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Introduction

Background
At present there is no single, overall process for work intake and response at ITS. Over time each ITS
group has developed its own processes or procedure for responding to customer needs and delivering
solutions and in many cases these processes are not linked with each other. The result is that customers
are often unclear on who to contact with their needs and how those needs will be considered and served.

The acronym CRSP (pronounced as Crisp) stands for Customer Request to Solution Process. The CRSP
Project is an ITS initiative to improve client responsiveness and to build a more process-based
organization. The Project team was charged with designing a single overarching Customer-Request-to-
Solution- Process that would enable all customer requests for work by ITS to be quickly responded to in a
consistent, predictable, effective manner. The process scope included the receipt of the request (work
intake) through to delivery of the solution to the customer (solution delivery).

When implemented, the CRSP process will be an integrative process that aligns and orchestrates all
these separate processes into a single ITS process from an ITS customer's point of view. This does not
mean that the CRSP process will change the design all existing processes. Our design approach has
been to critically examine existing processes that are working well, design better process linkages,
specify clear roles and accountability for process steps and to create new process steps only where
necessary for integration.

Project Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Role</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Sponsor</td>
<td>Larry Merkley, VP IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Sponsor</td>
<td>Mark Cianca, Director PMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Focus Group</td>
<td>Bill Hyder, Director CRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janine Roeth, Director IT Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Cianca, Director PMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pat LeCuyer, Director Application Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Mel Barracilffe, SVP AVCOR Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Team Members</td>
<td>Aaron Melgares, IT Service Manager, Personal Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann Berry-Kline, ITTP Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leslie Geary, Departmental Systems Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter McMillan, Divisional Liaison, BAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scotty Brookie, Divisional Liaison, Arts Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teresa Silva, Staff Administrative Specialist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CRSP Project organization is listed in the table above. The process model was developed over a
series of ten two-hour working sessions with the project team members from October 11, to December 6,
2006. Once the basic process model had been built, the team tested it with a number of Process Test
Cases drawn from suggestions the team and others’ experience. Thirty-eight of these test cases are
documented in Appendix C: CRSP Process Test Cases.
Unfortunately due to scheduling difficulties we were unable to schedule a dedicated Focus Group session during this time period, but Focus Team members were invited to and participated in some of the team working sessions. A final Focus Group Session will be held in January 2007 after distribution of this draft report to the SMT. After this input has been received a final version of this report will be created.

CRSP Process Model Structure

As W. Edwards Deming said “If you can’t describe what you are doing as a process, you don’t know what you’re doing”. A business process like the CRSP Process is a collection of interrelated work tasks, initiated in response to an event that achieves a specific result for the customer of the process.

A robust process model is much more than a simple diagram. Each element of the process workflow diagram must be defined and formally related. The Process Model developed by the CRSP team consists of the following interrelated components:

- Process Work Flow Diagrams
- Role involvements
- Process Definitions
- Data Flow Definitions
- Data Stores

The workflow diagrams are the form of a conventional cross-functional process model with “swim lanes” representing roles that interact with the processes and steps. The presence of a symbol in a particular model swim lane denotes that the corresponding role has responsibility for executing that specific process step. This does not mean that the role is the only participant in the step; they are simply responsible for ensuring that the step is executed. The team applied ANSI standard flowcharting symbols and conventions but not in the strictest usage (These are explained in the accompanying legend).
# CRSP Process Model Workflow Diagrams

In the following diagrams, process symbols that are depicted in **Blue** represent current ITS processes that the CRSP Process links to or is integrated with. Process symbols in **Green** are new steps that have been defined by the CRSP team. A four-page tabloid size version of this diagram may be downloaded in Adobe PDF format from the CRSP Project web page on the ITS PMG web site.

## Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Flowchart Symbol</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![START]</td>
<td>CSRP Process Start and End Terminators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![1.2 Assign Work Intake Responsibility]</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![5.8 Project Charter Sponsor Review]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Request]</td>
<td>Data Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Control Flow]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Project Approved?]</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Staffing Database]</td>
<td>Logical Data store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![3.0 Incident Management Process]</td>
<td>Pre-Defined Process. The process has sub-processes and its own internal workflow definition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Source or Sink for a Data Flow]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Off Page Connector]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Process Descriptions

Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type Using Classification Key
All incoming Customer Requests are classified into a type of IT work that corresponds to a Work Taxonomy developed by the CRSP team (Adoption of an IT Work Classification Key, page 19). A dichotomous key job aid is being developed by the team that will aid in this task. The Job aid could be implemented as a manual or electronic reference card or as a web page dialog e.g. Dichotomous Key Example.

Process: 1.2 Assign Work Intake Responsibility
This process step records the Customer Request and its work type into a central ITS system of record and charges a specific ITS role/individual with responsibility for overseeing the ITS response to the customer. An internal ITS Service provider directory will be used to route the request. The service provider directory identifies who has intake responsibility for each service in addition to listing all staff involved in the delivery of a given service in the service catalog.

Process: 1.3 Refer to DL for Evaluation
Client requests that do not map to an incident, standard service, or altered service are forwarded to the appropriate Divisional Liaison for evaluation. A major exception to this will be where there is no defined DL jurisdiction for the request e.g. ITS generated requests or requests that relate to Enterprise Systems. In these cases the request will be referred to an ITS Director.

Process: 1.4 Select & Mobilize Consulting Team
Where necessary, an ad hoc multi-disciplinary consulting team with the right subject knowledge is assembled to consult with the customer and to refine the problem or opportunity statement. This team can comprise of ITS staff, other campus functional area staff or external advisors, consultants and contractors.

Process: 1.5 Consult with Customer
The DL or Consulting Team works with customer to develop a problem/opportunity statement which clarifies the request and describes high level requirements.

Process: 1.6 VP IT Due Diligence
The VP of IT is consulted in those cases where the customer request is a “Simpson Letter” case i.e. it requires the approval of the VP of IT.

Process: 1.7 VP IT Funding Review
The VP of IT reviews those requests that require campus funding beyond their immediate unit or are to be funded at a campus level. Depending on the nature of the request and at the discretion of the VP of IT these requests may be submitted through the IT governance process to obtain funding or be funded directly by the ITS unit.

Process: 1.8 Evaluate the Benefits
A post-implementation audit process is conducted to provide an assessment of the project’s performance against objectives, budget and schedule. Output from this review process is a valuable part of building the project management knowledge base. Evaluation answers questions such as:
- Were the project’s goals achieved?
- Was the work completed on time and within budget?
- Was the customer satisfied with the results?
What worked?
What did not work?
What lessons were learned?

Process: 2.1 Service Delivery Process (Standard)
Every IT Service in the catalog should have a defined process for its delivery in response to a
customer request. The output of the process is the service to the customer.

Process: 2.2 New Service Development
At this point the CRSP process flow links to the pre-defined New Service Development process.
This process has been defined and described by the IT Services team in their “Service Factory”
methodology (URL link to Service Factory).

Process: 2.3 Service Delivery Process (Altered)
This process represents a situation where a client need may be satisfied by an existing IT Service
with some minor modifications. Some boundaries still need to be defined for what constitutes a
minor alteration of an IT Service and the service provider should notify the IT Service Group of the
modifications for service evolution purposes.

Process: 4.0 Work Request Process
This is a new process that the CRSP team recommends should be developed to make visible and
explicitly manage all ITS work requests that are too small to be tracked by a project management
system but nonetheless represent bona fide work that that ITS is authorized to perform. At present
there is no common means of tracking these routine work requests or work orders and yet they
consume a significant amount of ITS staff time.

Process: 5.1 Develop Project Proposal & Classify Project
Developing a project proposal and classifying the proposed project "allows the project sponsor and
project manager to quickly understand the dimensions of the project and identify alternate
approaches. At this stage, the process is exploratory in nature and it is not always certain that the
project will proceed. It is not advisable to spend too much effort on scoping the project. A rough
order of magnitude estimate of project resources (cost, FTE’s) and timing will suffice for moving the
project through the first phase of the portfolio management process.

