Process

Baker Tilly Risk Assessment
- Initiated by Internal Audit; Will inform 3-year audit plan

Moran Technology Consulting Strategic Plan
- Engaged a steering committee that provided oversight during the process
- Solicited project ideas from throughout campus

Established 3 Work Groups to Inform Steering Committee
- Tech Investments
- Leveraging Resources
- Governance
Where We Are . . .
Themes
Since Oregon’s current model for delivering IT services to the institution is decentralized, we have noted three IT risk themes that transcend IT units and could affect many of the IT risk areas identified. While these themes are not risks, leadership should keep these factors in mind as they address the identified risk areas with new and updated risk management practices.

Theme #1: Distribution of IT Services and Collaboration of IT Units
IT services are delivered to faculty, staff, students, and other University community members by all 27 IT units. While not all IT units provide the same types or levels of services, many of the services are duplicated across IT units (e.g., end user support, application development).

To show the distribution of IT services across units, we have documented in the figure at right the services provided by each IT unit.

In addition to the distribution of IT services across the IT units at Oregon, there are numerous instances of IT units collaborating to provide services to other functional areas of the University, some of which have a dedicated IT unit and others that do not.

As such, IT risks and challenges in one IT unit can affect many of the other IT units due to the level and complexity of the collaboration between IT units.
As an example of the distribution of IT services and collaboration of IT units, we have documented in the figure at right the various data center facilities (e.g., distinct physical spaces housing servers) that exist across the institution. IT units such as Information Services, College of Education, College of Arts and Sciences, Advancement, UO Police, and Student Life all provide data center services, such as housing systems of others, to functional areas outside of their own functional areas.
Theme #2: Optimization of IT Resources

As a result of the decentralized model of IT services, which has grown organically over time, both personnel and budget dollars are dispersed across campus in the 27 IT units and are likely not optimized in terms of efficient use of resources.

As such, this current structure could make it difficult to optimize people and budget resources across the University in order to address risks and support strategic initiatives.

To show the level of decentralization of people resources currently deployed, we have documented in the figure at right the self-reported current full time equivalent (FTE) positions, both staffed and open, in each IT unit.
To show the size of IT budgets across the institution, we have documented in the figure at right the self-reported fiscal year 2016 IT unit budgets (including costs such as salary, hardware, software, and services).
IT Risks

Oregon faces many IT threats as a higher education institution managing multiple networks and systems, and providing IT services to thousands of faculty, staff, students, and other constituents. The risk map below depicts the specific risk areas for Oregon prioritized by the potential impact and likelihood. The placement of the risks on the risk map was based on criteria tailored to Oregon for potential impact and likelihood. The rating of risks was based on judgment, and the criteria were purposely not weighted equally or applied uniformly across the risk areas. Impact was based on reputational, financial, operational, and compliance factors, while likelihood was based on potential timing of occurrence in the short, medium, or long timeframe. The descriptions of each area are listed on the following pages. It is important to note that these areas do not necessarily represent problems, but are risks inherent to Oregon’s operations and the environment in which it operates.
Key Takeaways from Moran

• The highly decentralized nature of technology funding and decision-making prevents most campus-wide efforts to improve basic technology services. For example:
  o UO relies on a ‘pass the hat’ approach for funding institution-wide services due to lack of central funding.
  o Deploying any cross-University strategy is virtually impossible since any department can refuse to participate – even when the objectives are important to UO overall.

• Campus IT infrastructure has been underfunded for years and now requires a large infusion of capital in the short term to remove the risk of major failure and to bring it to an acceptable level for a premier research university.

• Decision making is often a problem - decisions are often made at the wrong levels for IT purposes and a need for consensus stymies the ability to react to common opportunities and challenges. Colleges are sometimes making IT decisions that should be made at the University level.
  o For example, there are at least 3 different email systems on campus. While this is an improvement from the 10 systems that used to exist, this leads to inefficiencies in spending and support and creates difficulties in communicating across the campus.
  o The decentralized model has created an environment of “haves” and “have-nots.”
  o The lack of a good IT governance model has allowed inefficient decision-making.
Key Takeaways from Moran

• Cross-campus communications requires improvement across the university.
  o UO has no commitment to using a common calendaring system, resulting in scheduling complications in setting up meetings and other campus-wide commitments.

• Technology purchasing is not centralized, making it difficult to take advantage of enterprise discounts and other institutional efficiencies.

