Meeting Minutes
Technology Strategy Partners
October 26, 2017
4:00 P.M.
Rich 242

Attendees
Sonia Alvarez-Robinson  Nelson Baker  Rich DeMillo
Mark Hoeting  Chris Jones  Paul Strouts

Inform & Discuss Items
- None

Inform & Decide Items
- IT Governance Modification proposals (Hoeting)
  o 1) Rename the “Technology Governance Steering Committee (TGSC) to “Technology Advisory Council” (TAC)
    ▪ Approved
  o 2) Establish “Technology Strategy Partners” (TSP) as the Technology Governance oversight body
    ▪ The current coordinating body is not formally named
    ▪ The name of the oversight and coordination body should reflect roles and purpose
    ▪ Approved
  o 3) Additions to the TSP
    ▪ Executive Director, Ga Tech Strategic Consulting
    ▪ IT Chief Operating Officer (ex-Officio) – Non-voting member
    ▪ Chief Information Security officer (ex-Officio) – Veto only
    ▪ Chief Technology Officer (ex-Officio) – Non-voting member
    ▪ Undergraduate SGA Vice President
    ▪ Discussion
      • Senior IT leadership is responsible for delivery of enterprise technologies across the Institute
      • Planning and execution of Digital Strategy requires close alignment with Sr IT Leadership
      • Change “Undergraduate SGA Vice President” to “SGA Representative”
    ▪ Approved
  o 4) Transition SISGov into a subcommittee of the Enterprise Applications Committee
    ▪ Item tabled for future discussion due to key members not being available
  o 5) Governance meeting frequency
    ▪ Technology Strategy Partners to meet monthly
    ▪ Governance committees to meet monthly
    ▪ Full Technology Advisory Council to meet quarterly
• Monthly meetings of full TAC do not allow enough time for committees to conduct their work between TAC meetings
• Adjusting to quarterly TAC meetings will establish a pace that allows work to continue and allow for substantive report-backs to TAC
• Allows committees to work at their own pace and still produce results
  ▪ Approved
o 6) TSP will establish functional committee objectives and high level work plans
  ▪ Provides for coordinated effort across committees, which is necessary to achieve strategic alignment
  ▪ Approved
o 7) TAC will review/prioritize/recommend any IT project meeting one or more criteria
  ▪ Guiding Principles:
    • Minimize risk and threats to security
    • Minimize waste, maximize data use & alignment of business intelligence
    • Drive consistency
  ▪ No action taken, need to discuss further at a future meeting
  ▪ Chris Jones: Talk to 4-5 IT leaders in Research and ask them to provide a use case that they believe, based on this draft, could pose some ambiguity
o 8) TAC will identify/review/prioritize/recommend service management and abatement across the Institute for services that meet one or more of the following criteria
  ▪ Criteria
    • Scope: Services used by more than one unit, division or college
    • Projects or Services over $150,000
    • Project timelines longer than 6 months
    • Savings levels exceeding $75,000
  ▪ Intent is to empower the group/council as a whole to minimize waste & hold us accountable for decommissioning services that are no longer effective
  ▪ Approved
o 9) TAC will lead development of technology strategy and goals within the following domains:
  • Digital Learning
  • Research Technology
  • Enterprise Applications
  • Data Management
  • IT Infrastructure
  ▪ TAC will provide input to the development of the technology strategy, which then can be formulated by the TSP
  ▪ TSP will review/approve/implement the technology strategy
  ▪ Needs further discussion and clarification
o 10) Technology Strategy Partners (TSP) will advise on technology planning and budget priorities as a part of the Institute budget development process
  ▪ Approved
11) Standardize on one strategy framework

The TAC will utilize one standard strategy and execution framework within which all enterprise organizations will contribute.

The process of creating an OGSM (Objectives, Goals, Strategies, Measures) allows the Institute to:

- Clearly define objectives (both in purpose & financially)
- Align key strategies, programs & initiatives
- Assign owners & responsibilities
- Build a roadmap against which future decisions are made
- Need consistency in the alignment with other strategy framework that is being used across the Institute
- Need additional discussion and potential modifications to the structure

Items brought up during the meeting (not included on the meeting agenda)
- None

Items requested to be included on a future TSP meeting agenda
- None

Meeting adjourned at 5:30
Technology Strategy Partners

October 26, 2017
Agenda

Proposed Modifications to IT Governance

Discussion on Governance Execution Framework

Announcements
IT Governance Modification

Simplification of the Governance Structure

Technology Advisory Council (TAC)

Technology Strategy Partners (TSP)

1. Strategy Partners Aligned to Governance Committees.
2. Expanded At-Large roles.
3. COO, CISO, [CTO] added.
5. Advises on Priority Setting
6. Reviews/Approves Project & Service Proposals
7. Advises on Emerging Issues and Opportunities
8. Advises on Service Management
9. Advises on Technology Budget Priorities & Development
10. Meets Monthly

Instructional Technology
Research Technology
Architecture
Enterprise Applications
Data Governance

1. Meets independently, Monthly
2. SISgov integrated into Enterprise Applications Committee
3. Charters remain as written
4. Reviews policies, proposals, services
5. Uses Docusign as workflow
6. Responsible for IT planning within domain area.
Proposed Modification 1: Renaming IT Governance Body

Current Name: Technology Governance Steering Committee
Proposed Name: Technology Advisory Council

Background:
The current nomenclature does not match the model, and lends confusion to stakeholders.
Proposed Modification 2: Establishing Technology Strategy Partners as the IT Governance oversight body.