Key questions that need to be answered in this step are:
- What is the problem or opportunity to be addressed by the project?
- What are the goals?
- What risks may affect the project?
- What is the high-level budget and timeline for the project?"

Process: 5.2 Check Project Proposal & log in Work Inventory
The proposal is checked for completeness and logged in the Work Inventory data store.

Process: 5.3 Investment Option Process
This process is part of the PMG Portfolio Management process. It enables multiple customer
initiatives to be examined, related to one another, ranked and evaluated by campus stakeholders in
order to determine the best course of action for the campus from an IT investment perspective.

Process: 5.4 Obtain Customer Sponsor Approval of Project Proposal
At this point a “Go/No Go” decision should be made by the Project Executive Sponsor(s). If the
project is approved at this phase, then the next level of detail, the Project Charter, will be
developed. If the project is not approved for further consideration then the reasons for not approving it and the initial Project Proposal serve as a record of the governance process.

**Process: 5.5 Obtain ITS Management Approval of Project Proposal**

The Project Proposal is reviewed by the IT Senior Management Team as part of the standing agenda of the weekly SMT Meeting.

**Process: 5.6 Develop Project Charter**

Development of the Project Charter begins the planning phase of the project management life cycle. This step focuses on scoping and planning the program or project in detail.

Key questions that need to be answered are:

- Why is the program or project needed? (Objectives)
- What outputs or results will the project need to produce? (Deliverables and Outcomes)
- How long will the project take and what people and roles will be needed to execute it (Work Plan)?
- What are the project costs and benefits?
- How will risks be managed?
- What are the detailed resources (costs, FTE’s) required?

The answers to these questions are captured in the complete Project Charter document. The Project Charter is used to provide greater clarity in the scope of the project and how the objectives will be achieved. The Project Charter also documents the agreement between the project manager and the project sponsor for a successful project completion by defining specific deliverables along with acceptable criteria for eventual project closure.

For governance reasons and for practical purposes the Project Charter is developed in an iterative manner. Two separate “Go/No Go” decision points are included in the Plan phase to move the project from concept to launch.

**Process: 5.7 PMG Review & Project Class Recheck**

For governance reasons and for practical purposes the Project Charter is developed in an iterative manner. PMG will objectively look at the project to ensure all IT implications are taken into consideration.

**Process: 5.8 Project Charter Sponsor Review**

The Project Charter is refined to identify specific resources and roles, approach, deliverables and work plan. In addition a project risk assessment should be developed. Risk assessment identifies potential risks and defines the appropriate risk mitigation strategies. The risk assessment may result in changes in the project scope, timing, role assignments and cost. The Project Charter should be updated reflecting this new information. Once the more detailed Project Charter has been developed the project will be subject to a second “Go/No Go” decision by the project sponsors and the IT Portfolio Management Governance Committee.

**Process: 5.9 Obtain ITS Management Approval of Project Charter**

If the project is approved on this second iteration, resources will be assigned (LOCKED) and the project may be officially launched.

**Process: 5.10 Launch Project**

At this phase a specific project governance structure is established (Executive Sponsor, Project Sponsor, Steering Committee etc.). The project organization is finalized. Project team members are cast in their roles and briefed on the project by the assigned Project Manager. The project team
members refine the project work plan as necessary and are assigned responsibility for their specific tasks and deliverables.

Process: 5.11 Manage Project

Reporting project status is a critical success factor for managing expectations of project sponsors, the project steering committee and other key stakeholders. Regular and effective reporting is critical for synchronization of multiple projects within a program. The Manage phase runs throughout the life of the project to keep stakeholders informed and to engage their active involvement and sponsorship for the project or program.

There are two aspects to communications in this phase - internal and external project communication and formal or informal communication. Formal reporting may be sponsor or committee briefings, presentations, or written reports. Informal reporting can be minutes, “management by walking around”, or sponsor and team discussions. Formal external reporting to Steering Committees and Executives should be built into the project calendar. This allows time for preparation and alignment with the end of major project phases or the key milestones. For internal reporting standing meetings should be established for the project team and the Project Sponsor and Project manager. The frequency of these meetings should be appropriate to the duration of the project.

