

**Agenda**

**ADAC Meeting #31**
October 21, 2014, 8:30 am – 10 am
Pond Room, Michigan Union

**Representatives:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Steward</th>
<th>At Large Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Steve Schram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Karen Isble, Regis Vogel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Procurement/Shared Services</td>
<td>James Gorman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Laurita Thomas, Chair and IT Council Rep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Resources</td>
<td>Kim Kiernan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Administration</td>
<td>Daryl Weinert, James Ashton-Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Administration</td>
<td>James Holloway, IT Council Rep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>George DiGiacomo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>Debbie Mero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Literature, Science &amp; Arts</td>
<td>Steve Schlecht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Ford School of Public Policy</td>
<td>Marcy Brighton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>Jim Bell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost’s Office</td>
<td>Jo Ann Preissner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross School of Business</td>
<td>Valerie Suslow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Technology Services</td>
<td>Holly Nielsen, Carrie Shumaker, Rob Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agenda Items:**

- Discussion of FY16 Capital Requests (Rob Thomas)
  - Presentation from Sept. 17 meeting with project descriptions
  - Voting Spreadsheet with Raw Data
  - Rankings and Feedback
  - Questions and Answers

- Next Steps in the Capital Request Process (Rob Thomas)
ADAC 10/21/14 Meeting Notes

- L. Thomas opened the meeting
- How does the process work once the Committee determines its rankings?
  - Recommendations go to Laura Patterson, who considers the feedback as advisory and uses it in her final recommendations to the IT Council. Laura has asked that we rank the proposals absent of the dollar amount; committee has not been given a dollar figure to consider when doing the rankings.
- Review of High priority proposals: 800 MHz Radio Upgrade, Oracle Exadata Security, Multifactor Authentication Expansion
- MIDAR
  - Request to move from “Medium” to “High.”
  - James Ashton-Miller--what is missing from the notes is that this addresses two audits received in the recent past
  - D. Mero - this system is the second newest system and has not had the investment of some of our other systems. If we were looking for a place to impact faculty administrative burden, this would be a good place to invest. We also have supplementary systems that make up for the deficits of the Research systems.
  - D. Weinert - Both compliance benefits and savings to be had. 1) Reducing faculty burden (huge opportunity cost to faculty time in administration activities), 2) Savings in central offices by having a tool to bring all the pieces together - COI, IRB, Animal use, budgetary data, etc. 3) Wild card - Fine avoidance. We don’t know when / how we could get hit with a substantial fine. That is a potential cost with having a highly inefficient system like we have today. The Research Admin system was created somewhat “on the cheap” and this corrects some of that.
  - H. Nielsen - we did roll out Research Admin one piece at a time and that led to a somewhat disjointed system. This fixes that. Also, we are considering a re-implementation of the Research system. However, there is no system out there that we could implement that would meet our needs. If we invest more in this system, it could buy us a number of more years of using our current system.
- Automation of faculty hiring
  - Question on the Med School system and why that system could not be leveraged - however - this process submits paper to the central HR office. It is not integrated with enterprise system.
  - Why only faculty? It is the only hiring that is not already automated.
- Strategic Approach for Enterprise CRM
  - G. DiGiacomo - How can we know these expenses? Should we start with a smaller approach? -- These ideas are built into this proposal. It includes support from ITS to get an RFP off the ground, pick a vendor, etc. Start slow doesn’t mean start small. It means start slow and build your business case. We can step back and build the strategy right. However, we are behind our peers on this for
quite a few years now. I would call this a “strategic imperative.” I also need this from the standpoint of Student Life to measure student engagement on campus.

○ K. Ishop - It is a strategic imperative and needed to unify silos of the organization in communicating with prospects, transfers, etc. The CRM is necessary. It will help unify the approach to processes across campus. Peers have taken off with this 5-7 years ago, so we appear very siloed to students. Strategic imperative and provost imperative. The only way to get where we need to go is with a CRM. There are a lot of vendors and it will take a lot of time to pick the correct vendor and do it right - this means a high cost on the front end to ensure you have purchased the right tool.