Proposal: Technology Strategy Partners

Background:
The current coordinating body is not formally named. The name of the oversight and coordination body should reflect roles and purpose.
Proposed Modification 3: Additions to the Technology Strategy Partners

Proposal: Add Executive Director for Strategic Consulting
IT Chief Operating Officer (ex-officio)
Chief Information Security Officer (ex-officio)
Placeholder for Chief Technology Officer (ex-officio)
Undergraduate SGA Vice President

Background:
Senior leadership in IT is responsible for delivery of enterprise technologies across the institute. Planning and execution of Digital Strategy requires close alignment with Senior IT Leadership.
IT Governance Modification 3
Supporting Information
Proposed Modification 4: SISGov added as subcommittee of Enterprise Applications Committee

Proposal: Existing SISGov committee will be added as a subcommittee of the Enterprise Applications Committee

Background: SISGov currently resides outside of IT Governance, even though it effectively operates as an IT governance body. Many of the same individuals in SISgov are also on the Enterprise Applications Committee. The sub-committee structure minimizes duplicated effort.
Proposed Modification 5: Governance Meeting Frequency

**Proposal:** Technology Strategy Partners will meet monthly. IT Governance Committees will meet monthly. Full Technology Advisory Council will meet quarterly.

**Background:** Monthly meetings of the full council do not allow enough time for committees to conduct their work between full council meetings. Adjusting to quarterly full council meetings will establish a pace that allows work to continue and allow for substantive report-backs for the full council.
Proposed Modification 6: Committee Functions

Proposal: Technology Strategy Partners will establish objectives and work plans for the Technology Governance Committees.

Background:
A coordinated effort across committees is necessary in order to achieve strategic alignment.
Proposed Modification 7: Project & Service Proposal Review

Proposal: The Technology Advisory Council will review/prioritize/recommend any IT project meeting one or more criteria:

**Impact:** more than one unit/department/division/college

**Expense:** $25k or greater 1x cost -or- ongoing cost of $10k annually -or- five year TCO $1M or greater.

**Reputational risk:** Significant potential for damaging Institute reputation.

**External Mandates:** required to comply with state or federal statutes or USG or Institute policies or directives.

**Reduction of duplication:** opportunities to significantly reduce duplication of systems, data, or expense.

**Potential for broader benefit:** Projects initiated by one department that could also benefit the entire institute.
Proposed Modification 8: Service Management & Abatement

Proposal: The Technology Advisory Council will review/prioritize/recommend service management and abatement across the Institute for services that meet one or more of the following criteria:

- **Scope**: services used by more than one unit, division, or college.
- **Projects** over $150,000
- **Project timelines** longer than: 6 months
- **Savings** levels exceeding: $75,000
Proposed Modification 9: Establishing Strategies & Goals

Proposal: The Technology Advisory Council will lead in the development of technology strategy and goals within the following domains:

1. Digital Learning
2. Research Technology
3. Enterprise Applications
4. Data Management
5. IT Infrastructure
Proposed Modification 10: Advise on technology planning and budget priorities

Proposal: The Technology Advisory Council will advise on technology planning and budget priorities as a part of the Institute budget development process.
Governance Execution Framework

**Proposed:** Standardize on one strategy framework.

**Proposal:** The Technology Advisory Council will utilize one standard strategy and execution framework within which all enterprise organizations will contribute.

**Background:**
The process of creating an OGSM allows the Institute to 1) clearly define objectives (both in purpose and financially), 2) align key strategies, programs, and initiatives, 3) assign owners and responsibilities, 4) build a roadmap against which future decisions are made.
Governance Execution Framework

Every governance-approved program and initiative should identify these elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Georgia Tech Digital OGSM Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of what we intend to accomplish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What we need to achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financials &amp; Operational Performance Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The choices we make to achieve our objectives and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programs, initiatives, etc required to deliver our strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerical measures of how the Institute will benchmark progress toward implementing each strategy or initiative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WORDS) (NUMBERS) (WORDS) (NUMBERS)
Governance Execution Framework

Objectives
Where are we going?

Goals
What must we accomplish functionally?

Strategies & Initiatives
How will we achieve our goals?

Measures
How do we measure success

Resource Planning & Priorities

Internal & External Situational Awareness
What issues do we need to address? What opportunities do we have?

Alignment
Do we all agree?

Velocity
How fast are we going?

Vision
Where are we going?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Georgia Tech IT Goals (examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expanding Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase externally sponsored research by 30% per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transform Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a digitally enabled learning environment that reduces the total cost of education by 5% in five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Technology Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a reliable and secure shared technology framework that enhances productivity by 30% within 5 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Governance Execution Framework

## Transform Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1</td>
<td>Program or initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2</td>
<td>Program or initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governance Execution Framework

Proposed: Standardize on one strategy framework.

Proposal: The Technology Advisory Council will utilize one standard strategy and execution framework within which all enterprise organizations will contribute.

Background: The process of creating an OGSM allows the Institute to 1) clearly define objectives (both in purpose and financially), 2) align key strategies, programs, and initiatives, 3) assign owners and responsibilities, 4) build a roadmap against which future decisions are made.