance. . . Organizational readiness plays a huge role!

• Leverage your times of opportunity!
Help Us Improve and Grow

Thank you for participating in today’s session. We are happy to share any templates and tools that you may find useful. Contact Christina Griffin (cgriffin@gwu.edu) or Leslie Margolis (margolislj@gwu.edu)

We’re very interested in your feedback. Please take a minute to fill out the session evaluation found within the conference mobile app, or the online agenda.