

Information Services and Technology

IT Planning and Governance

Information Technology Governance

Version 1.1

23 March 2018



UNIVERSITY
OF MANITOBA

© THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

THIS DOCUMENT IS THE PROPERTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
MANITOBA, AND IS INTENDED FOR INTERNAL USE.

THIS DOCUMENT IS CLASSIFIED AS **PUBLIC** UNDER THE UNIVERSITY
DATA SECURITY CLASSIFICATION.

Contents

- Document Summary 4
- 1 IT Governance Overview 5
 - 1.1 Key Governance Priorities 5
- 2 IT Governance Structure 7
 - 2.1 Committees 8
 - 2.2 CIO and Vice-President Administration (CIO/VP Admin) 9
 - 2.3 Committee Chairs (Chairs) 10
 - 2.4 The University IT Advisory Council (UITAC) 11
 - 2.5 Senate Committee on Academic Computing (SCACom) 12
 - 2.6 Student IT Experience Committee (SITEC) 13
 - 2.7 Research Computing Advisory Committee (RCAC) 14
 - 2.8 Administrative Services IT Governance Committee (ASITGC) 15
 - 2.9 Enterprise IT Architecture Committee (EITAC) 16
 - 2.10 IST Project Management Office (PMO) 17
 - 2.11 IST Planning & Governance (P&G) 18
- 3 IT Governance Scope 19
 - 3.1 Key Principles 19
- 4 IT Governance Processes 21
 - 4.1 Sub-Committees and Working Groups 21
 - 4.2 Governance Membership 21
 - 4.3 Terms of Reference and Operating Procedures 22
 - 4.4 Meeting Logistics 22
 - 4.5 Process Phases 22
- 5 IT Governance Approval Paths 27
 - 5.1 Standard 27
 - 5.2 Fully Resourced 28
 - 5.3 Research 29
 - 5.4 Mandatory 30
 - 5.5 IST Operational 31
 - 5.6 Direct to CIO 31
- Appendix A – Glossary of Terms 32

Document Summary

Purpose

This document defines Information Technology Governance (IT Governance) at the University of Manitoba. It describes the structures, processes of IT Governance and the mandates and general function of the committees, councils and support aspects of the process.

This document replaces the document *IT Governance Renewal at the University of Manitoba (v2.9)* that set down the initial framework for IT Governance.

Intended Audience

- The Vice-President Administration, under whose authority IT Governance operates.
- Organizational leaders who need to understand the IT Governance process.
- Members of committees who participate in IT Governance.
- Staff who support the IT Governance process.

Reviewers

- Terry Bunio, Manager, Project Management Office
- Adam Gerhard, Director, Planning and Governance
- Mario Lebar, Chief Information Officer
- University Information Technology Advisory Committee (UITAC)

Approvers

- Vice-President Administration

Revision History

Version	Date	Author	Changes
0.1	7 November 2016	Adam Gerhard	First published draft
0.2	24 November 2016	Adam Gerhard	Second published draft after review by JD and SY
0.3	7 December 2016	Adam Gerhard	Added delegate clarification to UITAC
1.0	8 September 2017	Adam Gerhard	Added revised RCAC mandate. Finalized and published.
1.1	23 March 2018	Adam Gerhard	Update RCAC mandate to correct HPCC naming

1 IT Governance Overview

Information Technology has been identified as a critical enabler of the University's current and future success. To ensure that the University has a degree of enterprise-wide control over Information Technology (similar to people, budgets, and facilities), the IT Governance process was established.

A key objective of IT Governance is to create an environment where planning, investment and priority setting is transparent, controlled and coordinated. IT Governance ensures university-wide control, supported by clear authorities, mandates and university-wide perspectives on IT strategy, priorities and associated investments.

Specifically, IT Governance provides:

- A **University IT plan** that is aligned with, and enables, the University's strategic and business priorities;
- A **consolidated view of IT investments** on which the University can set priorities and measure return;
- Clarity on **university-wide IT mandates and authorities** among central agencies, faculties and administrative units;
- Alignment of **IT advisory and governance processes** to strategy;
- Alignment of IT projects to, **core IT standards and guidelines**; and
- An **environment of control** through formal governance processes where executive and business leaders have meaningful roles in IT decision-making and priority setting.

The scope of IT governance is university-wide and extends across the IT function – including and beyond the Information Services and Technology (IST) department.

1.1 Key Governance Priorities

1.1.1 Control

Provide a mechanism and framework to exercise appropriate controls (including priorities and direction) over Information Technology at the University of Manitoba.

1.1.2 IT Strategy Development

An IT Strategic Plan articulates the strategic direction and priorities for IT at the University in a manner that is closely aligned with, and supportive of the University's overall strategic plan and the business plans of its faculties and administrative units.