Process: 5.12 Review Project Status with Customer & Sponsor

As noted in the Manage Project process, regular reporting with the project sponsor and customer is an important part of the manage phase. Depending on the size of the project, reporting can take place formally and informally through status reports, issue and risk logs, analysis, change control forms and meetings.

Process: 5.13 Monitor & Advise on Project Status

The DL or IT Director actively monitors the status of the project through an ongoing dialog with the Project Manager, the Project Sponsors and the Customers. If necessary they will provide guidance and help to resolve project issues.

Process: 5.14 Conduct Customer Review of Deliverables

Using the deliverables listed in the charter, plus any new change control appendices and the success criteria from the charter, the project manager will work with the sponsor and customer to determine if the deliverables were delivered according to the charter.

Process: 5.15 Notify Change Management

The IT Change Management process is currently being implemented. At this point in the CRSP process a RFC (Request for Change) would be generated using the procedure defined by the Change Management process.

Process: 5.16 Determine & Implement Corrective Action

This process examines ways in which a project that is failing to meet its objectives may be adjusted to be successful. The exact changes may vary but would typically involve changes in scope, technology, expertise and skills, sponsorship, funding etc.

Process: 5.17 Close Project

Program and project management is a temporary endeavor. All programs and projects end. The ending needs to be a deliberate and explicit process to ensure the project closes with the appropriate hand-offs and knowledge transfer. The Close phase is conducted once the project team has met all deliverable commitments. In some cases the project will be terminated due to changes in business circumstances, changes in sponsorship or a failure to meet project objectives.
The Close process is used to:

- Formally end the project.
- Evaluate the project assessing performance against objectives, budget, and schedule.
- Examine the project for improvements in approach for future projects.
- Package information for reference by future projects.

The Close process provides a basis to continuously improve and enhance the project management methodology using examples, templates, lessons learned, and process and technique improvements.

To formally end the project, the project manager ensures all planned testing is complete, customer requirements (deliverables) are met and the product is operational. The project manager also ensures the customer accepts the product before transitioning to production. The acceptance may be a formal written project closure sign-off or an informal acceptance of work completed.

**Process: 6.0 IT Resource Planning Process**

This is a new process recommended by the CRSP to introduce formal IT Resource Planning (Staffing initially) to the ITS organization. The team recommends that the a new role of IT Staffing Manager be created to define and perform this process. This individual should report to the PMG and be perceived as a neutral broker and facilitator for making the best ITS staffing decisions to maximize the work accomplished by the unit and to provide opportunities for staff to develop their skills and competencies. The individual should have strong interpersonal, diplomatic and facilitation skills.

**Process: 7.0 Release Management**

1) Release management has relationships to
   a) Change management (as we have in the PM process flow)
   b) Service Level management
   c) Configuration management

2) Activities within Release Management are in 3 phases
   a) Development Environment
      - Release policy
      - Release planning
      - design and develop, or order and purchase the software
   b) Controlled Test Environment
      - build and configure the release
      - fit-for-purpose testing
      - release acceptance
      - roll-out planning
      - communication preparation and training
   c) Live Environment
      - distribution and installation

Remaining questions are then, when is a project considered closed (what is the definition that we will employ)? Does the project management process outer bracket the release management and change management processes?

**Role Descriptions**

**Role: Help Desk**

The existing ITS Help Desk staff within the CRM function.
Role: Customer
Any member of campus who is entitled and authorized to use the services provided by ITS.

Role: DL or IT Director
When request for an organization unit for which a clear DL jurisdiction exists this role will be played by the appropriate Divisional Liaison. Where this is not the case, the CRSP team recommends that IT Directors be assigned to predefined request areas, for example requests for an Enterprise Application should be the responsibility of Director of Application Solutions. One area that is still not clear is where requests are of such a nature that they really require an “ITS Divisional Liaison” e.g. individual hardware or computing needs.

