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### ITS Policy, Standard, and Guideline Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Creation</th>
<th>Approval Steps</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policy (Examples: PIRG, password config., password reset, web privacy) | Plan of action to guide decisions and actions affecting IT and its customers. Specific parameters and consequences are established. Will likely reference established standards or guidelines. | Created by a work-group of interested parties. The customer and subject matter experts must be involved. | 1) Working Group*  
2) ITS Directors  
3) Executive or Leadership Sponsor  
4) IT Executive Steering Committee  
5) General Counsel  
6) University Coordinating Committee  
7) University Cabinet** | Published via luc.edu as approved by UMC. Training and awareness established in conjunction with affected departments and Human Resources where applicable. | The IT infrastructure covered by policies and its related standards will be properly supported by ITS, as agreed upon with the customer. | Metrics, monitoring and consequences of non-compliance are established. |
| Standard (Examples: Databases, O/S, equipment recommendation) | A specific model, parameters, limits, or criterion established to govern a specific product or its acquisition. | Created by a work-group of interested parties. Subject matter expertise must be represented. | 1) Working Group*  
2) Mgmt Sponsor  
3) ITS Directors  
4) VP ITS/QIO  
5) IT Executive Steering Committee**  
6) University Cabinet** | Published via luc.edu as approved by UMC, distributed via email, or rolled out via ITS management. Training and awareness recommended. | The IT infrastructure covered by standards will be properly supported by ITS, as agreed upon with the customer. | Metrics, monitoring and consequences of non-compliance are established. |
| Guideline (Examples: Cell provider, 3rd party software) | Plan of action to guide decisions and actions affecting an effort to create a level of uniformity. | Created by a work-group of interested parties. Subject matter expertise must be represented. | 1) Working Group*  
2) Mgmt Sponsor  
3) ITS Directors  
4) VP ITS/QIO | Published via luc.edu as approved by UMC, distributed via email, or rolled out via ITS management. Training and awareness recommended. | The IT infrastructure covered by guidelines will be supported by ITS, to the best of their ability. | No specific metrics or monitoring in place. |

*Third party review may be requested if desired.  
** As Required.
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Executive Summary

• It’s difficult to prioritize cross-functionally
• We need “parent/child” groupings for related projects…
  – To acknowledge dependencies
  – But they may have differing priorities
  – Task to PRB
• “Institutional impact” statements need improvement
• Despite first-pass challenges, we do have some clear priorities
  – Vetting process confirms that, for the most part, “A” projects have been correctly identified
High-level Priorities

1. Student System Upgrade
2. Credit Card Processing
3. LOCUS Enhancements
4. Construction projects
5. Security projects
6. “Housing/Scheduling” projects
Short-Term Project Delivery Goals

• “A” Projects (Highest Priority)
  – Due dates committed and actively tracked
  – Subject to periodic reviews by the ITESC

• “B” Projects (Medium Priority)
  – Due dates may be set but are soft

• “C” Projects (Low Priority)
  – Could be worked as time/resources available, but no commitments on delivery dates
Long-Term Prioritization Goals

• Begin T-shirt sizing projects
• Take next steps with resource capacity estimates
• Require “Institutional impact” statements; quantify where possible
• Ongoing review of “new/unplanned” projects
• Capture adjustments to the process
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ITS Projects by Priority

FY08 Q1-Q2 Projects by Priority

- U-Unplanned, 12, 8%
- M-Must Do, 14, 10%
- C-Low, 31, 22%
- B-Medium, 41, 29%
- A-High, 45, 31%

Data as of 08/17/2007
FY08 Q1-Q2 Projects by Strategic Alignment

- Continuous Service Development, 26, 18%
- Academic & Faculty Support, 40, 29%
- Infrastructure, 25, 17%
- Administrative Initiatives, 36, 25%
- Student Technology Support, 16, 11%

143 Projects

Data as of 08/17/2007
Qualifying Characteristics

1. Enhances Learning/Supports Teaching & Research Initiatives
2. Advances Student’s Positive Experience at LUC/Increases Retention
3. Improves Service
4. Improves Efficiency or Effectiveness
5. Reduces Risk of Failure/Improves Security
6. Has Strong Sponsorship (Owner Commitment & Funding)
7. Client Community is Ready to Use
8. Technology Complies with LUC Standards and Integrates Well
9. Project is Clearly Defined and Benefits are Measurable
## ITS Capacity Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATC</th>
<th>INF</th>
<th>SIC</th>
<th>PAQS</th>
<th>CIO Office</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HC-Full Time</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HC-Part Time</strong></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hours</strong></td>
<td>36,348</td>
<td>49,998</td>
<td>59,534</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>165,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff %</strong></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Hours</strong></td>
<td>10,018</td>
<td>10,095</td>
<td>13,330</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>38,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support %</strong></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Hours</strong></td>
<td>21,627</td>
<td>29,809</td>
<td>22,158</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>4,583</td>
<td>80,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project %</strong></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Hours</strong></td>
<td>4,703</td>
<td>10,095</td>
<td>24,046</td>
<td>6,780</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>46,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAFF** = Vacation, Sick, Management of Staff, Staff Meetings, Training, Conferences etc.

**SUPPORT** = Operational/Ongoing Work and Services, Maintenance, Troubleshooting, Bug Fixing

**PROJECT** = Targeted effort with fixed scope and time

Data as of 08/17/2007
## ITS Budget Benchmarking

*Budget reflected in millions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUC BUDGET</strong></td>
<td>$154.8</td>
<td>$144.5</td>
<td>$142.2</td>
<td>$163.8</td>
<td>$208.0</td>
<td>$249.7</td>
<td>$297.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITS BUDGET</strong></td>
<td>$10.3</td>
<td>$9.9</td>
<td>$7.3</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
<td>$10.3</td>
<td>$11.5</td>
<td>$12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITS as % of LUC</strong></td>
<td>6.65%</td>
<td>6.83%</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>4.94%</td>
<td>4.62%</td>
<td>4.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ITS % of total LUC Budget

![Graph showing ITS % of total LUC Budget from 2002 to 2008](chart.png)
## Range of Centralized IT Budgets as a Percentage of Institution Operating Budget (E&G)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Typical Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research/Doctoral</td>
<td>3%-6.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>4%-7.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>4%-7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>5%-7.5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Meeting Agenda

• Student System Project Review
  – Clare Korinek and Kevin Smith

• Review and Discuss Combined Prioritization Results