IT Governance, specifically through UITAC (**See Section 2.1**), is how the *Information Services and Technology unit* (IST) will engage the University in developing and refining the University IT Strategic Plan.

1.1.3 IT Investment Review Process

An IT investment review and approval process where university-wide IT planning, investment and priority setting is transparent and coordinated is fundamental to an environment of control at the

University. This will support the University's interest in pursuing those IT projects that serve the greatest university-wide priorities.


A structured IT investment review process ensures that all proposals are received, assessed, prioritized and approved in a way that is rationalized on a university-wide basis. The process is aligned and integrated with the Strategic Resource Planning process (Budget Review, Capital Planning, and Integrated Planning committees) to ensure that it complements rather than duplicates the existing budgeting process.

2 IT Governance Structure

The IT Governance structure is made up of a council, 5 committees, the CIO and the VP Administration, with support from the IST Project Management Office (PMO) and IST Planning and Governance (P&G).

The VP Administration, on the recommendation of the CIO, approves all IT investment at the university. The University Information Technology Advisory Council (UITAC) recommends investment to the CIO and VP Administration.

UITAC is supported by five committees structured into portfolios that represent the University’s faculty, student, research, and administrative business needs and supported by a cross-campus information technology body. This portfolio approach allows for committees (and any future committees) to discuss initiatives, challenges and priorities with clear scope and context and, thus avoid confusion about purpose or alignment.



2.1 Committees

There are four primary committees:

- The **Senate Committee on Academic Computing (SCACom)**;
- The **Student IT Experience Committee (SITEC)**;
- The **Research Computing Advisory Committee (RCAC)**; and
- The **Administrative Services IT Governance Committee (ASITGC)**.

A fifth committee - the **Enterprise IT Architecture Committee (EITAC)** – serves two primary roles:

- Serving as a portfolio committee with respect to all in-scope IT projects of a university-wide IT infrastructure or common IT service nature.
- Serves as a technical feasibility review committee for all proposals that are recommended by the other four primary committees

2.1.1 Administration and Accountability

IT Governance is supported and administered by the IST Project Management Office (PMO) under the direction of the IST Director, Planning and Governance. The PMO ensures proper classification and handling of requests, supports the committees and otherwise administers the governance processes.

IST Planning & Governance ensure the accountability of the process by reporting to UITAC on the investments, and generally administering and refining the governance processes.

2.2 CIO and Vice-President Administration (CIO/VP Admin)

The Vice-President Administration (VP Admin) retains responsibility and authority for IT at the University. This includes approval authority for initiatives and investments that the University may undertake as well as the governance process itself. The CIO works closely with the VP Admin and exercises delegated authority for oversight and approval within the governance process as determined by the VP Admin.

Mandate:

In the context of IT Governance

- Reviews and Approve IT Investments recommended by UITAC;
- Allocate or otherwise secure funding for projects that are approved with insufficient funding;
- Provide authority and mandate to the IT Governance Process; and
- Ensure the functioning of the IT Governance Process.

Scope:

Information Technology at The University.

All plans, projects and priorities across the University recommended by UITAC.

Membership:

- Vice-President Administration
- Chief Information Officer

Terms and Processes:

- Meets as needed

2.3 Committee Chairs (Chairs)

The Committee Chairs (Chairs) meet before each UITAC to review all proposals. The chairs look for opportunities for collaboration and synergies across all proposals. The chairs also provide feedback on the governance process.

Mandate:

- Review proposals from all the committees to share information;
- Review proposals for inconsistencies or identify opportunities across the entire university that may not have been identified;
- Gather feedback on the IT Governance process and determine how the process can be improved;
- Review recommendations in regards to process and governance; and
- Consider, recommend and seek committee members for all IT Governance committees.

Scope:

All plans, projects and priorities across the University recommended to UITAC.
The IT Governance Process.

Membership:

- Chairs/Co-Chairs of all IT Governance Committees
- Chief Information Officers
- Director, Planning & Governance
- Manager, Project Management Office

Chair:

- Director, Planning & Governance

Secretariat: CIO Office

Terms and Processes:

- Meets before all UITAC, and after all committees (when possible)

2.4 The University IT Advisory Council (UITAC)

The university-wide IT governance framework features an executive-level committee – the University IT Advisory Council (UITAC). UITAC replaces the former PACITi group - with a stronger mandate to provide university-wide recommendations and direction on IT strategy and investments. The UITAC will engage senior-level leaders from across the University in providing recommendations and advice to the Vice-President, Administration and the CIO with respect to IT strategies and investment proposals.

