

2016 Best Practices Proposal Form



CACUBO
Central Association of College
& University Business Officers

Completed proposals are to be submitted to bestpractices@cacubo.org or by contacting Donna Rohlfer, Director, CACUBO Best Practices Awards, rohlfedm@miamioh.edu.
The deadline is April 30, 2016.

Best Practices Program Submission:

Title: IT Project Request and Prioritization process

Primary* Contact Information:

The primary contact must be a CACUBO member institution of higher education.

Institution: University Wisconsin – Platteville

Address1: 1 University Plaza

Address2:

City: Platteville State/Prov: WI Zip Code: 53818

Salutation: Prof. Dr. Mr. Mrs. Ms.

First Name: Heather Middle Name/Initial: I

Last Name: Faherty Suffix (Jr, III, etc.)

Professional Title: Project Manager

Email: fahertyh@uwplatt.edu

Phone: 608-342-7359 Fax:

*Additional team contacts may be listed at the bottom of this form.

Institution Information:

Institution: Research Comprehensive/Doctorate Small Institutions Community College

Year Founded: 1866

Geographical Location: Southwest Wisconsin

Number of Students: 8950

Website: www.uwplatt.edu

2016 Best Practices Proposal Form

Statement of the Problem:

The University of Wisconsin – Platteville lacked a central mechanism to receive and prioritize technology related projects from across the university to ensure they aligned with the mission of the university and could effectively be accomplished with the resources available.

Project submissions were received via multiple channels and often lacked quantifiable data, detailed project information, and little to no research was completed prior to project submission to determine best approach and high level time and budget estimates

Once projects were received there was a lack of communication to project submitters, inability to effectively allocate resources, reluctance to say no to projects which did not meet the mission of the university, lack of awareness to existing IT projects, and lack of cross functional representation when reviewing and prioritizing technology related projects.

Identify the Solution (250-words maximum):

To address deficiencies within the technology related project submission and oversight process, the Technology Oversight Planning Committee (TOPC) was created. While TOPC gave a good stepping point, it did not correct many of the pain points and challenges. The committee structure was too large to provide effective governance and the submission process was cumbersome. Therefore, consultants were engaged to assist in determining a more efficient process for IT Governance.

Stakeholders from cross sections of campus were interviewed to identify current state, key findings, and areas for improvement such as; Organization, Demand Management, Portfolio Management, and Communication.

The final report resulted in a creation of the Project Management Center of Excellence Office (PMCOE) and a more defined IT Governance process, which is now known as the IT Project Request and Prioritization process (ITP) and works in partnership with the PMCOE.

The PMCOE has direct management of the ITP process and is responsible for receiving all project requests, clarifying missing information, and triaging to one of the three ITP Advisory Committees for review. Creating three Advisory Committees allowed committee structure to remain smaller and meetings to be more productive. All Advisory Committee feedback is channeled to the Executive Committee, which has oversight for all projects submitted in any of the two project cycles with the Chancellor providing final approval. Project submitters and their respective sponsors are kept informed throughout the entire ITP process. Once projects are approved, Project Managers are assigned and a start date is defined.

2016 Best Practices Proposal Form

Implementation Timeline:

1. October 2010- Start of TOPC Planning
2. February 2011- TOPC Subcommittee made recommendations for TOPC process
3. October 2011- Assistant Chancellor rolled out TOPC to campus community
4. October 2011- First call for TOPC submissions
5. January 2012- First TOPC approved projects started
6. December 2012- Hired consulting company to review TOPC process
7. February 2013- Recommendation from consulting company
8. August 2013- Hired Director to create Project Management Center of Excellence Office
9. October 2013- Changed TOPC to ITP, creating new processes and documents
10. November 2013- Created Project Management Center of Excellence Office
11. December 2013- First call for ITP submissions
12. March 2014- ITP Process and PMCOE office fully implemented
13. May 2014 – Projects submitted via newly defined IT Prioritization process started
14. March 2015 – Enhanced existing ITP submittal form and reduced project cycles from three to two

Benefits & Retrospect:

With the Implementation of the ITP process came greater transparency to campus regarding project submission deadlines and expectations of project requests. Below highlights a few of the many benefits realized after the successful implementation.

- Agreed upon definition of what qualifies as an ITP project. This provided the campus community with an understanding of what must be prioritized through the ITP process and what types of requests could be handled outside the ITP process.
- Clearly defined ITP calendar ensures campus is aware of submissions deadlines and when decisions can be expected.
- Project requests are submitted through one channel allowing for better tracking and ensures project are not missed or forgotten.
- PMCOE partners with submitter prior to project being submitted to Advisory Committee to ensure request is complete. This ensures the Advisory Committee can make the most informed decision and recommendation.
- Consistent scoring of each project allows for projects to be prioritized based on impact to university and alignment with mission rather than individual department push.
- Creation of three independent Advisory Committees allowed for smaller committee make up which resulted in meetings being more productive and decisions more easily obtained.
- The creation of three Advisory Committees allows for projects to be channeled to one of the three advisory committees based on their impact to the university which enables the committees to better focus and prioritize projects having greatest impacts on their areas.
- Increased communication through the entire ITP process to all project submitters and project sponsors.

2016 Best Practices Proposal Form

- Creation of a monthly Project Management Dashboard ensures all ITP committees are aware of current project progress in order to effectively prioritize incoming requests.
- Creation of the Project Management Office provides resources to complete projects on time which allows for newly approved projects to begin when required.

Additional Team Contact Information:

Additional Contact #2:

Institution: University of Wisconsin – Platteville

Address1: 1 University Plaza

Address2:

City: Platteville State/Prov: WI Zip Code: 53818

Institution: Research Comprehensive/Doctorate Small Institutions Community College

Salutation: Prof. Dr. Mr. Mrs. Ms.

First Name: Tadra Middle Name/Initial: L

Last Name: Mack Suffix (Jr, III, etc.)

Professional Title: Business Analyst

Email: mackt@uwplatt.edu

Phone: 608-342-7360 Fax:

Additional Contact #3:

Institution: University of Wisconsin – Platteville

Address1: 1 University Plaza

Address2:

City: Platteville State/Prov: WI Zip Code: 53813

Institution: Research Comprehensive/Doctorate Small Institutions Community College

Salutation: Prof. Dr. Mr. Mrs. Ms.

First Name: Suzanne Middle Name/Initial: A

Last Name: Traxler Suffix (Jr, III, etc.)

Professional Title: Assistant Vice Chancellor of IT/CIO

Email : traxlers@uwplatt.edu

Phone: 608-342-1421 Fax:

updated Feb 2016