Information Technology Steering Committee

Information Technology Strategic Direction 2014
Information Technology Steering Committee

IT Strategic Direction development initiated by the newly formed IT Steering Committee:

**Mandate:** The Information Technology Steering Committee will develop, update, communicate and oversee the implementation of the strategic vision and objectives for the University’s information and communications technology.

**Method:** The committee will accomplish its mandate through inclusive and consultative processes that it shall design, implement and maintain - in form of appropriate sub-committees and working groups.

**Membership:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Dr. Allan Conway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Mr. Bala Kathiresan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Dr. Alan Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Ms. Gwen Ebbett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Ms. Sandra Aversa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Dr. Michael Siu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Dr. Ziad Kobti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process followed in developing the Information Technology Strategic Directions

Engaged the Services of KPMG Consultant
– Mr. Roger Bryan

Group Meetings:
• Associate Deans’ Council
• IT Advisory Committee
• Focused Group Meeting
• IT Leadership Team
• Gartner & IBM Education Session

• Review of prior IT Strategic Planning Reports
Case for Change

• What did we hear from the Consultations?
• Status of our current systems
• Where is the industry heading?
The case for change

Consultation process what we heard...

• Technology is an institutional resource and not individual department resource
• We are in a competitive landscape and we have to adapt; IT can be a game changer
• Current model of IT delivery is not financially sustainable and is putting at risk the University’s ability to deliver its academic mission
• Current status of our core systems is a risk to our institution
• Developing software is not our core business
• Our systems must interoperate well, be reviewed systematically, replaced as needed, and planned to meet future needs in a reasonable timeframe in order to maintain a competitive advantage
• We have to work within the new fiscal realities and still be competitive
• The University needs to become more nimble in its approach to change and invest where needed to improve efficiency
Case for Change
Current Critical System Assessment

Major Systems

- **Student Information System:** Rewrite from Forte to Java, at current pace, will take about 15 person years to provide existing functionalities.

- **Financial Information System:** Becomes unsupported as of December 31, 2013. Our existing version is several releases behind and would take approximately $1.7 Million to get current, requiring continued use of manual interfaces to key systems.

- **Learning Management System:** Nearing end-of-life and can’t be interfaced to new Library System.

Major Risks

- **No redundancy in the campus network** or in many mission critical systems.

- **Dependency on specific people** to carry out core system development, maintenance and support.

- **Lack of redundant power supply** to central server and network main distribution centre.

- **Lack of physical security and privacy controls**.

- **Lack of segregation of duties** between development and production systems.

- **Storage Area Network nearing end-of-life**.

- **System backup within campus and not off-site**.

- **Total cost of ownership not documented and approved prior to acquiring and implementing technology**.

- **Lack of well defined project management structure and projects prioritization process**.

University of Windsor
The Case For Change Industry Perspective - Gartner Group

• Technology is driving disruption. There will be;
  – a proliferation of new higher education business models
  – A dismantling of the traditional integrated education business model (an institution does it all)
• Most institutions are pursuing digitization; the education ecosystem is wide open for an increasing number of competitors;
  – Georgia Tech and Udacity’s Master of Science in Computer Science massive online course (MOC) offered at $7,000 compared to traditional on campus for $40,000.
  – Knewton’s adaptive learning enabling digitalized pedagogical models such as personalized learning
• Institutions must be able to implement considerably higher levels of interoperability
• IT needs to develop the flexibility and ability to increase speed of change
• Institutions must improve their ability to make choices quickly and correctly.
Leading Practices and Significant Trends
Information Technology Strategic Priorities

To effectively support University's Strategic Priorities

IT Strategic Priorities must:

• Make it easier for students to use technology to connect with us, to learn about us, and to come to us
• Enable us to manage the entire student life cycle: from attraction, recruitment, enrollment, and retention to alumni development
• Deliver innovative approaches to personalized learning systems
• Implement an integrated Decision Support System
• Be accessible 7/24
• Provide Faculty and staff access to use technological tools anytime/anywhere
This requires a shift in the Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Current State</th>
<th>To Future State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legacy system requiring interfaces and reliance on a key individual</td>
<td><strong>Fully integrated and vendor supported enterprise solutions</strong> enabling workflow and process optimization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental approach to decision making and onerous committee structure lacking accountability</td>
<td><strong>Institutional approach to decision making</strong> with stakeholders input and representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standalone solutions and applications – Island of technology and technology expertise</td>
<td><strong>Collaborative and centrally coordinated approach</strong> to implementation of solutions based on client’s needs and achieving institutional standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of redundancy and disaster recovery capabilities</td>
<td><strong>Improved reliability and survivability</strong> with a view to achieving comprehensive business continuity and disaster recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of project and change management focus for implementing technology</td>
<td><strong>Efficient business processes and change management</strong> supported by applications and technology solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmented and insufficient data to support analytics and decision-making</td>
<td><strong>Comprehensive data to enable real-time analytics and decision-making</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


IT Investment Decision-Making Criteria

Ask of each proposed IT Investment project:

- How does it contribute to University’s strategic priorities?
- In what way does it build on the campus-wide IT strategy?
- How does the initiative integrate with other key systems?
- How does it enhance organizational efficiency and effectiveness?
- How does the initiative mitigate current and future risks?
- How does it enhance campus-wide decision-making?
Information Technology
Mission and Vision

**Mission**
Information Technology’s reason for being is to ensure that the systems, applications, and processes serve the University’s Mission and are designed, implemented and operated efficiently and effectively.

**Vision**
Pursuing excellence in Information Technology in support of University’s Mission and Vision.
Near-term Information Technology Action Plan

January - April 2014

- Form a Enterprise Resource Planning System Selection Committee with a mandate to select a multi-year integrated vendor developed enterprise system
- Develop a robust Infrastructure Renewal Plan
- Create Capacity to implement “opportunistic” projects
- Define, develop and socialize centrally coordinated model of Information Technology Services delivery
- Implement the new Institution-wide IT Governance Structure
- Review to identify opportunities for optimization of institution-wide IT

May 2014 - April 2015

- Complete the ERP Selection Process and form appropriate implementation committees
- Develop the implementation plan and commence the implementation of the Financial Information System.
- Implement a vendor developed Learning Management System
- Implement components of the Infrastructure Renewal Plan

May 2015 - April 2016

- Review the model of Information Technology Services delivery
- Commence implementation of integrated vendor developed student CRM
- Continue the implementation of Infrastructure Renewal Plan
- Conduct a post implementation review of the operational applications
Moving forward we will…

- Stop in-house development of core systems – only break-fixes, mandatory/senate directed changes to be undertaken. Any other enhancements will be approved on a business case approach with pay-back achieved within useful life of the product.
- Objectively examination of how we must deliver technology services
- Follow the IT governance structure and accountability framework
- Form and effectively utilizing internal and external strategic partnerships
IT Governance Structure

- President
  - Provost/ Vice President Academic
    - Deans’ Council
    - Planning & Administration Executive Committee
  - IT Steering Committee
    - Executive Director, Information Technology Services
      - Co-Chairs
        - Finance – 2
        - Registrar’s Office – 2
        - Student Relations – 1
        - IT – 1
        - Purchasing – 1
      - Implementation Committee
        - Security Working Group
        - Disaster Recovery Working Group
        - Application Specific WG
      - Technology/Infrastructure Projects
      - Policy Development and Recommendation Services Catalogue and Service Level Agreements
        - Information Technology Advisory