• Administrative processes are in need of redesign, changing from paper intensive to more automated processes.
  o Banner is heavily customized and many new features are not being utilized.

• IT Policies are virtually non-existent but attempts are being made to establish a number of critical processes, such as an “acceptable use policy.”
  o The absence of IT policy has created a culture that allows users to do almost anything they want to do, without consequence.

• UO doesn't have a good data governance strategy, so data owners often prevent data usage by managers who have legitimate business needs.
Where We Want To Be . . .
Attract and retain high quality, diverse faculty and staff

Elevate research, scholarship and creative profile including expanding graduate education

Enhance physical and IT infrastructure to ensure academic excellence

Attract high quality, diverse students and promote student access, retention, and success

Pursue resource efficiencies to effectively fund high priority needs
How We Get There . . .
Information Technology Vision

UO will strive to create a collaborative and secure IT environment that attracts and retains the best students, faculty and staff by providing a common foundation of anytime/anywhere technology access for all UO ‘citizens’ and that focuses on strategically funding targeted technology capabilities to support its learning and research goals.

To achieve this vision, the University of Oregon must:

• Ensure that a collaborative IT Governance Model is deployed that continually focuses on prioritizing, funding and driving community-valued IT services
• Recognize that having a secure and robust underlying technology infrastructure is critical to providing all other technology services
• Identify cross-campus core IT services that are more cost effectively provided in a centralized approach and use the potential savings to fund strategically targeted projects
• Mobilize collaborative cross-campus constituencies to identify and address common goals
• Streamline our administrative processes and systems to provide more seamless and automated service to all campus stakeholders
• Have consistent and strong executive support to ensure that the IT Strategic Plan is supported and fully funded over the long-term
• Excite students and faculty to leverage technology to improve learning and research outcomes
  • Stop using “the Oregon Way” as an excuse for not moving forward
Progress To Date . . .
# Strategic Planning Team

**Steering Committee:** Jamie Moffitt, Brad Shelton, Jim Brooks, Patrick Chinn, Bill Cresko, Guy Eckelberger, Randy Kamphaus, Adriene Lim, Andrew Marcus, Brook Muller, Kevin Williams, Melissa Woo

## Work Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Group</th>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Propose investments for approval by the President &amp; Provost ($2.75M-$4M)</td>
<td>Chair: Kevin Williams, Melissa Woo, Jamie Moffitt, Helen Chu, Brad Shelton, Steve Menken, Doug Blandy, Jim Bouse, Mike Pluth, Darren Johnson, Fred Sabb, Will Laney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging</td>
<td>Make recommendations for consolidation &amp; integration of functions/services</td>
<td>Chair: Melanie Muenzer, Melissa Woo, Adriene Lim, Jim Brooks, Hal Sadofsky, Guy Eckelberger, Sherri Nelson, Rocco Luiere, Dave Landrum, Fred Sabb, Chris Krabiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Governance</td>
<td>Develop an IT governance model that will select, prioritize, and provide oversight on major technology investments &amp; policies</td>
<td>Chair: Melissa Woo, Melanie Muenzer, Will Laney, Steve Robinson, Scott Pratt, Patrick Chinn, Andrew Bonamici, Garron Hale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Investments Work Group

Proposal

Investment Request:

• Focuses on infrastructure*
• Recommends basic security measures
• Includes several first steps on consolidation/coordination

*A key next step in our planning process is to thoroughly assess the state of our entire IT infrastructure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>IT Infrastructure: Core Network Switches</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>IT Infrastructure: Zone-Based Building Infrastructure</td>
<td>$202,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAG - 1</td>
<td>IT Infrastructure: Break/Fix</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
<td>$548,000</td>
<td>$836,000</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
<td>$811,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>IT Infrastructure: Classroom Technology</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>IT Infrastructure: Cloud Email/Calendaring</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>IT Security: Security Information/event Management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>IT Security: Two-Factor Authentication</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>IT Security: Awareness Training</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Strategic Investment: ITSM Product</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$161,250</td>
<td>$173,344</td>
<td>$186,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Strategic Investment: CDN</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Strategic Investment: Web services and data integration</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Strategic Investment: Banner ERP Functional Evaluation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAG - 2</td>
<td>Strategic Investment: Enterprise Workflow</td>
<td>$590,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$271,000</td>
<td>$271,000</td>
<td>$271,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAG - 3</td>
<td>Strategic Investment: University Business Continuity Assessment</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,000,344</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,999,345</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leveraging Resources Work Group

