Executive Scorecard

Project Title – Consolidate departmental applications
Project Team – Jim Lehman, Logan Jordan, Jim Mullins, Terry Schroeder, Pat Smoker
Scorecard Category – IT Service Provision

Executive Summary — Include description of the current state and recommended future action. Provide key objectives.

The CITP Report recognized that the “...IT enterprise at the University grew in an organic and distributed fashion across campus in which IT needs were met through the formation of local IT groups at all levels.” While effective and appropriate in the early dawning of IT, this natural and distributed evolution made it difficult to identify and understand the various IT services being provided across campus. This project was an effort to identify existing departmental applications, which arose in a distributed fashion, but have the potential to be of broad benefit. Cost savings may be realized by: (a) making existing applications available to units that have needs for the functionality but currently lack applications (thereby avoiding new development or procurement costs), and (b) providing the opportunity for developers of applications meeting similar functional requirements to combine their efforts (thereby offering the potential for reducing duplicative development costs).

In the fall of 2010, this team surveyed academic and administrative departments on the Purdue West Lafayette campus to identify departmental applications. A departmental application is one that is developed or purchased, funded and supported (or some combination) by a specific unit, department, division, functional area, etc. A departmental application is usually intended for a specific function or set of functions within a single department. It is generally not shared with other departments but potentially could be shared with one or more additional departments and may include a collaborative or combined funding model. Over 600 applications were identified by units across campus.

Identified applications were categorized, and commercial applications were distinguished from applications that were developed in-house or from open source. Among the commercial products, many fall under existing university license agreements, but it is unknown whether departments took advantage of the license agreements when acquiring the applications. In other cases, there may be opportunities to establish license agreements where none currently exist. Departments identified using applications such as GAMS, Easy 5, Filemaker, AMOS, Camtasia, and others for which licensing agreements might be sought.

Among departmental applications that were developed in-house or from open source, the working team observed a wide array of applications, but in a number of cases there were commonalities in the functions for which applications were developed. We reviewed the applications with the goal of selecting a small set of departmental applications where the function appears to have widespread utility and there exists either a large unmet need or multiple solutions which might benefit from consolidation (or at least cooperation). The goal is that these functional solutions could be made available to the campus via some form of a cooperative and/or subscription solution.
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Three basic functional areas where there appears to be potential for realizing some advantages from leveraging departmental applications were targeted for initial exploration. They are:

1. Hiring/candidate evaluation. Existing applications include the Engineering Hiring Tool, Taleo, and HFS RAMS program.
2. Graduate applicant evaluation for departmental admission. Existing applications include ones in Agriculture, Engineering, Management, and Science.
3. Key/door access management. Existing applications include ones in Engineering, Science, Management, HFS, and Physical Facilities.

Alternatives Considered – Include a summary of the final options considered, along with significant pros and cons.

A variety of other functional areas have potential to be explored via this model. Others may include: faculty activity reporting, graduate student activity reporting, employee performance evaluation, leave management, student placement/career opportunities, equipment/inventory management.

Recommendation(s) – Provide a detailed recommendation for investigation.

It is proposed that for each of the three functional areas identified above, an ad-hoc committee (AHOC) be assembled to examine opportunities for leveraging existing resources. The AHOC group should consist of key stakeholders from units that have existing applications as well as other stakeholders that might benefit from the availability of applications related to this function. For example, graduate education deans in all colleges might have an interest in making available solutions for managing the review of graduate applications within units. The goal of the AHOC would be to identify opportunities for cooperation and, where feasible, for realizing cost savings through elimination of duplication. As a demonstration, we propose to form an AHOC to investigate key/door access management software, which was one of the identified functional areas, during spring 2011.

Going forward, this working group recommends that all new projects be submitted to the Director’s Project Portfolio (a SharePoint service to pursue initiatives for cross-area sharing), and that the senior IT operations group and the AITL (Academic IT Leadership) and Administrative Computing group review the list of projects to avoid duplication of effort and identify opportunities for collaboration.

Impact Assessment (if known)

Key stakeholders – Process owners, application owners, IT services providers and campus users of identified applications.

Impact on stakeholders – The methods and human resources used toward provisioning and managing common-good IT services could change. Individuals providing distributed services today could become part of specialized group. The existing paradigm for how individuals are paid, who they are supervised by, and who their work benefits could also change. Process owners might also be working with a different set of individuals in and in entirely different manner.
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**Identify assumptions** — Similar or duplicate IT resources are being delivered to different sets of clients in a multitude of ways. Opportunity exists to better leverage institutional resources by bringing together groups currently provisioning similar or identical services to create synergy.

**Risks associated with the recommendation** — Leveraging the above-stated opportunities would result in significant changes in strategy and culture. Both will need to be managed effectively. The strategy will fail if there is failure to recognize the need for focused attention to culture change. A sustainable fund model will be critical to success.

**Identify organizational units responsible for implementation** — Common-good providers including ITEA, ITSO, ITCR, ITNS and RCAC as well as organizations that own applications identified.

**Timeline** — Include target effective date, recommended phases and/or implementation dates for major milestones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/15/2010</td>
<td>Comprehensive list of departmental applications (completed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/2010</td>
<td>Resources to assess identified (completed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/31/2011</td>
<td>Pilot AHOC formed to assess identified resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost Savings** — Include possible FTE reductions, potential recurring and non-recurring $ income/savings, appropriate fiscal year and detail by general fund, auxiliary operation, sponsored research and other funds (if known); and breakdown savings by individual campus (if known).

Cost savings may be realized by: (a) making existing applications available to units that have needs for the functionality but currently lack applications (thereby avoiding new development or procurement costs), and (b) providing the opportunity for developers of applications meeting similar functional requirements to combine their efforts (thereby offering the potential for reducing duplicative development costs).

**Resource Requirements** — Include estimated incremental new costs to implement and maintain; and an estimated return on investment. Use of any existing staff/resources should be noted.

Approximately 6-12 weeks will be required of individuals participating in the AHOC for each resource identified for assessment. Costs associated with recommended changes in the provisioning strategy will be unknown until assessments for each identified IT resource are completed.