AGENDA

> Call to Order
> Administrative Updates
> IT Governance Working Group Report Out
> Wrap up
Administrative Updates

Andreas Bohman
Vice President for UW-IT and CIO
IT Governance Working Group Report Out

Jim Phelps
Director, Enterprise Architecture and Strategy, UW-IT
IT Governance Working Group Report Out

1. Status of work so far - what the Working Group has accomplished (5 min)
2. Ideas for change from the Working Group (12 min)
   a. Triad 1 presentation
   b. Triad 2 presentation
   c. Triad 3 presentation
3. Overall feedback (8 min)
4. IT governance workstreams (5 min)
5. What happens next? (5 min)

Intended outcomes:
1. ITSB understands the direction the working group is taking so far
2. The working group has good directional feedback on how to approach each goal
3. Start the conversation (awareness) on approach for how changes could be carried out
Participants

Working Group Members

- Ann Nagel - Associate Vice Provost and University Privacy Officer
- Erin Guthrie - Assistant Vice Provost and University Data and Analysis Officer, OPB
- Helen Garrett - University Registrar, Enrollment Management
- Kristal Mauritz-Miller - Chief Administrative Officer, UW Medicine ITS
- Kristen Dietiker - Associate Vice Chancellor of IT and CIO, UW Bothell
- Mary Mulvihill - Interim AVP, UW-IT IT Infrastructure and Director, SMO, UW-IT
- Michael Visaya - AVP for Information Management, UW Advancement Services
- Mick Westrick - Director of IT, Foster School of Business
- Mike Middlebrooks - Director of IT, School of Medicine
- Nicky West - Director of Departmental Computing, iSchool
- Patrick Pow - Vice Chancellor for IT and CIO, UW Tacoma
- Thayer York - Director of Technology Services, School of Law
- Tiffany Quatmann - Director, UWFT FRP Readiness Program
- Xiaosong Li - Associate Vice Provost, Research Cyberinfrastructure

Support Team

- Jacob Morris - Interim AVP for Research Computing & Strategy, UW-IT
- Jim Phelps - Director of Enterprise Architecture & Strategy, UW-IT
- Piet Niederhausen - Enterprise Business Architect, UW-IT
- Rupert Berk - Enterprise Solutions Architect, UW-IT
- Taifa Harris - Sr. Program Leader, ProjectCorps
- Christine Dean - Program Operations Specialist, UW-IT
Design Process So Far

(1) **Ideate** on potential approaches in response to direction set by ITSB

(2) **Develop candidate** Goals, Strategies, Objectives, and Tactics

(3) **Contextualize** candidates within an overall maturity model

In order to: Implement changes through projects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Contributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enable governance groups to work effectively with each other and for UW units</td>
<td>First draft</td>
<td><strong>Triad 1</strong>: Tiffany Quatmann, Kristen Dietiker, Helen B Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide units to use existing solutions whenever feasible</td>
<td>First draft</td>
<td><strong>Triad 2</strong>: Mick Westrick, Thayer York, Nicky West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align strategic IT priorities among governance of IT, data, privacy, security, etc.</td>
<td>First draft</td>
<td><strong>Triad 3</strong>: Ann Nagel, Erin Guthrie, Michael Visaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable governance to create IT strategy for the UW mission</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Xiaosong Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning funding/investment</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Thayer York, Erin Guthrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing risk</td>
<td>Started</td>
<td>Ann Nagel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Maturity Model for IT Governance

**Decision Making**
- Ad Hoc
- Strategic Partnership

**Governance Operations**
- Ad Hoc
- Transparent & Efficient

**Resourcing**
- Ad Hoc
- Strategically Aligned
The UW has many groups for governance of IT related domains including data, privacy, security, etc. By increasing shared understanding of the scope and relationships of these groups we can effectively and transparently route issues, make decisions, communicate, and support UW units in using governance.

Ties back to: **4. Create transparency of scope, roles and responsibilities** and **5. Make governance groups easier to navigate and less cumbersome**

**Identify and acknowledge the UW’s various IT governance and related governance groups, in order to create a purposeful process by which all are clear on the scope of authority among these groups and in relation to IT service providers including UW-IT.**

**Identify the scope of and relationships among existing governance groups in order to make changes that increase efficiency and transparency in moving issues and decisions among groups.**

**Create resources that help UW units navigate governance and related organizations, in order to make governance effective for all parts of the UW.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>TACTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify and acknowledge the UW’s various IT governance and related governance groups, in order to create a purposeful process by which all are clear on the scope of authority among these groups and in relation to IT service providers including UW-IT. Identify the scope of and relationships among existing governance groups in order to make changes that increase efficiency and transparency in moving issues and decisions among groups. Create resources that help UW units navigate governance and related organizations, in order to make governance effective for all parts of the UW.</td>
<td><strong>●</strong> IT governance groups and related governance domains and organizations have shared understanding of their scopes, roles, relationships, and handoffs. <strong>●</strong> Executive decision making is clear across all IT and related governance groups. <strong>●</strong> UW units can navigate IT governance groups and related governance domains and organizations efficiently to get guidance and decisions. <strong>●</strong> UW units have awareness and understand potential impacts of changes and investments.</td>
<td>1. Review and (where needed) clarify the <strong>scope</strong>, <strong>relationships</strong>, and <strong>interdependencies</strong> of all relevant existing governance groups (starting with their charters). 2. Between all governance groups relevant to IT, agree on how best to intake, assess, route, and escalate <strong>issues</strong> and obtain the right <strong>decisions</strong> from the right groups for each issue. 3. Agree on the types of <strong>decisions</strong> intended to be made by governance, by an office/program/service, or by local units. 4. Work with governance groups and their members to improve sharing and cascading of <strong>information</strong> about agendas, issues, proposals, and decisions. 5. Identify roles and responsibilities of <strong>participants</strong> in all relevant governance groups. 6. Develop and consistently apply criteria for creating equitable <strong>representation</strong> by the right people in each governance group. 7. <strong>Help UW units navigate</strong> governance groups and related organizations and obtain consultation and advice, especially constituents who only occasionally interact with governance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good governance should reduce risk, IT staff time, and/or licensing costs by guiding units to use existing software or solutions whenever possible where either UW-IT or another unit has already implemented one. To that end, consider what others have done before…

