The term “IT Governance” refers to any campus-wide decision-making system used to set technology policy; such systems are common at many colleges and universities and serve both to coordinate the use and development of technology across all campus units and to allow the structured participation of the community in setting strategic goals and establishing institutional priorities.

This document describes the current system of IT governance at Brandeis University, the goal of which is to make well-informed decisions as expeditiously as possible.

Committees
One steering committee and three subcommittees are created.

Structure
Governance structures are meant to provide representation for stakeholders, and a framework for community decision-making.

Process
Projects are proposed, researched, petitioned for, and approved by going through the steps on this flow chart.

Project Proposal Form
Brandeis community members use this online proposal form to submit any proposal to the Brandeis University IT Governance process.

Project Petition
LTS project managers use this template to standardize project proposals. Project Petitions are then submitted to the subcommittees for review.

Ranking Grid
Once a Project Petition is submitted to the appropriate subcommittee, each subcommittee member evaluates the Petition.

Calendar
Project Proposal Forms are reviewed in the order in which they are submitted, with the steering committee ranking them in February, June, and October.
As part of the IT Governance process, one steering committee and three subcommittees are created. All committees are composed of 5 – 7 members, one of whom is named chair.

Subcommittee and steering committee members serve a term of three years, with adjustments expected in the first two years of the program to allow for phased term expirations. Members normally will have served for one or more years on a given subcommittee before serving as chairs.

Subcommittees review proposals throughout the year as they are submitted. The steering committee meets three times a year to review the recommendations of the subcommittees.

**IT Governance Steering Committee**

Purpose: to ratify the projects approved by the subcommittees, to create and manage the queue of approved projects, to recommend projects needing new funding for the consideration of the Integrated Planning and Budget Committee (IPBC), to evaluate projects that cross multiple subcommittee categories, and to review and adjust the IT Governance process.

Appointments: members include the three chairs of the subcommittees. The chair is the Chief Information Officer.

**Academic Subcommittee**

Purpose: to formulate and recommend University priorities, strategy, and spending on information technology and services, as it relates to the University’s academic mission.

Appointments: members and chair are nominated jointly by the Associate Provost for Assessment and Innovation in Student Learning and the Senior Advisor to the Provost for Research, and approved by the leaders of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, the Heller School, the Rabb School, and the International Business School. Nominees might include members of the Committee for the Support of Teaching, the Academic Technology Advisory Group, and the High-Performance Computing Cluster (HPCC) Advisory Group.

**Administrative Subcommittee**

Purpose: to formulate and recommend University priorities, strategy, and spending on information technology and services, as it relates to University administrative operations.

Appointments: members are Senior Vice Presidents and Vice-Provosts or their designees. This committee addresses issues such as finance, communications, human resources, student and registrarial services, alumni relations, facilities, institutional planning, admissions, and health care, consulting with the Financials User Group, HR Information Systems Group, and sage Steering Committee as necessary. The chair is appointed by the Chief Operating Officer.

**Student Life Subcommittee**

Purpose: to formulate and recommend University priorities, strategy, and spending on information technology and services, as it relates to the student experience at Brandeis.

Appointments: most members are students nominated by undergraduate and graduate student government. Membership may overlap with that of the Student Information Technology Advisory Committee. The chair is appointed by the Senior Vice President for Students and Enrollment, who may also appoint faculty or staff as members.

**Related Groups**

Existing committees (such as the Communications Subcommittee of the University Advisory Committee and the Information Security Advisory Committee) provide input when projects that cross multiple subcommittee categories are proposed.

LTS staff with relevant expertise may join subcommittees as nonvoting members.

LTS project managers help others to produce informed Proposals and Petitions, and they work to ensure timeliness and transparency in IT Governance.
**Structure**

**Integrated Planning and Budget Committee**

**IT Governance Steering Committee**

**Academic Subcommittee**
Topics such as:
- Data curation
- Regulatory compliance
- Centers & Institutes
- Classroom technology
- Academic software

**Administrative Subcommittee**
Topics such as:
- Student enrollment systems
- Budget systems
- Payroll systems
- Business intelligence
- Admissions systems

**Student Life Subcommittee**
Topics such as:
- Information services for students
- Community informatics
- Information self-awareness
- Classroom technology
- Student information systems

**Communications**
Communications Subcommittee of the University Advisory Committee.

**Security**
Information Security Advisory Committee.

**Infrastructure**
IT leadership from Colleges, Schools, and Centers;
Data Warehouse Steering Group.
1. Proposal
A Brandeis community member submits the online Project Proposal Form.

2. Triage
Within a week, LTS project managers review the proposal and contact the proposer(s).

   Proposals that require no new resources, can be done without LTS assistance, and don’t interface with any University systems are exempted from ITG review.

3. Research
An LTS project manager and the proposer(s), engaging with stakeholders as necessary, develop a Project Petition.

4. Subcommittee Ranking
Throughout the year, subcommittee members review the relevant Project Petitions, ranking each.

5. Subcommittee Approval
Each subcommittee chair combines his/her members’ rankings, recommending projects to advance in the process.

6. CIO Review
From the recommended project proposals, the Chief Information Officer determines which projects can be done with existing resources.

7. Steering Committee
The steering committee, engaging with others as necessary, prioritizes recommendations from all of the subcommittees.

8. Funding & Implementation
Funded, highly ranked projects are scheduled for implementation. Resources are sought for highly ranked projects without existing funds; projects for which sufficient resources cannot be found may be resubmitted after one year.
Brandeis community members should use this online form to submit proposals to the IT Governance process. Within a week, an LTS project manager contacts the proposer(s) to confirm receipt of the proposal and to begin the conversation about developing a Project Petition. Please note:

- Proposals will benefit from consultative development, so do submit them as soon as possible.
- A proposed project may be exempt from IT Governance if it requires no new resources, can be done without LTS assistance, and doesn’t interface with any University systems; it may still need to be discussed for reasons of policy.
- If a proposed project would be grant funded, do not fill out this form, but instead begin by emailing a brief description to ltsgrantsupport@brandeis.edu.

1. Proposers
   List the names, department affiliations, and contact information of the individual(s) submitting this proposal.

2. Title
   Give a short name for your proposed project.

3. Description
   a. Describe in one or two sentences the nature of the project and its expected benefit (including reduction of risk) to the University.
   b. What University systems (e.g. LATTE, sage, or Brandeis Login) might the proposed project require or impact?
   c. If approved, when should this project be completed? Are there any other deadlines that ITG committees should be made aware of?

4. Possible Exemption
   Should this project be considered exempt from IT Governance? Even if it is, we’d like to know about it, in case we can connect you to others with shared interest.

5. Cost
   a. What is the estimated cost of the project? Don’t forget staffing costs.
      • less than $50,000
      • $50,000 up to $100,000
      • $100,000 up to $250,000
      • $250,000 or more
   b. Have any financial or staff resources already been committed to this project?
   c. What is your best estimate of any savings that could be realized through the project?

6. Benefit
   a. Which categories describe the nature of the benefit of the proposed project?
      • increased efficiency
      • improved functionality
      • new knowledge
      • improved morale
   b. What is the estimated scope of impact for this project?
      • a work group
      • a department
      • multiple departments
      • a subset of the student body
      • the entire student body
      • the entire University

7. Collaboration / Endorsement
   Have any departments or individuals reviewed and endorsed this proposal? Does it have an administrative or faculty sponsor? Proposals for projects estimated to cost over $50,000 should include a letter of support from at least one senior campus leader, e.g. a dean or senior vice president.

8. Strategic Considerations
   a. Does this project advance University strategic goals?
   b. Does this project provide the University with a competitive advantage of any kind?

9. Additional Data
   List any additional data or criteria that the relevant subcommittee should consider when evaluating your proposal.
LTS project managers use this template to standardize project proposals. Project Petitions are then submitted to the subcommittees for review. Maximum length is 2 pages.

**Petitioners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title**

The short name for this project.

**Description**

A 2 – 3 sentence summary of the project, including its expected benefit to the University, impacted systems, and desired time frame.

**Cost**

Estimated cost of purchasing, staffing, implementation, compliance, etc.

Estimated annual recurring costs.

Resources already earmarked for the project from other sources.

**Benefit**

The nature and scope of the expected benefit of the project.

**Collaboration / Endorsement**

The departments or units endorsing the project.

**Strategic Considerations**

Project alignment with University strategic goals, and any competitive advantage the project offers.

**Additional Data**

Additional information colleagues need to know in order to make an informed assessment of the proposal.
Once a Project Petition is submitted to the appropriate subcommittee, each subcommittee member evaluates the Petition. Below are sample ratings by a subcommittee member, followed by a sample subcommittee summary and recommendation. Please note that this is premised on the assumption that ratings are the beginning, rather than the end, of committee discussion.

### One subcommittee member’s ratings of a Petition (sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(low)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>(high)</th>
<th></th>
<th>insufficient knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unreasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>minimal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration / Endorsement</td>
<td>no departmental sponsors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>multiple committed departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Considerations</td>
<td>inconsistent with University plans, no competitive advantage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clearly aligned with University plans, clear competitive advantage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no additional compelling data</td>
<td></td>
<td>additional data is compelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation / Comments</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>I think this project would measurably increase the use value of our investment in Internet2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### All subcommittee members’ ratings of a Petition (sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reader 1</th>
<th>Reader 2</th>
<th>Reader 3</th>
<th>Reader 4</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (out of 20) 13.6
Project Proposal Forms are reviewed in the order in which they are submitted. Subcommittees rank and recommend Project Petitions throughout the year. The steering committee ranks them in February, June, and October.

Project Proposal Forms submitted between September 2 and January 1, for example, are guaranteed to be considered by the steering committee by the end of February. By the end of January, all Project Petitions for that cycle are created, and they are sent to the appropriate subcommittees. ITG subcommittees review, rank, and recommend them by the middle of February. The steering committee ranks recommended projects from all subcommittees by the end of February.

If it seems likely that a proposed project will require new resources, the Project Proposal Form should be submitted by September 1 in order to be considered for funding and implementation in the following fiscal year.