Role: VP IT & SMT
The Vice Provost Information Technology and the ITS Senior Management Team (SMT).

Role: ITS
This role may be played by any member of ITS in any sub-unit, however it will normally refer to two types of role: an ITS Project Manager or an ITS Service Provider.

Role: PMG
The ITS Portfolio Management Group.

Role: Service Management
The ITS Service Management Group.

Dataflow Descriptions
Every process step in the CRSP Process Model is connected by either a Control Flow or a Data Flow. A Control Flow simply designates the sequence and path of process execution. A Data Flow may act as a control flow and provide data input or output from a process. This section only describes the key data flows in the process model; those data flows whose nature and content can be deduced easily from the model context are not described here.

Dataflow: Customer Request
Although this flow is named Customer Request, it should be noted that this included both external and internal customers (ITS). For example an internal ITS customer Application Solutions may request a Source Code Management software tool.

Dataflow: Off-The-Shelf Service
This dataflow represents a request that corresponds to an existing IT Service has a defined, service delivery process in place and can simply be invoked through a simple customer request for that service. Note: The term “Actionable IT Service” is currently being used by vendors to describe IT services that go beyond a static list of services on a web site and that can be invoked by clicking on the service in an actionable IT Service catalog presented on a web site. Clearly this level of service delivery automation is not in place today at ITS and remains a long term goal.
The Customer View

The CRSP Process illustrated in the previous sections describes the process across all the various process stakeholder “swim lanes” including the customer and all key ITS roles. However, it should be noted that this view is only intended for process design purposes, it is not the view that a customer would see as they interact with the process.

Many of the process steps shown in the model will be actually executed behind the “line of visibility” for the ITS customer. The diagram below summarizes the customer’s view of the entire CRSP process in terms of the data or information flows between the customer and the process.
CRSP Team Recommendations
This section summarizes the major recommendations that need to be adopted in order to successfully implement the CRSP Process as designed.

Adoption of an IT Work Classification Key
- A “IT Work Classification key” should be used at the front of the work intake process
- The key should be used to classify, assign and route all work flowing into ITS
- The key will be used by IT Help Desk staff
- The key should be usable by the widest audience (ITS and users) – It does not have to be used through a single point of contact
- Recommend creating a simple web tool or other job aid to support it
- See Appendix A: ITS Work Classification Key for a key developed by the CRSP Team

Use a single system to log all ITS work intake
A single system should be implemented to track all work flowing into the ITS Division. The system should be capable of capturing all types of ITS requests, not simply Incidents (See Appendix B: ITS Work Types). The current IT Request system may be a candidate for this purpose but this and other alternatives should be formally examined for this purpose.

Develop and Publish an ITS Service Provider Guide
An ITS IT Services reference guide should be developed and implemented for ITS staff to use. This reference would identify and list “who does what” and “who knows what” inside ITS. This information would be critical to the CRSP Process step 1.2. Much of this work has already been conceived and prototyped by the IT Services group, we need to implement it to support the CRSP Process.

Mandatory IT Service Process
The SMT should require that every IT Service have a formally defined “Service Delivery Process” to ensure that when it is invoked a predictable and consistent outcome occurs for the customer. This would prevent requests falling into organizational “Black Holes”.

Assign Key IT Service Touchpoints
Key Service touch point staff should be identified for every ITS service provider group to support the CRSP work intake process.

DL’s should be Account Managers
The “Account Manager” aspects of the DLs role must be fully implemented. The DL is the primary Client Relationship Manager and is critical to the CRSP Process. However, the fact that the DL is designated as a primary relationship manager does not mean they are the only person who can talk or interact with the customer – they should simply be “in the loop” on all communications that impact their customer base.
- The DL must be made aware as a matter of course on all client requests impacting their clientele
- The DL is responsible for coordinating the overall ITS response to a client request by assembling an “ITS Consulting Team” when needed for complex requests
- The DL must ensure that the right blend of subject expertise matter experts within ITS are actively involved to address the clients needs and not try to do it all on their own.

Develop and Implement a Work Request Process
ITS needs to design and implement a Work Request Process for tracking and managing work that is below the 80 hour “Project Threshold”. This would be a new process to track and make visible all ITS work requests that are too small to be tracked by a project management system but nonetheless...
represent bona fide work that that ITS is authorized to perform. At present there is no common means of tracking these routine work requests or work orders and yet they consume a significant amount of ITS staff time.

**Develop and Implement a Resource Management Process**

The team recommends that a new Resource Management Process be defined to provide formal IT Resource Planning (Staffing initially) for the ITS organization. The goals of this process would be to:

- View capabilities, commitments and availability of staff
- “Lock” and “Unlock” resources for projects
- Enable DLs and IT directors to commit and assign ITS people outside of a division to a project
- Maintain an ITS work inventory database and a staffing database

The team also recommends that a new role of IT Staffing Manager be created to define and perform this process. This individual should report to the PMG and be perceived as a neutral broker and facilitator for making the best ITS staffing decisions to maximize the work accomplished by the unit and to provide opportunities for staff to develop their skills and competencies. The individual should have strong interpersonal, diplomatic and facilitation skills.

**Develop a Policy for One-Time and Ongoing Funding of IT Projects**

ITS needs a policy and approach to established for dealing with the issue of one-time and ongoing funding for IT projects.

**ITS Project Requests and Priorities must be visible to users.**

ITS project evaluation, priority setting must be more visible to users. The team recommends that a UPS or FEDEX style web application be developed that would allow our customers to see where their requests are in the CRSP process.

**Rationalize ITS Service Offerings**

When viewing the entirety of global and local IT services provided to the campus, it is the CRSP team's opinion that ITS has too many current service offerings and needs to rationalize and reduce them. Work was begun by the DLs to normalize the IT Service Catalog that they deliver – this work should be completed.
Conclusions

This phase of the CRSP project has focused on the design of the CRSP Process. Once SMT have reviewed and approved this work, another implementation phase of the CRSP Project should be launched.
Appendix A: ITS Work Classification Key
The work classification key examine four aspects of any incoming request to IT from a customer:

- Is it IT-related?
- Is it an incident?
- Is it an off-the-shelf IT service?
- Is it a service that could be performed after consultation?

This key also depends on having in place:

- A robust and quickly accessible and *searchable* IT service catalog ("ITS Service Catalog 2.0")
- Having the IT request system and process normalized around incidents vs. non-incidents
- Having quantifiable service levels -- "$250 worth of what?" – therefore, engineering IT Services and delivery processes.
### IT Customer Request Classification Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is it IT related and...</th>
<th>Which is...</th>
<th>How do you know?</th>
<th>But...</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Therefore...</th>
<th>Attributes Needed in Service Catalog or ITR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An incident?</td>
<td>A service not working as expected.</td>
<td>It's in the service catalog and it's not working right. IT Request is the place to start for incidents.</td>
<td>What's an incident? Not everything in IT Request is an incident. It's a mish-mash.</td>
<td>Non-incidents may stagnate in ITR.</td>
<td>Normalize incidents and non-incidents in IT Request.</td>
<td>A. Toggle in ITR (not in the service catalog): incident / non-incident. Or, incident / non-incident / consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An off-the-shelf IT service?</td>
<td>It's in the service catalog, it's not an incident, and the client can access it without consultation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. Contact info -- ITR routing, email or phone -- for receiving service. C. Quantifiable service level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A service, or reasonable candidate for a service, that can be handled after consultation?</td>
<td>It's in the service catalog, it's not an incident or off-the-shelf, and it appears to require a lot of time and/or involve multiple units. Or it's not in the service catalog, but could reasonably be.</td>
<td>How do I know at a glance whether consulting is required?</td>
<td>Same as above: routing overload for DL's and Directors</td>
<td>Flag as requiring consultation.</td>
<td>B. Contact/routing info. C. Quantifiable service level. D. &quot;Consultation required&quot; flag.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We don't do that.&quot;</td>
<td>None of the above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key

