

UC Davis Policy and Procedure Manual

Chapter 200, Campus Organization and Management

Section 45, Development and Review of Administrative Computing Systems

Date: 2/11/09

Supersedes: 9/13/07

Responsible Department: Information and Educational Technology

Source Document: Business and Finance Bulletin IS-10, Systems Development and Maintenance Standards

I. Purpose

- A. This section establishes oversight and accountability for existing and proposed campus administrative computing systems to ensure that campus administrative information technology investments benefit from timely review and broad consultation, promote integrated systems, and minimize impacts on business processes and workload.
- B. This section addresses administrative systems, including systems with a significant impact on or interaction with other administrative systems.

II. Definitions

- A. Administrative computing system--any computing system serving the administrative or business functions of the campus that meets one or more of the criteria in III.B, below.
- B. Domain convener—senior management official or designee with responsibility to coordinate administrative systems planning within a given administrative systems domain as defined by the Administrative IT Systems Governance Board.
- C. Project sponsor--the senior management official(s) of the unit(s) that own(s) the business process associated with the administrative computing system project.

III. Policy

- A. Campus administrative computing systems shall be developed in a manner that promotes effective system integration and interoperability with existing systems and between administrative units.
- B. Campus administrative computing systems that meet one or more of the following criteria are subject to the review process presented herein:
 - 1. Systems that cross organizational boundaries.
 - 2. Systems critical to meeting the University's business needs, regulatory obligations, or the enterprise-wide delivery of educational content. Includes high-risk systems that could result in a failure by the University to perform essential functions, a significant loss of funds, or significant liability or legal exposure.
 - 3. Systems for which funding is sought from the Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor for development, implementation, modification, or maintenance.
 - 4. Systems for which total implementation costs (purchase, programming, consulting, integration, and first-year maintenance) equal or exceed \$150,000.
- C. Research computing systems or departmental teaching-related systems that do not meet the criteria above are wholly outside of the review process presented herein, but may be governed by other policies when protected or private data (e.g., student or employee personal information) is involved.
- D. The purpose of the review process shall be to promote collaboration between units developing similar systems, to minimize the development of repetitive shadow systems, and to ensure the efficient use of University resources.

- E. Departmental systems generally will not meet the criteria above, but will be reviewed or overseen by the appropriate vice chancellor, vice provost, or dean.

IV. Roles and Responsibilities

- A. The Vice Provost--Information and Educational Technology (IET)
 - 1. Is responsible, in consultation with the Council of Deans and Vice Chancellors (CODVC), for the review and coordination of campus administrative computing systems that meet any of the criteria in III.B, above.
 - 2. May establish, in consultation with the Administrative IT Systems Governance Board, periodic deadlines and other requirements for the composition, completeness, submission, coordination, and review of project descriptions.
 - 3. Determines, in consultation with the project sponsor:
 - a. whether to initiate a review process for a new or existing system, or for a significant modification to an existing system;
 - b. whether a given submission provides sufficient detail to enable an effective review, and if not, what additional information is required;
 - c. a plan to solicit appropriate feedback as part of each review;
 - d. a timeline for each review.
 - 4. Provides each project description, its status in the review process, and a summary of review findings on the Web.
- B. The project sponsor
 - 1. Develops, in consultation with the Vice Provost--IET, concise project descriptions and related documentation for review.
 - 2. Responds to review feedback and recommendations in writing, providing clarifying information and describing intended project changes, if any, resulting from the review.
- C. Reviewers
 - 1. Will encompass the broadest appropriate input, typically including faculty, technical leads, deans, vice chancellors, vice provosts, CCFIT and other relevant advisory committees, and additional campus participants as appropriate.
 - 2. Review submitted project information and report findings.
- D. The Council of Deans and Vice Chancellors (CODVC) acting as the Administrative IT Systems Governance Board
 - 1. Reviews and makes recommendations on individual systems, informed by the findings of ad hoc reviewers.
 - 2. Ensures the system review is comprehensive but timely, and in keeping with the intent of this policy.
 - 3. Issues an annual report of its activities, including an overall assessment of the status of and progress towards effective integration and coordination of campus administrative computing systems.
- E. The oversight committee
 - 1. For projects that move forward, establishing appropriate oversight is the joint responsibility of the project sponsor and the appropriate domain convener identified by the Administrative IT Systems Governance Board.

2. The specific charge of the oversight committee shall be determined by the project sponsor and —domain convener, and will typically encompass:
 - a. Monitoring aspects of project implementation and status.
 - b. Reviewing, communicating, approving (or seeking approval for) changes in scope, impacts on workload, or policy issues.
 - c. Referring major changes in project development to the Administrative IT Systems Governance Board.
 - d. Reviewing project status and expenditures relative to the project plan and budget.
 - e. Ensuring development of communication plan to system stakeholders and users.
 - f. Ensuring continued consultation with system stakeholders and users.
3. When possible, existing oversight committees will be asked to fulfill this role.
4. Systems specific to a single school, college, or administrative unit may benefit from the same general approach described above, but on a smaller scale.
5. To guide system operation and maintenance, the oversight committee may remain in place after the system is implemented, sometimes with modifications to its membership or charge.

V. Review Process

- A. The review process assesses the anticipated impact of a technology project on campus business processes and on faculty and staff workload.
 1. The project sponsor, in consultation with the Vice Provost—IET, develops a structured overview of functional goals, technical approaches, timeline/budget, and risks/mitigations, and submits the project description to the Office of the Vice Provost—IET.
 2. The Office of the Vice Provost—IET, in consultation with the project sponsor, coordinates the process of identifying appropriate reviewers and collecting their written feedback.
 3. The Office of the Vice Provost—IET develops a written summary of the initial feedback, posting it on the Web and sharing it with the project sponsor.
 4. The project sponsor submits responses to reviewer comments and recommendations to the Office of the Vice Provost—IET.
 5. The Office of the Vice Provost—IET prepares an updated summary of reviewer feedback and sponsor's responses, adding IET recommendations as needed to highlight remaining unaddressed issues, provides the report to the Administrative IT Systems Governance Board, and posts it on the Web.
- B. Prior to submitting a full project description, sponsors are encouraged to submit "conceptual proposals" that reflect early thinking about a potential project to the Office of the Vice Provost--IET.
 1. These optional reviews allow a sponsor to receive early, structured feedback before all major project elements are defined, thereby informing development of the full project description.
 2. The review process for a conceptual proposal is identical to the process for a standard submission, but the conceptual proposal is understood to contain identified gaps.
 3. A conceptual proposal is not a substitute for a full project review.
- D. Detailed descriptions of these components and procedures are provided at

<http://admincomputing.ucdavis.edu>.

VI. Further Information

Additional information is available from Information and Educational Technology.

VII. References and Related Policies

A. Office of the President:

1. University Policy on Administrative Information Systems, 10/28/03.
2. Business and Finance Bulletins:
 - a. IS-3, Electronic Information Security.
 - b. IS-10, Systems Development Standards.
 - c. RMP-1, University Records Management Program.
 - d. RMP-7, Privacy of and Access to Information Responsibilities.
 - e. RMP-8, Legal Requirements of Privacy of and Access to Information.

B. UCD Policy and Procedure Manual:

1. Section 310-21, Computer Vulnerability Scanning Policy.
2. Section 310-22, UC Davis Cyber-Safety Program.
3. Section 320-20, Privacy of and Access to Information.

C. Administrative IT Roadmap (<http://vpriet.ucdavis.edu/itroadmap.cfm>).

D. Administrative Computing Project Reviews (<http://admincomputing.ucdavis.edu>).