○ D. Mero - do we have all the right stakeholders on board? This was a problem in the past, to get all to share the same goal. When we implemented DART, being able to share student data with the business office was a challenge. This is the part of this proposal that I worry about.

○ G. DiGiacomo - we have been working on this since 2009. There are 113 people in the Michigan CRM community of practice. The pilot process has been underway for ~6 months. This is building the business case for us working together and being able to share data in the same application. We are making great progress on these issues. Need to ensure that we have perceived prestige. We had a consultant (Apex) come help us put together requirements already. We are in the middle of a grad school pilot. In 3 years, we would hope to get most admissions offices on board as well as Registrar, Financial Aid, Enrollment Management - but it is longer than a 3 year process. Schools are ready to move forward (Engin has been on hold for 3 years). They will move forward themselves if we do not move forward.

○ D. Mero - is the “ask” to do the full implementation or to do analysis / requirements? G. DiGiacomo - to do as much as we can in 3 years. Fit / gap was done already.

○ H. Nielsen - the pilot is with Salesforce. This proposal is for an RFP that could potentially replace Salesforce and go a different direction. The big question is: are Kedra’s areas ready to cooperate with this?

○ K. Ishop - today, no. But this proposal is for FY16 and by then, we should be ready. FY17 is too far down the road.

○ M. Brighton - the dual degree process really exposes our silos. It is hard to sell the dual degree program when it is obvious to students that we are so siloed. We need this to work with other schools to recruit top students into our dual degree programs. In the pilot, people that are working together are loving it. As a small unit, this is great.

○ G. DiGiacomo - how would this track co-curricular involvement? We could see what volunteering / leadership positions students have. We would use it to answer questions like, if students receive financial aid, are they more or less likely to volunteer? We need answers to these. Currently DART collects this data via collections of spreadsheets.
- K. Ishop - the tool by its very nature is a cradle to grave concept.
- H. Nielsen - this can also integrate with our enterprise system.
- D. Weinert - what are the applications for research? (L. Thomas - there are potential applications for HR in future hiring / workforce). I’ve had several conversations about tech transfer, CEW, ICLE. Provost was interested in tracking faculty development on campus. We tabled some of these applications because it is too big to tackle all of it at once. It does warrant a constituent group and governance

Discussion of low priority projects
- R. Thomas - Ted gave interesting feedback at UITSC - this is a unit innovation and we think it could be leveraged across campus, so it is difficult when this is ranked a low priority.
- L. Thomas - keep in perspective that we are prioritizing above items that are all very high priority items. We need to keep that context. We have been asked to focus recently on students and faculty that we have not had in the past.
- L. Thomas - suggestion to move MIDAR up to High priority, accepted.
- K. Ishop - propose we move CRM to High. If we don’t do this from an enterprise standpoint, others will do this on their own.
- Decision: Move those two to High and move to 5 High priority items. Questions for Rob/Holly to bring back:
  - Multifactor Authentication may move off the list--it is less than $1M--should this be part of budget process instead?
  - Radio upgrade needs to be done--is it a throw away vote?

Action Items:
- Scorecard to be sent next week on ADAC projects

Feedback:
- Would like to see scale of investment on the chart so that we can see the portfolio “weights” of the proposals.
- Some were under the $1M threshold; committee doesn’t understand this inconsistency in applying the criteria (Multifactor Authentication Expansion). H. Nielsen - not sure how to handle this. It is less than $1M, but ITS doesn’t have the funding to cover it. (H. Nielsen and R. Thomas to take this back to ITS).
- Names should reflect what the proposals represent.

Next Meeting Date:
November meeting cancelled; will meet again in April, 2015.

Here is the link to our website with our charge.
http://cio.umich.edu/governance/administrative-domain.php