CIO Council Meeting Notes

Thursday, June 16, 2016 | Day 1 of 2
Madison, Wisconsin

Attendees: David Stack, Chip Eckardt, David Kieper, John Krogman, Robert Beck, Beth Schaefer, Anne Milkovich, Ilya Yakovlev (videoconference), Sue Traxler, Jason Winget, Jim Barrett (videoconference), Dan Dunbar, Joe Kmiech, Elena Pokot and guests Robert Flum (videoconference), Mike Schlicht, David Alarie, Jason Fishbain, Ruth Ginzberg (audio conference), Olga Turkina, Kathy Luker, Lynsey Schwabrow

MOR Graduation
CIO Council members congratulated the successful participants in the IT Leadership Program (ITLP) conducted by MOR Associates. The graduates delivered several presentations that demonstrated the material that they had learned. The graduates requested that the CIOs:

-   Take a chance on them to lead initiatives and projects
-   Provide responsibilities and roles that reflect their leadership and growth
-   Ask and encourage them to be involved in various committees and projects
-   Provide clear paths for them to be leaders in the workplace
-   Encourage everyone to lead from where they are and to offer the ITLP alumni as a resource to others
-   Continue to recognize and develop the potential of the ITLP alumni

John Krogman announced that there are sufficient interested participants from across the UW System for the FY 2017 ITLP program. Krogman needs the names, titles and email addresses of the participants.

Visit with Jim Henderson
Jim Henderson joined UW System on March 15th as Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs. He has worked in three very different university systems ranging from a loose federation to a highly centralized environment. He received his doctorate in mathematics from UW-Madison and, as of last Friday, he is tenured in Mathematics at UW-Milwaukee because of his long standing relationships with colleagues at that institution.

Henderson's first meeting after joining the UW System was about the Learning Management System (LMS). His perspective on software transitions is informed by his experience as a faculty member and he is sensitive to the outcome when a transition doesn't go well.

Henderson does not have a preconceived notion regarding which LMS the UW System should choose. He also doesn't want faculty to be told which LMS they are going to use without their having input into the decision. He wants to be cautious that the LMS RFP process is not challenged because of inappropriate procedures. He doesn't want to set an artificial deadline for any transition that would not be feasible.

CIO Council members shared their perspectives on the path ahead:
*   The DoIT technology organization at UW-Madison has both a Learn@UW team supporting D2L and has another LMS group that will be involved in rolling out Canvas to their campus over the next couple years.
*   UW-Eau Claire is not happy with lack of analytic support in the current LMS despite considerable efforts on the part of UW-Madison. The institutions in northwest Wisconsin are questioning why Unizin/Canvas is not the preferred direction given that UW System funds have helped support UW-Madison's founding membership in Unizin.
*   UW-Superior has only a half time LMS administrator and therefore wants to see only one LMS for the UW System. They are also interested in predictive analytics.
*   UW-Platteville has perceived mixed signals coming from the UW System. Budgets are being cut while the

proposed course of action will potentially stretch out the overlap between multiple LMS contracts. The decision for Canvas at UW-Madison has resulted in the possibility of two LMSs indefinitely.

- UW-Oshkosh faculty don't want to go through an RFP if it turns out later that the process was just for show.
- UW-Green Bay needs to move as quickly as possible. The process can't be completed soon enough. There needs to be a plan for engaging the campuses and the faculty. The ball needs to get rolling long before September. They are concerned that there is a perception that a software system can, by itself, bring the institutions closer together.
- UW-Whitewater stresses that Unizin is only one path to an integrated learning environment. The UW System needs to do an RFP that is not merely checking off feature sets. Faculty want to hear from their colleagues, not the IT department.
- At UW-Milwaukee the academic side of the institution is pleased by the RFP approach and the engagement of faculty. D2L was first implemented at UWM and there is still a separate D2L instance that is distinct from the rest of the UW System. UWM has the largest LMS use in the UW System and extensive online curricula, so any changes will have great impact.
- UW-Stevens Point wants to make the "best" choice possible for the UW System.

