

University-Wide IT Governance Framework

Incorporation of Stakeholder Input Document

Numerous recommendations were received from across the University via the anonymous survey, the IT Governance Town Hall event, email correspondence, and meetings with the IT Advisory Committee.

Recommendations were reviewed by the IT Governance Working Group and finalized by the Vice President for IT and CIO in collaboration with the Vice President for Enrollment and Academic Services.

<u>Stakeholder Input</u>	<u>Decision</u>	<u>Document Location</u>
1 - Consider adding a representative from the Executive Advisory Council on Core Facilities (EAC-CF), which includes Associate Deans for research from Colleges, to the RITC.	Approved. The representative was added and incorporated into the RITC Membership. With related RITC changes, the committee count rests at 13 voting members.	Page 18
2 - IRPSC Committee – Office of General Counsel rep should become ex-officio.	Approved. The representative was moved to an ex-officio (non-voting) role.	Page 22
3 - Reduce the 2 VP for Research IT reps on RITC down to 1 VP for Research IT rep and 2 Associate Deans down to 1 Associate Dean.	Approved. The representation changes were incorporated into the RITC Membership. With related RITC changes, the committee count rests at 13 voting members.	Page 18
4 - Consider a phased approach to committee establishment by starting with SITC, AIC, & IRPSC.	Acknowledged. A project to operationalize the ITG framework will be executed during Summer - 2017 with an IT Governance event occurring on September 29, 2017, to on-board the ITG Governors (committee members) appointed. The first committee to be established will be the SITC with a phased approach following the other committees.	Not Applicable
5 - Include background in the ITG framework that outlines how other research by ITAC and related groups were considered in the evaluation.	Approved. The IT Governance Working Group values the efforts tendered by numerous stakeholders, campus committees, and reference bodies on the topic of IT Governance. Acknowledgement was added into the <i>Background</i> section of the document.	Page 1
6 - Add more clearly defined scope for the EAC and exclude specific services.	Approved. A revised scope was developed for the EAC with the removal of specific services referenced in the committee charge.	Page 24
7 - Ensure that all five data owners be included given the Compass role in the EAC (Registrar, Admissions, FAID, SBS, OGAPS).	Declined. The Academic Services representatives will be kept at two members to allow balance among the other members on the committee. The Vice President for Enrollment and Academic services will utilize the Academic Services appointments to strategically place appropriate representatives.	Not Applicable



<p>8 – Discontinue the Enterprise Information Systems executive committee if EIS has a voting member (not ex-officio) and at least one of the three members are named in the EAC (CIO, Controller, or AVP for Academic Services).</p>	<p>Acknowledged. The ITG framework will allow the EIS executive committee to respond naturally over time to the impact of a formalized ITG framework. No discontinuation is recommended at this time.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p>9 - Only 2 faculty are on TTLTC. Consider adding more faculty and a staff rep.</p>	<p>Approved. The membership was changed from 3 Associate Deans to 2 Associate Deans and from 2 Faculty Members to 5 Faculty Members.</p> <p>The additional staff member was declined with recognition that 3 IT staff members serve as ex-officio.</p>	<p>Page 15</p>
<p>10 - More Faculty Required. The IRPSC, AIC, RITC, and EAC need more faculty in general.</p>	<p>Approved.</p> <p>IRPSC – Increased to 3 faculty members.</p> <p>AIC – Added 1 faculty member (no faculty members were previously allotted).</p> <p>EAC – Maintained faculty count and slightly reduced staff allotment.</p> <p>RITC – Increased to 4 faculty members. Reduced Associate deans from 2 to 1.</p>	<p>Page 21</p> <p>Page 29</p> <p>Page 26</p> <p>Page 18</p>
<p>11 - Add the VP for Research to the Executive IT Council to promote equity across learning and discovery representation.</p>	<p>Declined. Representation by the Provost at the EITC covers both the Academic and Research mission.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p>12 - Overall framework lacks representation from College IT professional.</p>	<p>Approved. The Vice President for IT and CIO will employ a practice of selecting College IT representatives from among the IT Professional appointment allocations.</p>	<p>Page 34</p>
<p>13 - Need to have more specific language in the SITC regarding the budget and what should come through SITC.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. The ITG framework will allow the SITC to focus on University-wide priorities without having a set amount of capital or management over specific operational budgets. The SITC focus is on the <i>strategies</i> associated with funding as opposed to the <i>management</i> of funding.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>



<p>14 - Need to have a connection in the RITC committee to TAMUS agencies that conduct research.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. University leadership recognizes the complexity inherent across the University, and will be cognizant when making appointments.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p>15 - Reorder the committee charge statement to place the “out of scope language” to the end of the charge instead of at the beginning.</p>	<p>Approved. The previous order added undue confusion. Each committee charge has been repositioned to begin with the in-scope charge.</p>	<p>All Committee Charge Statements</p>
<p>16 - How will TAMUS mandates and guidelines be incorporated into IRPSC? Should there be a connection with the TAMUS ITG framework?</p>	<p>Declined. The TAMUS IT Governance Audit #20160203 recommended the development of a <i>University-Wide</i> IT Governance framework. TAMUS Policy topics or issues may enter into the framework via University Risk and Compliance as shown in the Component Model, through the University Risk and Compliance IRPSC member, the VP for IT and CIO, a Recognized Advisory Body in the component model, or any IRPSC committee member.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p>17 - More explicit definition on the “evergreen” strategic planning process and way that the strategic plan will guide ITG discussion will benefit the document.</p>	<p>Approved. A supplemental paragraph was added in the Alignment Process of the ITG framework. Additional strategic planning information will be presented over time as the ITG framework is operationalized.</p>	<p>Page 31</p>
<p>18 – Health Science Center, TAMU – Galveston and TAMU – Qatar’s role in the framework is not clearly addressed, specifically, the impact on branch campuses.</p>	<p>Approved. Incorporated HSC representation into the SITC. TAMUG and TAMUQ was already represented on the SITC. The campus leader appointments by the President were increased from 2 to 3 with a requirement that one member be appointed from the HSC.</p>	<p>Page 12</p>
<p>19 - Recommend that SITC meet more frequently due to budget component and being the lynchpin for the framework.</p>	<p>Approved. The SITC meeting cadence was previously set at 4 times per year. The updated language indicates a minimum of 4 meetings and maximum of 6 meetings per year.</p>	<p>Page 12</p>
<p>20 - Need to address how the engineering/agriculture extension happens with respect to IT Governance.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. University leadership recognizes the complexity inherent across the University, and will be cognizant when making appointments.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p>21 - With the numerous inputs/outputs and topics, we need to ensure that an operational plan is available with communication specialists that can operate across the committees.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. A periodic meeting of Chairpersons will occur to ensure the synchronization of issues. A communication plan will be developed and followed along with the posting of ITG information to a website.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>

<p>22 - Simplify diagram boxes and cover the TAMUS ITG framework integration.</p>	<p>Approved. A simplified diagram was developed. Reference input item 16 for a general position on TAMUS ITG integration.</p>	<p>Page 5</p>
<p>23 - The lines in the framework are not clear. Need to cover the inputs/outputs between the committees to help in understanding how the framework will operate.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. A simplified diagram was developed to aid in recognizing committee relationships. The solid lines indicate a directly defined relationship outlined in the IT Governance Framework document. The dashed lines indicate an undefined/indirect relationship. A professionally developed graphic will be published during the implementation of the framework.</p>	<p>Page 5</p>
<p>24 - Need to add clarity on decision-making, especially in the TTLTC and RITC or this will be very off-putting to committee members.</p>	<p>Approved. A statement was added into the charge of the TTLTC, RITC, EAC, IRPSC, and AIC, “<i>The [Insert Committee Name] votes and makes decisions within the above charge and scope.</i>” The input/decision matrix adopted from the Weill and Ross IT Governance Model Table was removed to avoid confusion.</p>	<p>Multiple Committees</p>
<p>25 - There is overlap on two duties of the TTLTC (one references pedagogy grants) that is covered in the position description of the Dean of Faculty for Faculty Development. Can this be removed or changed?</p>	<p>Approved. The two statements, previous bullet numbers 4 and 5, were removed from the TTLTC charge.</p>	<p>Page 14</p>
<p>26 - Too many people (i.e. Faculty) will “check-out” and not adopt the framework if TTLTC and RITC do not have any decision rights.</p>	<p>Approved. Reference input item #24. Decision-making was always available to the committees, however, the intent was poorly described in the previous document version.</p>	<p>Multiple Committees</p>
<p>27 - Formalize the input methods for issues to enter the ITG framework from across the University.</p>	<p>Approved. Added language into the third paragraph in the decision-making structures section.</p>	<p>Page 6</p>
<p>28 - Add a Centers & Institutes Council representative from the newly formed body on the RITC committee.</p>	<p>Approved. Added a representative to the RITC membership list and referenced the role in the <i>Appointments</i> section.</p>	<p>Page 18</p>
<p>29 - AIC should report to SITC and not be a subordinate to other committees.</p>	<p>Declined. The AIC is intended to provide deep technical expertise and analysis in support of all committees in the framework. It has the ability to send issues directly to the SITC without moving through another committee.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p>30 - Add a “University Advisor” representative due to their consumption of IT services.</p>	<p>Declined. The inclusion of additional stakeholders through sub-committees is expected to occur across all ITG committees.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>



<p>31 - Add Library and College IT unit reps to the committees.</p>	<p>Declined. Appointments by the Provost may include a Library representative. College IT representation was addressed in input item #12.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p>32 - Consider adding a “system administrator” representative to the AIC.</p>	<p>Declined. 5 appointments for IT Professionals are available to the VP for IT/CIO in the AIC.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p>33 – The Division of Marketing & Communication should have a rep at the SITC.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. The campus leader appointments were increased from 2 to 3 and the Division of Finance and Administration representative was removed to avoid any Division being expressly represented. The President may appoint a Marketing & Communication representative as a campus leader at his discretion.</p>	<p>Page 12</p>
<p>34 - Generate a list of FAQ’s and post to a future ITG website that gives examples of what is included in ITG and what is not. Example: “A department wants to purchase software to aid their office. Does this go through ITG for approval?”</p>	<p>Acknowledged. A website presence will be published as part of the operationalization of the ITG framework with an FAQ style component that provides clarity to common questions.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>