

# Criteria

## 1. Strategic Alignment

- Supports specific articulated goals of the highest level executive team
- Enables faculty recruitment/retention
- Enables student recruitment/retention

## 2. Technical Alignment

- Supports current technical direction
- Integration with other applications
- Reusability

## 3. Mandates

- Federal and state requirements
- University contractual obligations
- Technical imperatives such as vendor updates

## 4. Implementation success factors

- Scope of project (size and clarity of requirements)
- Feasibility – staffing and funding availability in IT
- Feasibility – staffing and funding availability in business area
- Requestor experience with IT projects
- Proven versus emerging technology
- Lack of defined maintenance plan (helpdesk, user training, ongoing support)

## 5. Operational success factors

- Readiness for change
- Active ongoing project sponsorship
- Complexity of reengineered business processes
- Lack of clearly defined deliverables
- Not getting planned benefits from investment
- Impact on ongoing support systems (shadow systems)

## 6. Value Factors

- Competitive Advantage: student success, academic reputation
- Service to the Community: improved customer service for faculty, students and staff; enterprise-wide impact; number of people impacted
- Decision Support: expanded number of decisions makers; data integrity
- Efficiency and Productivity: reengineered process; project life expectancy; enhances on existing systems, reduces/eliminates redundancy; cost reduction

# Process

## Principles

- Process needs to be endorsed by executive team and consistently applied
- Process needs to be transparent as to how decisions are made
- Process needs to be accessible to whole community (online form and instructions)
- Establish clearly defined timelines, deadlines and communications strategy
- Any request other than production support or ongoing maintenance goes through the process

## Project Review

- Submission of online request form to ACS
- Preliminary assessment of impact by requestor/ACS
- Functional sub committees review requests for clarity, completeness, potential interdependencies and determines whether it will go to full committee at this time (key cycles, packaging with like requests, etc.)
- ACS/requestor do an in-depth impact analysis including staffing required from business area and IT
- Presented to full committee for scoring

## Monitoring of Progress

- At quarterly meetings, business process owners/ACS will provide written update of progress for review and action if necessary. Committee will be asked to address any significant success factor challenges that have occurred.

## Evaluation/Assessment of Results

- At the end of each project, committee will assess how well project has met the operational success factors and value factors.

## Obstacles

- Marketing of and buy-in for the process
- Definition of what is administrative computing (academic/admin boundaries aren't clear)
- Scope of committee responsibility
- Relationships between projects chosen and infrastructure to support them (lack of infrastructure)
- Perceived lack of context or alignment for a project
- Campus politics (e.g. what should be a university-wide application vs. what is not in the priority setting)
- Campus benefits vs. University-wide benefits may not be well-defined or may be ignored
- Lack of leadership/vision to support some university-wide initiatives
- Lack of understanding of what is achievable
- Track record of execution
- Project scope creep
- Stove-pipe mentality
- Lack of leadership or sponsorship for a project
- Adequate funding
- Unwieldy processes that challenge automating
- Proliferation of shadow systems
- Poor communications (User/IT)
- Coordination of central vs. local resources
- Ability of sponsors to adequately define project requirements
- Need for business process re-engineering
- History of institution
- Reducing current maintenance requirements
- Data ownership