The CIO Council members also provided their feedback on the CSRG process:

- UW-Madison is concerned that there is a lack of strategy in the CSRG process. The focus seems to be on cutting the budget. Many CSRG components are operational systems that serve business functions such as HR and the budget. These are not IT projects for the sake of IT. Some incremental improvements in the CSRG process have been made in the last year.
- UW-Oshkosh recommends exploring what additional services should go into CSRG because that's where savings are generated.
- UW-Eau Claire is concerned that academic investments get "short shrift" in the CSRG budget process. If we don't have students, we're out of business. Innovative learning needs to be funded.
- UW-Whitewater noted that it is important that there is academic leadership for the CSRG. The conversation needs to be primarily about strategy, not dollars. The CSRG is often treated at as a collection of independent projects, even though they are interdependent. Although improvements have been made to the process in the last year, there is more work to be done. On the academic side, individual campus departments make decisions that are not in common across the UW System in the way that HR decisions might be. Perhaps the academic initiatives should be local endeavors, not common system wide functions. Each institution will implement different initiatives to compete for students versus the other UW System institutions.
- UW-Stevens Point agrees that IT capabilities and student services can be differentiators for institutions. The UW System institutions are already advertising in each other's backyards because all institutions are competing for the same high school student demographic.
- UW-Parkside stressed the importance of collaborating on the systems that are held in common.
- UW-Platteville recommended that the UW System Administration help the institutions by funding the EAB analytics products even though it is difficult to get data out of the LMS to support these products.

Jim Henderson acknowledged that the competition for students within the UW System is resulting in elbows getting very sharp. Institutions want to differentiate their brand via their processes and they will fight to keep those processes. As the institutions become more dependent on tuition rather than state revenue, the competition will increase. Only about 30% of the high school graduates in Wisconsin come into the UW System, so there is room for growth. Another opportunity is to increase retention numbers through student success, which is good for both the institutions and the students.

CIO Council Meeting Notes

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the February, April and May 2016 meetings were approved by acclamation.

Business Intelligence Project

A few Business Intelligence (BI) Executive Sponsors who are not CIOs joined the meeting virtually. Kathy Luker explained that dimensional data modeling training has been completed for representatives from about half the institutions. Responses from the RFP for additional consulting services are due tomorrow afternoon. Tom Jordan is assembling the technical options for the RPD metadata layer. An RPD development class will be held next week.

Luker reported that there has been about 30% turnover in Executive Sponsors and 12% turnover in campus coordinators while the project has been underway. The number of BI related staff at the UW System institutions is lean, and there is turnover among their ranks as well.

The BI Core Team met last Tuesday and the question arose as to whether the sunset date for the legacy Interactive Reporting (IR) product is firm. This decision will be taken to the Executive Sponsors.

Council members noted that each institution will need to do its own estimate of what it will take to convert their legacy queries. In response to the question of whether it would be possible for the project to help institutions that have too many queries and too few resources, Luker explained that the institutions are in the midst of doing their own IR Query/Data analyses. The query author training has not yet been scheduled.

A discussion ensued regarding whether it would be better to have a single or multiple instances of Oracle Business Intelligence Enterprise Edition (OBIEE). There are central systems like Human Resources and Shared Financials. To a large extent the student information systems are similar. On the other hand, institutions have other systems that are not held in common, such as Mapworks and student success systems.

By contract, the UW System has the technical capability to build as many OBIEEs as desired so long as there are no more than 3,100 named users. Going that route would allow for local control and less need for system wide coordination. However, access to the central enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems would be more challenging and data would not integrated throughout OBIEE.

The Operational Governance Team has met several times, considered the tradeoffs, and decided that the user experience should be paramount followed by the lowest overall cost for the UW System. Under this model, a single RPD metadata layer that contains all connections to all databases would be in one file. It will be technically possible for a campus to have their own section of the RPD where they can do their development. The complication will be moving the institutional developments into the one production file for the entire system which would largely be the task of the system administrator. Poor code executed on the part of one institution will impact only that institution and anyone else who was given access to that code. The greater potential for slowdowns will exist at the database servers running at the individual institutions. If an institution purchases commercial solution packs, presumably they could be implemented within that institution's portion of the RPD.

The alternative model of multiple OBIEE instances would require more expertise and resources at each of the institutions. Changes at any of the common systems would also have to be replicated at each

institution, or the institution queries would have to be written to pull data from two different places.

The participants came to consensus and the former model, which avoids the cost of 13 OBIEE administrators, i.e., one for each institution, was selected.