Mandate:

- Ensures the effectiveness of IT Governance and its alignment with university-wide strategy and business priorities;
- Reviews university-wide IT investments for alignment with institutional goals; evaluates their benefits and risks; and recommends investments to the VP Administration/CIO approval; and
- Supports the development and review of a university-wide IT strategy.
- Approve membership on all IT Governance committees.

Scope:

- All plans, projects and priorities across the University recommended to UITAC by its committees.
- IT Governance process

Membership:

- Vice-Provost (Graduate Education);
- Vice-Provost (Students);
- Vice-Provost (Integrated Planning & Academic Programming);
- Associate Vice-President (Partnerships);
- Associate Vice-President (External Relations);
- Three Deans as appointed by the Chair, for a three-year term - selected to represent the diversity of faculties. The Chair may renew the terms of appointed Deans. In addition, the Chair may choose to adjust the appointment terms of these Deans in the interest of staggering appointments to support continuity
- Chief Information Officer;
- University Librarian;
- Chief Risk Officer;
- President, UMSU;
- President, UMGSA; and
- All UITAC Committee Chairs (as per below) - *ex-officio; non-voting*
- Director, Planning and Governance, IST – *ex-officio non-voting*

Chair: Vice-President, Administration

Secretariat: CIO Office

Terms and Processes:

- Meets at least quarterly (more often if required).
- Attendance is defined as in-person, by phone, by video call
- Members must be in attendance to vote.

Quorum:

- 60% of filled voting positions, in attendance.

2.5 Senate Committee on Academic Computing (SCACom)

The SCACom's focus is the teaching and learning IT portfolio. The committee reports to UITAC as well as the University Senate on all IT matters relating to teaching and learning.

Mandate:

- Fosters innovation in educational programming, especially as it relates to technology in teaching and learning.

Scope:

- Receive, review, prioritize and make recommendations on all IT plans and projects applicable to the teaching and learning systems and supports;
- Advise and inform the Senate on all matters pertaining to IT for teaching and learning; and
- Foster communication and share expertise on teaching related IT issues and practices.

Membership:

- Vice-President - Research and International, or Designate (*ex-officio*);
- Vice-Provost (Students);
- Two Deans or Directors elected by Senate;
- Six members of the academic staff elected by Senate (at least one from the Bannatyne Campus);
- Four Students elected by the Senate (Two Undergraduate; Two Graduate students);
- Dean, Faculty of Health Sciences;
- Chief Information Officer;
- University Librarian (*ex-officio*); and
- Education Specialist, Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL) (*ex-officio*).

Chair: VP Academic and Provost (or delegate)

Secretariat: Office of the University Secretary, Governance System Coordinator

Sub-Committees and Working Groups reporting to SCACom:

- Online and Blended Learning Implementation Working Group
- Instructional Design Group (Distance and Online Education)
- Faculty of Medicine (Health Sciences) Informatics & eCurriculum Working Group

Terms and Processes:

- Meets a minimum of four times annually;
- Provides a report quarterly to UITAC; and
- Reports annually to the Senate.

2.6 Student IT Experience Committee (SITEC)

SITEC's focus is the student IT experience.

Mandate:

- Provides a forum for students and members of the University administration to identify opportunities and develop a prioritized list of recommended projects where the use of information technology would enhance the student experience at the University.

Scope:

- Receive, review, prioritize and make recommendations on all IT plans and projects applicable to enriching the student experience.

Membership:

- Two (2) undergraduate students appointed by UMSU;
- Two (2) graduate students appointed by UMGSA;
- One (1) Member, Student Affairs Leadership Team appointed by the Vice-Provost (Students);
- Director, Client Services, IST; and
- One (1) Member, Administration appointed by the Associate Vice-President Administration.

As requested, from time to time, additional people may be invited to attend Committee meetings to present information or act as resources.

Co-Chairs:

- Director, Client Services, IST; and
- Member, Student Affairs Leadership Team, Student Affairs.

Secretariat: CIO Office

Sub-Committees and Working Groups reporting to SITEC:

- Mobile Applications Sub-Committee

Terms and Processes:

- Meets a minimum of four times annually;
- Reports quarterly to UITAC;
- Agendas will be circulated a minimum of three days in advance of each meeting. Minutes will be kept; and
- UMSU, GSA, and the IST Leadership (CIO) will be informed of meeting results through the circulation of minutes.

2.7 Research Computing Advisory Committee (RCAC)

The focus of the Research Computing Advisory Committee (RCAC) is the University's research computing IT portfolio. The users of research computing have widely varied requirements that range from depending on IT and computing facilities as tools incidental to their research (such as, the gathering, storage, and analysis of data) to supporting research in computing as the primary focus of their work. Many researchers also require access to resources further afield including access to cloud computing (including advanced research computing), remote data bases, and collaborative environments.

Mandate:

- Recommends and prioritizes proposals and projects in support of the research computing environment across the University, including the allocation of advanced research computing (ARC) resources;
- Advises the CIO and other enablers regarding the University's Strategic Research Plan and the alignment of university-wide IT plans and strategies to that plan;
- Advises the Vice-President (Research and International) on institutional level research applications involving/requiring research computing infrastructure and its support; and
- Advises on interactions and protocols with other institutions and granting organizations outside of the University that support IT and Advanced Research Computing (ARC) as part of collaborative research funding programs (i.e., CFI, CANARIE, Compute Canada, and WestGrid).

Scope:

- Receive, review, prioritize, and make recommendations on all IT plans and projects applicable to enhancing the research environment and requirements of the University.

Membership:

- Vice-President (Research and International);
- Five (5) Associate Deans (Research) representative of the diversity of research computing across the campus (as appointed by the Chair)
- University Librarian;
- Five (5) researchers representative of the diversity of research computing across the campus (as appointed by the Chair); and
- Representative from IST Leadership Team (as appointed by CIO).

Co-Chairs:

- Associate Vice-President (Research and Partnerships); and
- Director, Computer and Network Services, IST.

Secretariat: CIO Office

Sub-Committees and Working Groups reporting to RCAC:

- High-Performance Computing Committee

Terms and Processes:

- Meets a minimum of four times annually; and
- Reports quarterly to UITAC.

2.8 Administrative Services IT Governance Committee (ASITGC)

ASITGC's focus is the administrative operations and services IT portfolio.

Mandate:

- Aligns Administrative Services IT related plans with UITAC direction;
- Recommends to UITAC strategic investments that will provide substantial benefits to Administrative Services;
- Prioritizes Administrative Services IT project related activities when necessary; and
- Reviews university-wide IT investments for alignment with institutional goals, evaluates their benefits and risks and recommends IT project investments to UITAC.

Scope:

- Receive, review, prioritize and make recommendations on all IT plans and projects applicable to the University's administrative services and requirements; and
- All plans, projects and priorities applicable to support administration through the use of technology systems and supports within this portfolio fall within the mandate of ASITGC.

Membership:

- University Registrar;
- University Comptroller;
- University Librarian;
- Executive Director, Office of Institutional Analysis;
- Director, Human Resources;
- Director, Donor Relations;
- Director, Office of Research Services;
- Director, Planning and Governance, IST

Chair: University Comptroller

Secretariat: CIO Office

Sub-Committees and Working Groups reporting to ASITGC:

- Web Steering Committee
- Mobile Applications Sub-Committee

Terms and Processes:

- Chair is a two-year term – rotating chair as voted by members of the Committee.
- Meets a minimum of four times annually; and
- Reports quarterly to UITAC

2.9 Enterprise IT Architecture Committee (EITAC)

The EITAC's focus is university-wide IT architecture, infrastructure, applications, data and security domains. It serves to support the cross-university IT foundation. In this context, EITAC serves as a technical oversight committee with respect to all in-scope IT projects of a university-wide IT infrastructure or common IT service nature. It also serves as a technical feasibility review committee for all proposals that are recommended by the other governance committees

Mandate:

- Reviews and prioritizes in-scope IT projects from a university-wide IT architecture, infrastructure, applications, data and security perspective.
- Considers submissions in the context of strategic IT objectives and prioritizes in-scope IT projects accordingly.
- May create submissions based on technology foundations or prerequisites that are required to support other submissions or projects at the university.
- Highlights and escalates in-scope IT projects that require exceptions from university-wide standards and best practices

Scope:

- Receive, review, prioritize and make recommendations on all IT plans and projects applicable to the IT technical architecture and infrastructure of the university;
- May review any submissions under consideration by UITAC and its committees to ensure alignment with the University's technical architecture and IT standards and guidelines; and
- Articulates exception rationale and constraints for IT projects that have a strong business case for non-alignment with IT standards and guidelines – for approval by the CIO.

Membership:

- Director, Technology Services, IST;
- Director, Planning and Governance, IST;
- Enterprise Architect;
- Manager, Application Development;
- Manager, Application Maintenance;
- Manager, Infrastructure Maintenance;
- Manager, Infrastructure Development;
- Manager, Desk-side support;

Co-Chairs:

- Director, Technology Services, IST
- Director, Planning and Governance, IST

Secretariat: CIO Office

Sub-Committees and Working Groups reporting to EITAC:

- IT Architecture Practice

Terms and Processes:

- Meets monthly or as needed;
- Reports to CIO-IST; and
- Reports quarterly to UITAC.

2.10 IST Project Management Office (PMO)

The IST Project Management Office (PMO) provides administrative support to the IT Governance Process. This includes intake, coordination and other general administrative duties in support of the processes and committees.