Ties back to: **2. Governance should drive standardization in technology and practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>TACTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Set a $/# of users/privacy threshold where review is required. | • Avoid forcing units into selecting solutions that might not be the right fit for their needs | 1. Create **Communities of Practice** around new software/technologies (ex. Salesforce, Teams, SharePoint, others…)
| • Document review of currently deployed solutions and if doing something new, why? | • Define how services move from locally to centrally managed (and back again when needed) | 2. Provide **one location to refer to when making acquisition/project planning decisions**, to include information captured by the Software Registry, TrustArc, procurement processes, exception decisions, etc. Could we use Connect/Service Management as the single reference source?
| • Leave room for researchers to obtain tools right for them | • Document exceptions…why did you make a different choice. | 3. Develop a **quick-review process for collecting information on projects** in the ideation phase into the single reference source (tactic #2)
| | • Acknowledge that the tech needs of researchers are often different while documenting solutions in the same place | 4. Set up **incentives and guardrails to use shared services** when possible (such as central funding), so that it is easier for units to choose an existing/standard service
| | • Automate the flow of information where possible so that data doesn’t need to be entered in multiple locations | 5. Assign **specific ownership over acquisition documentation** process within local units

**Triad 2: Mick Westrick, Thayer York, Nicky West**
**Theme: Guide units to use existing solutions whenever feasible**
In addition to governance of IT resources, the UW has and will continue to need governance of data, privacy, and security. These domains need to align on strategic IT initiatives, as well as help UW units raise strategic priorities in the right forums.

Ties back to: **1. Ground IT investment decisions in UW strategic outcomes and common challenges**

**Strategic IT Priorities and Initiatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>TACTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Share the goals of each governance domain, in order to enable governance groups and related organizations across domains align on priorities for strategic IT initiatives (if/when applicable). Publish a shared institutional resource that provides guidance and information sharing in order to bring strategic IT priorities to the right governance groups and organizations. Focus on results and the path to achieving results for the whole UW. | • Priorities for strategic IT investments are transparent across related governance groups, particularly priorities for UW-IT.  
• Governance groups and related organizations have clear roles in partnering to comprehensively and efficiently achieve results across domains.  
• Governance groups have increased mutual trust, accountability, communication, and ability to make commitments and achieve results. | 1. **Share strategic IT priorities** and initiatives among these domains and align (if/when applicable) on current priorities and next steps.  
2. **Pool information** on what’s being asked of UW-IT (and possibly other IT providers) so there is transparent information about the opportunities for collaboration, the commitment to the strategic priority, the timeline, and measurements of success.  
3. Create a **decision tree/navigation map** to support colleagues in engaging governance groups to get support for their strategic IT priority/investment.  
4. Create guidance for colleagues on **when and how to engage an organization** that is essential to the success of the strategic goal/priority (e.g., when to raise an issue to an IT service team, the Privacy Office, the CISO, etc.). |
What seems most impactful:

What, if anything, do you see here that you would most support?

>(to be completed in session)
IT Governance Workstreams (March-September 2023)

**IT Governance 2.0**

- IT Strategy Board (including June, and August if needed)
- IT Service Investment Board (March and May)
- Service Management Board (monthly)
- IT Governance Working Group (approx. twice monthly)

**IT Governance Operations:** Recruiting & onboarding new team (with UW-IT EA team as interim)

**HR & Finance Workday Governance**

- Executive Sponsor Group (monthly, starting in April)
- HR & Finance Workday Applications Board (monthly)
- HR & Finance Workday Change Control (2-6x weekly)

**Potential Working Group Summer project(s)**
What we’ll learn from HR & Finance Workday Governance for Governance 2.0

> How to **support and coordinate** governance groups in an active domain, including staffing Governance Operations
  — Creating two new positions: **Governance Operations Specialist** and a **Governance Analyst** position to support both HR & Fin Domain Governance and IT Governance
> How to **track and prioritize** high urgency issues and projects in a complex domain
> How to **engage executives** in setting direction and strategy in a domain
> How to **define investment opportunities** for governance to pursue, in order to continue to maximize the value of Workday for the UW
> How to communicate with and engage business and IT **stakeholders across the whole UW** who are affected by HR & Finance governance decisions
> **Tools, templates, and analysis** that are most effective in governance
What happens next? Charging & Resourcing Change Efforts

**Workstream: HR & Finance Workday Governance**

- First meetings of new governance groups in April
- Staff IT Governance Operations positions
- Create governance processes, reports, and tools for the new groups

**Workstream: IT Governance Working Group**

- Complete additional themes on strategy, funding, and risk; prioritize among the themes
- Identify tactics that Working Group members would like to carry forward
- Working Group members should begin to socialize the vision through conversations with peers and in governance groups
- Once new Governance Operations staff are on board, engage them in some of this work
- Provide regular check ins to the IT Strategy Board and other Boards
- Prepare for an October in-person meeting with IT Governance and HR & Finance Workday Governance to capture lessons learned and how to apply them to IT Governance 2.0 (more to come)
QUESTIONS
QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION