Agenda – January 27, 2010

Present: Amy Buse, Rick Christner, Cheryl Cluchey, Denise Grinnell, Mary Kay MacIver, Eric Menold, Leah Monger, Jennifer Thede, John Urbanick, Melanie Mulder, Kristin Salomonson

Absent: Dan Burcham, Don Flickinger Deb Yost

Eric Menold is the interim director of technology taking over for Robin Getz at Kendall.

Review Process and Stage Gates

- John provided handouts about the new PPM process
- Denise explained the first process form, the Project Initiation Form
- Technical Review Team Stage Gate form is the second step after the request for a project is made. It will ferret out how much effort will be needed, who will be affected, etc. The ranking questions will be asked in the technical review. The customer will be contacted and the project will be discussed. The form has spaces for labor costs, impacts on other units, etc. It is a lot of work upfront but will hopefully make for well-thought-out decisions.
- The FACT/PAC/FAB form was shared.
- College/Department form was shared.
- After something is approved, it moves onto the next "gate"
- Suggestion was made to have a "cool IT things available to campus" page on the IT website so people would know that a solution that they might be looking for already exists. This would allow departments to pre-filter before it comes to IT which that would be great
- Concern about length of approval time, but IT feels that time spent beforehand will deliver a better product
- Hope to move from pilot to production this semester

Informed Decision on Project Prioritization?

- Potential Future Projects: DAKCS collection software, Housing software, Physical Plant server
- Is the information that IT can provide on a project enough for the committee to feel comfortable approving and disapproving? It is a good start and seems complete but we will see as things happen.

Pilot Projects in the System

- Denise showed a current project, adding 3 FerrisConnect servers to our cluster, and how that works in PPM. It shows time allocated per person for the project
- Going to finish pilot projects before launch date

Successes, Changes, & Cross Roads

- John shared success of the ASC:
    - Completed a new charge that encompassed more than Banner; this was shared with the group
    - Project Definition completed. Defining the criteria for a project was difficult and some may still argue the criteria, but it's helping
    - Ranking questions: The ASC really helped with these, and they will be tested
    - Project Request Process: this is complete
- Changes:
    - New leadership at VP level
    - Project normalization internally within IT. Seeing a reduction in the # of projects.
    - Improved organization within IT
    - Fewer new project requests
    - Gained efficiencies
- Crossroads
    - Is IT doing a good enough job prioritizing projects that the ASC input is not as needed?
    - Is it a non-issue to set priorities with various changes that have happened?
    - Can we move this group into being decision makers?
        - Mary Kay said we've spent a lot of time providing the input to IT; now it's time to start prioritizing
        - Ready and still necessary
        - A process that requires putting time in means that people are thinking through requests better
        - Time to test drive the system!
        - John said we need to give some thought to how we run the ASC meetings in the future. If we don't have projects or processes to approve, or is there a little more work and coordination to do.
        - What type of priority mechanism do we use: high, medium, low, emergency, mandated??? We will discuss that next meeting.
        - Electronic feedback on projects to avoid delays in decision making. (long term potential goal)

Adjournment