Mandate:

In the context of IT Governance:

- Intake, classification and coordination of all investment proposals.
- General process coordination and administration.
- Coordination with committee secretariat and committee chairs to ensure proper functioning of committees.
- Support to IST Planning and Governance for reporting and accountability.
- Support to proponents and advocates in creating and refining investment proposals.
- Support to proponents and advocates in navigation the governance process

Scope:

All in-scope plans, projects and priorities across the University that fall (or may fall) within the scope of IT Governance.

Membership:

- IST Project Management Office

2.11 IST Planning & Governance (P&G)

IST Planning & Governance (P&G) provides oversight and control of the IT Governance Process and serves as the point of accountability for the IT Governance Process to UITAC, the CIO and the VP Administration.

Mandate:

In the context of IT Governance

- Oversee and direct the work of IST in support of the IT Governance Process;
- Refine and adapt administrative processes as required to support the IT Governance Process;
- Monitor and propose adjustments to the IT Governance Process based on observations and input from committees;
- Seek input from UITAC and Committee Chairs on process changes; and
- Provide regular accountability reporting to UITAC on the IT Governance Process.

Scope:

- All in-scope plans, projects and priorities across the University that fall (or may fall) within the scope of IT Governance; and
- The IT Governance Process in general.

Membership:

- Director, Planning & Governance
- Manager, IST Project Management Office

3 IT Governance Scope

All IT projects that meet one or more of the following criteria at the University are in scope for IT Governance:

- **Over 20k** - The cost of the investment specific to the information technology (eg. hardware devices, software products, and/or network infrastructure; acquisition and licensing costs; professional services, etc.) needed to implement the proposed solution is in excess of \$20,000; (including tax)
- **Over 20 Days** - The requirement of IST resources needed to implement the proposed solution is expected or has the potential to be in excess of 20 person days in total. These 20 days include:
 - Any time required from ITPC for procurement
 - Any time required from Security to complete a Threat Risk Assessment
 - Any time required to completed a Privacy Impact Assessment
 - Any time required to Analyze, Design, Configure, and/or Customize the solution
- **Core Network** - The proposed solution is expected to or has the potential to be integrated into the core University network, data centre, and/or infrastructure.

3.1 Key Principles

Principle	Description
Ongoing Costs should be included.	Funding proposals are for first year costs and ongoing costs. These costs should cover capital costs, license fees, and consultant costs.
Advocates involved throughout.	Project advocates “own” their proposals throughout the process with governance committees presiding over the proposal endorsement process – exercising review and due diligence in recommending projects to UITAC and, in turn, the CIO and Vice-President Administration;
Business Focus	The process is primarily “business” vs. “technology” based. As such, projects will be proposed, assessed, prioritized and approved through a common and transparent criteria set that are based on business needs, drivers and considerations. As such, the criteria will be founded on a balanced assessment of two primary factors – <i>Value (Benefits & Strategic Alignment)</i> and <i>Risk & Complexity</i> ;
PMO will manage the process	Proposals will be assigned by the PMO-IT to one UITAC committee for review to avoid potential dual ownership of proposals;

Alignment to SRP	IT Investment review process will be aligned with the university-wide Strategic Resource Planning budget approval processes to ensure an integrated and efficient approval process that avoids duplication of process and effort;
Approval vs Execution	The IT Investment review process separates intake-to-approval process from project execution. Procurement, execution and benefits realization is not part of the review process (beyond the need to report on these outcomes)
Funded projects still require approval.	It is recognized that some IT project proposals may enter the process as fully funded and resourced – i.e. from external sources or internal budgets (and, therefore, would not impact draw on existing CIO and IST resources). Such proposals may be granted approval by the CIO for inclusion in UITAC’s investment project portfolio. However, these projects would still proceed through the evaluation criteria scoring by the appropriate committee and will need to be assessed by EITAC (for alignment with University IT standards and guidelines).

4 IT Governance Processes

4.1 Sub-Committees and Working Groups

UITAC and its Committees may form additional sub-committees and working groups as needed. Sub-committees are ongoing groups that are responsible for issues and decisions in certain areas of responsibility or interest of the University. Working groups are defined as time-bound groups assigned specific problems to solve or tasks to accomplish. As such, they are not considered standing or ongoing governing bodies.

4.2 Governance Membership

Committee membership is designed to be representative of the campus community. Generally, members are selected to represent academic, student, research and administrative units of varying size.

Members are recommended to the Governance Committee Chairs by governance committee members, by members of the campus community, or through a search process to identify potential members who represent a specific unit or group that is not currently represented in the governance membership. If specific expertise is desired or required for a particular project of governance, experts are identified and recommended to the Governance Committee Chairs. After recommendations are considered, committee member candidates are finalized by the committee for review and approval by UITAC.