Robert Flum and Sue Traxler discussed their respective roles at UW-Platteville:

The UW-Platteville CIO has strong support from the Chief Business Officer (CBO) for their Business Intelligence (BI) initiative, which began four years ago. The institution implemented OBIEE and their student data warehouse at the same time. The CIO is mainly responsible for providing staffing and resources and advocating for the BI with the institution's leadership team. The CIO meets with every senior leader on campus at least once per month and BI is part of the discussion. The party line for BI is, "…this takes a while." The CIO drums up support from the functional areas to help validate data as quickly as possible, which is an ongoing challenge. A Project Management Office is engaged with functional areas that want new reports and features.

The Project Coordinator works with many different people and teams on campus to collaborate on implementation and development, including the registrar, the admissions office, the financial aid office, institutional research, etc. He is also involved with strategic planning, change management, project management methodology and communications. The project has been run as a series of phases, the latest of which is strategic decision making. Custom reports have been built for specialty areas such as support for veterans and international students. Training is provided for report authors as well as report users.

Some of the EAB products might rely upon data from OBIEE. There are many OBIEE dashboards that EAB products cannot replace. EAB products also allow for benchmarking against other campuses. EAB products can also provide an outside perspective that can help bring change to business processes, level setting and deeper analytics. EAB products will not eliminate the BI team.

IT Security Policy Review
David Stack reviewed the progress of the Information Assurance Council (IAC) to date, including the largely complete drafting of two policies, substantive drafting of a third policy and drafts of a security program and security framework. It is important that the IAC members relay drafts and comments back and forth from their stakeholder groups. Generally speaking, the CIO Council is more interested in policy and the TISC (Technology and Information Security Council) group is more interested in procedures. All of the procedures that are matched with the corresponding policies will allow for compensating controls on the part of the institutions. Many people are spending at least one day a week working on this effort.

Microsoft
Ruth Ginzberg explained that the UW System is up for renewal of the Enrollment for Education Solutions (EES) agreement. This is also an opportunity to modify the Office 365 amendment. Ginzberg is working to enable the purchase of Microsoft Surface computers that will require projections on how many the institutions may acquire. Ginzberg is also attempting to get an amendment that would allow the purchase of Azure services. Data is being gathered to help determine whether a three-year contract or multiple one-year contracts would be more advantageous depending upon the future demographics of the UW System.

CIO Council Meeting Notes

Friday, June 17, 2016 | Day 2 of 2
Madison, WI

Attendees: David Stack, Chip Eckardt, David Kieper, Robert Beck, Beth Schaefer, Anne Milkovich, Sue Traxler, Jason Winget, Jim Barrett (audio conference), Dan Dunbar, Joe Kmiech, Elena Pokot and guests Mike Schlicht, Olga Turkina, Renee Pfeifer-Luckett, Peter Mann, David Lois, Shaun Abshere, Jenna Weidner

Tour of New WiscNet World Headquarters
Shaun Abshere, Deputy CEO of WiscNet, gave the CIO Council a tour of their new office space and explained how they leverage their quarters for staff recruitment and retention in the competitive Madison Information Technology (IT) market.

CIO Strategy Session
Chip Eckardt and David Stack introduced the continuation of the April discussion on the role of the CIO Council, the UW System CIO and related matters. A Gartner document on four types of CIOs was shared. It is important that IT not be viewed as a cost center. IT is sometimes accused of throwing out terms that others don't understand, which leaves the door open for vendors who speak the language of university executives. On the other hand, it is also important to educate executives about IT.

Another stakeholder complaint is that the involvement of IT makes everything take too long, e.g., the classic waterfall approach to managing projects. Vendors who sell value-added services to the institutions claim they will get results with just a "small" amount of time invested by the IT staff. If IT can be fast and agile that will help open up conversations with university executives.

Since resources are so stretched, it is difficult to give staff the opportunity to explore new alternatives, which can lead to being left behind. IT is dealing with expectations of just-in-time service delivery as a result of stakeholders' consumer experiences.

The relationship between IT and university executives must be built upon trust. The IT staff can help them keep their names out of the paper by preventing things from going badly when the IT staff are not involved.