Proposal

Important to consolidate functions that:

- Are strategic priorities for UO
- Will result in opportunities for scale economies
- Will result in a more efficient use of resources
- Cut across multiple units and do not require specialized knowledge of a unit
- Will result in faculty/staff/students receiving new or improved services/products
- When consolidated improve operations and mitigate risks
Leveraging Resources Work Group

Proposal

Long Term:

• Run coordinated assessment process

Short Term:

• Proposal to focus on 5 areas for consolidation/coordination
Ongoing Assessment Process:

- Establish (to the best of our current knowledge) an inventory of all existing units/functions that need to be assessed.

- Establish a work group that:
  - Prioritizes the review of the units/functions
  - Creates the rubric by which each unit/function is assessed (based on the established guiding principles)
  - Sets the timeline for staged completion (what work can be done to inform next year’s BAG?)
  - Carries out the assessment process
Leveraging Resources Work Group

Proposal

Short Term

Goal: Identify areas that (1) address risks identified by Baker Tilly, (2) could result in fairly rapid cost efficiencies, (3) have an identified path forward, or (4) are likely to be supported by campus.

Five areas have been identified that address the goals above:
- Consolidate data centers
- Move all email/calendaring to the cloud (Microsoft 365)
- Establish central contracts for hardware procurement
- Handle vendor enterprise software licensing through Central IS (includes work flow initiative)
- Better coordinate help desk support
Governance

The mission of IT:
• Provide services that are critical to the front-line mission of the institution: teaching and research
• Provide important services directly to all students
• Provide services that are critical to all of the other services that are directly or indirectly supporting the mission of the institution (e.g., business operations, academic support operations, research operations, auxiliaries, data security)

Why do we need a robust and formal IT Governance model?
1. IT resource needs will always outstrip available resources, thereby requiring strategic prioritization of how resources are deployed, within the context of the mission of the institution
2. IT security, business continuity and compliance needs require sensible and enforceable policies that support, rather than unduly interfere with, the mission of the institution
3. Appropriately balancing central and local IT and IS activities requires frequent recalibration
4. As remarked above: every member of the University community (student, faculty, staff) is a direct stakeholder in the success of our IT and IS enterprises
Governance Work Group

Proposal

Activities:

• Recommend IT service and project priorities for the University
• Advise the CIO on the implementation of the UO IT Strategic Plan
• Advise the CIO on the development of future versions of the UO IT Strategic Plan
• Identify existing campus technology committees and working groups, then develop and maintain a framework that connects them back to this Committee for purposes of information-sharing
• Review proposals, recommendations, and input from other campus technology committees and working groups make recommendations for further action
• Provide recommendations for effective use of campus-wide technology resources
• Evaluate and recommend technology-related policies and procedures
Governance Work Group
Proposal

Activities:

• Support the CIO in campus-wide monitoring of and ensuring compliance with best practices, IT policies/processes, and institutional priorities.
• Provide input regarding technology project and service proposals into the campus budget process
• Recommend potential sustainable funding model(s) for campus IT
• Recommend approval of all proposed technology projects and services that meet both of these criteria: (a.) Affects 100 or more campus users, and (b.) Affects more than one campus unit and involves multiple campus stakeholder groups
• Make recommendations for aligning IT professional resources to institutional goals with respect to: (a.) UO’s IT organizational structure, and (b.) Standards for compensation and competency
• Recommend approval of procurement of all technology services and products meeting either of these criteria: (a.) Purchases of $25,000 and higher, and (b.) Contracts involving technology services or products
Governance Work Group

Proposal

Membership:

- University CIO, chair
- Two deans
- Two faculty members
- Two students
- One representative from the Undergraduate Council
- One representative from the Graduate Council
- One representative from the UO Libraries
- One representative from the Office of the Vice President for Research and Innovation
- One representative from the Office of the Vice President for Enrollment Management
- One representative from the Office of the Vice President for Student Life
- Three representatives from the Office of the Vice President for Finance and Administration, representing the budget, procurement, and human resources units
Next Steps

• Guidance/approval from President & Provost on proposals
• More robust campus engagement
• Determine teams to engage in long-term assessments (infrastructure, units/functions)
• Implement President/Provost decisions