Membership on committees must be approved by UITAC.

4.2.1 Delegation of Membership.

Long term, executive level staff are required for consistency, collaboration, and proper decision making. To that end, membership on committees is not be delegated. In rare situations where membership must be delegated, the delegation

- a) must be approved by the Vice-President Academic; and
- b) must be long term, or, preferably, permanent.

Delegation in the event of absence for one meeting is not appropriate.

4.2.2 Sub-committees Membership

Sub-Committee and working group membership can consist of committee members or any qualified personnel identified by the committee and do not require approval by UITAC.

4.3 Terms of Reference and Operating Procedures

UITAC and its committees are responsible to create Terms of Reference from the mandate statements outlined above as required. The Terms of Reference should include operating procedures that address:

- Decision-making and issue escalation processes;
- Member expectations and participation – including delegation/Non-delegation authorities;
- Meeting agenda and supporting documents – including agenda input, processes governing advance material required, timelines, records of decision/action; and
- Other logistic matters as required

The Vice-President Academic must approve all terms of reference.

IST Planning & Governance will support the development of all terms of reference at the direction of the committee chair.

4.4 Meeting Logistics

The CIO office is will provide secretariat and support services to all IT Governance committees except where noted or otherwise directed by the committee chair. The Committee Chairs and IST PMO will coordinate the timing of committee efforts and ensure proper functioning of the process.

4.5 Process Phases

The IT Investment review process contains nine key phases governing the life-cycle of a proposal from generation to execution as a project.



4.5.1 Submission and Refinement

In IT Governance, the **Investment Proposal** is the starting point of turning an idea into a project. Proposals can be submitted by any person or group at the University.

All proposal submissions are sent first to the PMO for an initial completeness review. If additional information or clarification is required, the PMO consults with the proponents and/or advocate. The PMO also determines the category of the submission and the process path that the submission will follow including the committee to which the proposal will be sent for review.

If the proposal crosses committee mandates, the PMO, in consultation with the committee chairs, will determine the appropriate committee for the proposal. In some cases, multiple committees may review a proposal.

4.5.2 Committee Evaluation

The committee evaluation process has 4 steps:



Qualification

Committees will review the proposals assigned to them to qualify them for evaluation.

For proposals that do not meet the minimum assessment criteria, the Committee Chair (or PMO at the direction of the chair) will notify the project's advocate that the committee does not intend to proceed with the proposal or it requires additional information in order to proceed.



Clarification

Committees may request additional information it deems necessary to support its evaluation of the proposal – i.e. from the submitter and/or advocate, from other UITAC committees (that may be impacted by the proposal), from interested/expert parties at the University or any sub-committee/working group the Committee may choose to establish to assemble the required information.



Evaluation

The Committee evaluates proposals using considerations specific to the Committee's mandate. Committees should only recommend proposals that they are prepared to support and defend at UITAC.

The committee may:

1. Return the proposal for refinement;
2. Reject the proposal;
3. Recommend the proposal for approval.

In the case of **returned or rejected** proposals, the chair of the committee will communicate the decision to the proponent.

In the case of **recommended** proposals, the chair (or the PMO under the direction of the chair) will communicate the decision to the proponent.



Prioritization

In situations where there is significant work being evaluated by the IT Governance committees, the committees may be asked (by the PMO) to prioritize the proposals.

4.5.2.1 Appeal

Should a proposal's advocate/proponent disagree with a committee's decision the advocate may appeal the decision. Appeals proceed as follows:

1. The advocate or proponent discusses the issues with the Committee Chair to seek clarification and resolution.
2. If the issues cannot be resolved, the advocate notifies the PMO of their desire to appeal.
3. The advocate or proponent raises the issue with their dean, director or Vice-President.
4. The PMO notifies the CIO and Committee Chair of the appeal.
5. The CIO, Committee Chair, Advocate and D/D/VP will meet to discuss the issue and resolve the situation.
6. In the event of continued disagreement, the Vice-President Administration retains authority to arbitrate disputes.

4.5.3 EITAC Review and Comment

EITAC, along with being a committee of the IT Governance process, also acts as a technical reviewer for all proposals. They may (at the discretion of the chair, or by request of another committee chair or the PMO) review any proposals for technical feasibility and adherence to standards and provide comment.

See 2.9 Enterprise IT Architecture Committee (EITAC)

4.5.4 Committee Chairs Review

Before being reviewed at UITAC, the recommended proposals are reviewed at a meeting of the committee chairs. The purpose of this meeting is to:

1. Review proposals from all the committees to **share information**;
2. Review proposals to **spot inconsistencies** or **identify opportunities** across the entire university;
3. Gather **feedback on the IT Governance process** and suggest changes; and
4. Review **process and governance recommendations** before they are proposed to UITAC.