Cloud options for new services create more opportunities for IT to partner with the other executives, which is a culture shift for some IT professionals since they are no longer controlling every aspect of a product. A robust Identity & Access Management (IAM) infrastructure is necessary, as are learning tools interoperability (LTI) standards for academic products.

The disparity of different products doing similar functions within the UW System is largely the result of functional business owners making purchasing decisions, not the central IT staffs.

David Stack noted that the UW System Librarians have had a "One System, One Library" strategy for decades which leads them to approach projects from a collaboration first strategy. It was pointed out that – in contrast to IT – the Librarians largely own the services they are delivering. IT is often not the owner of the service it is helping to deliver.

A robust discussion covered several categories:

1) Proactive engagement at the institutional level

a) CIOs should meet with the institutional business leaders to understand emerging needs before setting out their work plan for the year

b) CIOs can play a liaison role between business units and institutional leaders if they hear anything about potential technology-enabled services

c) CIOs need chancellor support to ensure that IT is at the table

d) Any system that requires one to log in is an IT system and the CIO should be involved. It is largely irrelevant what an application costs. An application that costs $100 could be a million dollar liability depending upon the data stored in it.

2) Proactive engagement at the UW System level

a) Need CIO representation or connection to the various governance and stakeholder groups in the UW System

b) UW System Administration can advocate with institutions for IT representation at their executive level.

c) Chancellors, provosts, and CBOs should be encouraged to direct people back to their CIOs

d) Procurement processes need improvement. Cloud and subscription services should be easier to procure.

e) The CIOs would like to know more about the UW System organization. Is there a comprehensive organizational chart? It is difficult to find people and to know who to contact. Sarah Kicker of UWSA is leading the reorganization of the UW System website.

f) Everyone needs to talk less about efficiency because it is just a surrogate word for cost. As soon as spreadsheets are brought out, the strategic discussion is lost because spreadsheets frame IT as a cost center. Instead, we should talk about where we should be going. That is much easier with new initiatives than with existing systems.

3) Desired Characteristics in a UW System CIO

a) Needs to be someone who listens and who recognizes technology as an enabler not an end result.

b) Personality matters.

c) Needs to be a strategic partner to others in UW System Administration.

d) Should share the agendas and minutes from the stakeholder meetings with the CIO Council.

e) Needs to be an enabler and a conductor

f) Needs to be someone who can connect what's happening in the UW System with IT strategy, such as the reduction of customizations in ERP systems.

g) Needs to be a collaborator, communicator, facilitator and the voice of the CIO Council; not a technologist but a strategist.

h) Needs to be proactive at fostering organic collaboration, i.e., those that are not part of the formal Common Systems. An example is UW-Whitewater hosting VOIP for several institutions.

i) Need to have an understanding of the sizes and needs of the UW System institutions. Merely visiting and touring the institutions would disrupt important work.

4) Branding of the CIO Council

a) Less focus on IT per se.

b) The CIO is the information officer. There is no I-T in C-I-O. It's all about information, not technology.

c) Need to brag about successes, e.g., how much was saved, what costs were avoided what risks were ameliorated?

5) CSRG Recommendations

a) There are base funding levels that are needed to keep the lights on. The CSRG processes should not focus on these.

b) There needs to be more funding for new initiatives.

c) It has been useful in the current model to set apart base funding from new initiatives.

d) The operational areas should be mapped to determine if there are any possible synergies.

e) There is a perception at the institutions that the CSRG is all about acronyms and not about problem solving. It is perceived as a rubber stamp.