See 2.3 Committee Chairs (Chairs)

4.5.5 UITAC Evaluation Process

UITAC receives proposals of two types:

1. **For information.** Proposals that do not require approval, but help to understand the University IT landscape as a whole.
2. **For evaluation:** Proposals that have been recommended by an IT Governance committee and requires action by UITAC to recommend or reject it.

UITAC evaluation process has 2 steps



Evaluation


Proposals received for evaluation will be presented by a member of the committee recommending it. UITAC will consider all proposals taking a university-wide view in its work. Its assessment will also include consideration of balancing of resources, budgets and implementation capacity.

UITAC may:

1. **Reject** the proposal;
2. **Recommend** the proposal for approval.

In the case of a **rejected** proposals, the chair of the originating committee will communicate the decision to the proponent.

In the case of **recommended** proposals, the chair of the originating committee (or the PMO under the direction of the chair) will communicate the decision to the proponent.



Prioritization

The PMO will offer - for approval - a proposed order and timeline for projects. In a situation where the work exceeds ISTs ability to reasonably execute, UITAC will be asked to prioritize the work.

4.5.5.1 Appeal

The appeal process for UITAC is identical to that of the Committee. **See 4.5.2.1 Appeal**

4.5.6 Approval

The VP Administration in consultation with (or by delegation to) the CIO will review all IT Investment proposals recommended by UITAC.

The CIO/VP may:

1. Approve the proposal
2. Reject the proposal

If a proposal is **rejected**, the CIO will communicate the results with the proponent.

If a proposal is **approved**, the original committee chair (or the PMO under the direction of the committee chair) will communicate the results to the proponent.

4.5.7 Budget Allocation

Some submissions come with budget confirmed, but others have no budget yet allocated. For these submissions, the first step after the submission has been approved is to allocate budget.

The CIO is responsible to facilitating the funding conversation for approved unfunded (or partially funded) projects. In the event that funding is required, the advocate is first consulted for budget availability. If no budget is available, the CIO, in consultation with the VP Administration, determines if they wish to fund the project.

If no budget can be found, the project will be placed on hold until budget can be allocated.

4.5.8 Resource Allocation and Scheduling

Once the project has budget allocated, the PMO schedules the project, forms the project board, and allocates key project resources including a project manager. Based on the scheduling, the planning and initiation activities begin.

4.5.9 Project Execution


Project execution will follow established methodologies as defined by the PMO. Projects run under the direction of the project board.

5 IT Governance Approval Paths

All proposals go through a review and approval process appropriate to their scope and impact. There are 6 approval paths:

1. Standard – most investments come through this process.
2. Fully Resourced – investments that have full allocation for time and resources outside IST.
3. Research – investments driven based on research requirements.
4. Mandatory – investments that are a regulatory, legal necessity or otherwise deemed required.
5. IST Operational – technical investments to maintain the IT infrastructure and systems.
6. Direct to CIO – and expedited process for urgent requests

5.1 Standard




Most of the proposals will generally follow this standard process flow (i.e. the proposal does not meet the definition for any of the following exception processes).

Stage	Description	Outcomes/Action
Discovery	Define and socialize idea	Idea
Articulate	Refine and submit proposal	Proposal
PMO	Review proposal, suggest changes, determine path.	Forward
Committee	Review proposal and recommend for approval or reject it. May also seek clarification.	Recommend Reject
EITAC	Review proposal for technical feasibility. May comment.	Comment Forward
Chairs	Review all proposals for consistency and opportunities.	Forward
UITAC	Review all recommended proposals	Recommend Reject
CIO/VP Admin	Review all recommended proposals	Approve Reject

High Level Process : Committee(Recommend) → UITAC(Recommend) → VP/CIO (Approve)

5.2 Fully Resourced




If the proposal is providing for all of the funding and resources required, the proposal can be considered *Fully Resourced* and approved prior to UITAC. This assumes that

1. The advocate's respective unit or faculty is providing all **funding, staffing and any other** resourcing needed to fully implement the proposal;
2. No funding or staffing is required from IST;
3. The IT element of this proposal *may* impact the core IT infrastructure of the University.

UITAC retains the authority to veto these proposals and may defer or otherwise prioritize the implementation the proposal. There is no budget limit for this type of proposal.

High Level Process : Committee(Recommend) → VP/CIO (Approve) → UITAC(Veto)

5.3 Research




Investment proposals are proposals that:

1. support specific research with an IT component of over \$20,000;
2. do not require any resources from IST;
3. do not require any additional funding from the University;
4. do not impact the core IT infrastructure of the University; and
5. have already been approved for funding by a faculty.

Such investment proposal submissions are received for informational only so that the investment information can be captured and incorporated in the current IT Investment Plan. An example of such an investment could be a research initiative that may be partially funded by an external body with the balance of the funding coming from a faculty.

High Level Process : RCAC Committee (Approve) → CIO (Receive) → UITAC (Receive)

5.4 Mandatory




Investments that are required as a result of a legislative, University governance, contractual or regulatory requirement:

1. **Legislative** is a compliance requirement resulting from municipal, provincial, or federal legislation.
2. **University governance** is a directive from the University Senate or Board of Governors.
3. **Contractual** is a legal requirement as a result of an existing contract, or some other legal requirement that the University is required to address.
4. **Regulatory** is a constraint or compliance requirement from a regularity body for the University such as Tri-Council, OAG, or Internal Audit.
5. **Executive** is a directive from the President's executive team.

These proposals are not received by their respective committee's due to their nature of not being discretionary. EITAC receives the proposal to provide comment on the technical impact and feasibility and provides the comments to the CIO/VP Admin. Rejection, in this context, is possible, but would be done in consultation with the proponent and consider mandatory nature of the proposal.

High Level Process: EITAC (Comment) → CIO (Approve) → UITAC (Receive)


5.5 IST Operational



Investment proposals that are IST internal and do not introduce new business functionality. These proposals are typically advocated by IST staff. There are no limits on budget amount or resource effort for these proposals. This category is meant to communicate the significant work that is being done that business would typically be unaware of.

High Level Process: EITAC Committee(Recommend) → CIO (Approve) → UITAC (Receive)

5.6 Direct to CIO



Urgent proposal that meets the following criteria:

1. Between \$20,000 and \$50,000;
2. less than 20 IST days of effort; and
3. has the potential to impact the core infrastructure.

This category is meant to address the proposals that have a need to be expedited prior to the next UITAC meeting.

Process : Committee Chair (Recommend) → EITAC (Forward) → CIO (Approve) → UITAC (Receive)

Appendix A – Glossary of Terms

TERM	DEFINITION
Advocate	The individual who proposes, sponsors, and lobbies for a proposed project, and who will represent this proposal to the University on behalf of their respective faculty/department/unit. This individual is usually a Dean, Director, or Department Head.
ASITGC	An acronym for the Administrative Services IT Governance Committee which is part of the IT Governance structure.
CIO	An acronym for Chief Information Officer.
CIO Office	Refers to the administrative, Leadership and PMO areas that support the CIO of the Information Services and Technology department.
Committee	Refers to the 5 Committees within IT Governance which report to UITAC – RCAC, SITEC, ASITGCS, SCACom, EITAC
EITAC	An acronym for the Enterprise IT Architecture Committee which is part of the IT Governance model supporting both UITAC and the Committees.
IST	An acronym for the Information Services and Technology Unit of the University of Manitoba
IT Governance	This is the structure and processes used to receive, assess, evaluate and select IT proposals based on a University Wide perspective.
IT Investment	An expenditure on information technology assets (ex. equipment, licences, software), and/or external information technology resources that will likely require both one-time and ongoing funding. The investment is realized by the implementation of the proposed IT Project.

TERM	DEFINITION
IT Project	<p>A proposed project that meets <u>one or more</u> of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the cost of the investment specific to the information technology (ex. hardware devices, software products, and/or network infrastructure; acquisition and 1st year licensing costs; professional services, etc.) needed to implement¹ the proposed solution is in excess of \$20,000; the requirement of resources from IST needed to implement the proposed solution is expected or has the potential to be in excess of 20 person days in total; This total includes the numbers of days required from IST staff AND consultants. the proposed solution is expected to or has the potential to be integrated into the core University network, data centre, and/or infrastructure.
PACITi	An acronym for the President’s Advisory Council on Information Technology and Innovation. It is a former executive level governance committee that has been replaced by UITAC – University IT Advisory Council.
Portfolio	Refers to the collection of enterprise wide Information Technology (IT) proposals and projects.
Proponent	The Advocate or Submitter of an IT Investment proposal for a project.
RCAC	An acronym for the Research Computing Advisory Committee which is part of the IT Governance structure.
SCACom	An acronym for the Senate Committee on Academic Computing which is part of the IT Governance structure.
SITEC	An acronym for the Student IT Experience Committee which is part of the IT Governance structure.
Submitter	The person documenting the content of a proposal on behalf of the proposal's advocate. This person could also be working with the advocate to provide subject matter expertise on content.
UITAC	An acronym for the University IT Advisory Council which is part of the IT Governance structure.

¹ Implementation costs are not to include any 'post-project', operating costs.