f) Perhaps the CBOs could take over the role of the budget committee for the existing operations with the CIOs weighing in with answers to questions such as:
   i) Do we need the service?
   ii) If so, ask are we doing it the right way?
   iii) These are difficult questions to ask with the service providers in the room
g) Perhaps the Service Providers should bring their reductions and initiatives to the CIO Council for review, rather than trying to educate the provosts and CBOs on all the technical issues.
h) UW System Administration could help the institutions by investing the services offered by EAB for all institutions. This is a possible CSRG initiative.
i) Maybe the CSRG should entertain presentations from student affairs professionals, facilities professionals and other functional areas about their business problems rather than talking primarily to the CIOs, IT Service providers, CBOs and Provosts.
j) Common Systems should be driven by common business process, not by common procurement opportunities.
k) Perhaps the CSRG should be asked what they would do with a million dollars instead of waiting for proposals from the (existing) service providers.
l) It may be possible to sweep up multiple CSRG offerings into bigger boxes, e.g., the components that support the HR System.
m) The CSRG could benefit from business executives championing the ERP systems rather than representatives from the service provider entities.
n) The spreadsheet of which applications are already deployed at the UW System institutions provides a look in the rear view mirror. There is also a need to look at the existing gaps and at where higher education is going. It is easier to collaborate on new initiatives than to encourage institutions to switch from their existing products.
o) A system wide view of the entire IT portfolio is needed, not the silos of CSRG, Microsoft Contract, HR System, Budget System, etc.
6) What can CIOs do for the UW System CIO?
a) Aid in finding common ground among the UW System Institutions
b) Empower the UW System CIO by talking up the role at the institutions
c) Help the UW System CIO define governance and how decisions are, or should be made, e.g.:
   i) The CSRG doesn't make all the decisions/
   ii) What decisions should reside with the CIO Council?
   iii) What is the charter of the CIO Council?
   iv) The consensus decisions of the CIO Council have a lot of leverage.
   v) How is IT in all of its forms governed within the UW System?
   vi) Develop an overall IT portfolio
7) Opportunities for future discussion:
a) Dive deeper in the Gartner document on the four types of CIOs
b) Discuss how to move from one quadrant to another in the document

David Stack will investigate whether there are other license alternatives for the EAB services than simply paying campus by campus.

Learn@UW Executive Committee Updates
Renee Pfeifer-Luckett and Peter Mann reported that the upgrade of the D2L LMS to version 10.6.0 went well. The UW System is now running the latest on premise version of D2L under a Long Term Support model that fixes the code base for a year instead of installing monthly updates. Any bugs will be hot fixed on an as needed basis.

Mann has noted that the same people at many of the UW System institutions serve on the overall D2L steering committee as well as the committees for the Kaltura and Blackboard collaboration modules. Combining the three

groups into one will result in one coalesced group that will be a more efficient use of peoples' time. Mann will distribute a spreadsheet of who has been serving on each of the committees.

The charter for the Learning Environment Requirements Gathering (LERG) RFP effort was circulated for feedback. The CIOs are especially encouraged to review the assumptions section.

Pfeifer-Luckett described last summer's Learning Environment Needs Analysis (LENA) and LERG as phases along a continuum that began two years ago with a learning environment roadmap. The LENA process helped identify major themes for the digital learning environment and the LERG process will endeavor to help everyone feel they had a chance to make their voice heard. The CIOs will be asked to help with the LERG communication process. A stakeholder's matrix is being developed to help identify members of the RFP committee and other groups.

A web conferencing RFP use case process is getting underway through the Learning Technology Development Center representatives. A survey instrument will help identify how the tool would likely be used. Some institutions already have Skype for Business and/or WebEx and/or Goggle hangouts so a new tool could be duplicative. The first step will be to evaluate what exists already before the RFP is issued.

The volume of Kaltura usage across all of the UW System institutions was discussed. Unlimited usage models are being explored.

Quiet inroads have been made using the third-party tools in the Learning Analytics Tool Chest. The initial grant to develop the tool chest has expired and a new pilot will be put together in the fall timeframe. The tools could be transitioned to a different LMS if need be. Students can use the tools to compare their progress against their peers.

Future CIO Council Meetings
It was suggested that the August noon to noon meeting be scheduled for Wednesday to Thursday instead of Thursday to Friday. The first day should include a strategy session reflecting on the Gartner document that outlines the four types of CIOs as well as Jenna Weidner's exercise to identify products that are candidates for Common Systems. Unless an institution volunteers to host, the meeting will be in Madison. The December meeting may be rescheduled to UW-Whitewater.

2016 Meeting Dates	Meeting Time	Meeting Location
July 21st	8:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.	Videoconference
August 10th-11th	Noon-to-Noon	WED: 780 Regent Street, 126A-B THU: 660 Regent Street, Madison
September 15	8:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.	Videoconference / Joint Meeting w/CBOs
★October 18th	TBA	In conjunction w/ITMC
November 17th	8:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.	Videoconference
★December 15th-16th	Noon-to-Noon	THU.: Van Hise Hall, Room 1820 FRI.: 780 Regent Street, 126A-B