- **Actual classification key elements**
- **CRSP thought process and discussion**
- **Action items needed for key to work**
Appendix B: ITS Work Types

Incidents
- As currently defined in IT Request

Change Request
- Request for exception to standards
- Urgent support
- “Help me fix my existing application”
- Operational day-to-day
- Application and system changes
- “I need new reports (AIS)”
- IT Management and Planning Requests
- Strategic Initiatives
- Simpson letter requests
- Division IT growth (Anticipate/Solicit needs/Clients Conversations)
- Help specifying a new building
- Staffing needs
- Temporary and permanent/ongoing
- Support for proposed grad program
- ITS generated project ideas

Service Requests (Service Invocation)
- Non-ITS Requests
- Request for an existing service
- Project Manager
- Problems (ITIL)
- Software functional help
- Requirements analysis
- Project requests
- General consulting/advice
- Ideas, needs
- “Help me figure out what I need”
- Request for project that has wider applicability
- Small database application with possible campus application
- Referral to appropriate person
- Customer Project (not ITS managed)
- Request for a small application/upgrade
- New services
- New features in existing service
- Contractor referral requests
- Server hosting
- Professional faculty website
- Help with compromised server
- Training
- HW and SW needs
- Small customized database
Appendix C: CRSP Process Test Cases

In order to develop and test the CRSP Process model the team collected and documented a number of process test cases. In many cases these test cases were submitted by project sponsors and other participants. In this section, each case is documented in terms of its original description and interaction with the CRSP Process model.
Description:
A question appeared for me during the budget reviews that I’m sending along for your consideration, something like this:
Once a project or service upgrade has been requested, and once it has been decided this is a "local" service request and not a "global/ITS funded" request, who approaches and negotiates with the division for funds?
Examples:
-- An AIS upgrade requires additional server capacity.
-- Curriculum leave planning phase 2 requires an fte and server capacity.
-- LITs supporting the student system in Unex need specialized training as part of a service upgrade
-- AFDS (URelations) needs an fte for their upgrade
Considering the roles of the DL/crm, PMO, and App Solutions, are these decisions entirely situational; i.e. the most likely person to succeed makes the call; or, is this a principally role-based action; i.e. it's "always" the "X"?

Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:
- Process: 1.3 Refer to DL for Evaluation
- Process: 1.4 Select & Mobilize Consulting Team
- Process: 1.5 Consult with Customer
- Process: 1.6 VP IT Due Diligence
- Process: 1.7 VP IT Funding Review

Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):

Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:
**Number:** 2  
**Name:** “Simpson Letter” Review of Elluminate  
**Date:** 09/18/06  
**Source:** Larry Merkley

**Description:**
As part of this review, I think it would be timely for us to produce a statement indicating the purpose for the “Simpson letter” review, and the criteria applied. This situation pushes the edges of those criteria in some interesting ways.

**Example: Elluminate Application Request**

From: "Bruce Andrew Duncan" <baduncan@ucsc.edu>  
To: "Patrick LeCuyer" <plecuyer@ucsc.edu>  
Cc: "Michael P Edmonds" <medmonds@ucsc.edu>,  
"Garfield Byrd" <gbyrd@ucsc.edu>  
Subject: RE: Elluminate Live! Quote  
Date: Mon, 18 Sep 2006 10:21:44 -0700  
Organization: New Teacher Center@UCSC

Hi Pat,
I don't recall whether or not we discussed our desire for a live collaboration environment during our in-person meetings, but no, it was not formally included in our requests in June related to the Goldman-Sachs grant. There was no money available in the budget at that time for it.
NTC has an array of situational needs that a live/synchronous collaboration environment can support, including “distributed staff meetings”, live distance professional development delivery, even live mentoring support for a distributed cohort of beginning teachers being served remotely by an online mentor. All these could articulate well with our asynchronous collaborative learning environment and align with our strategic plan.

You're likely aware that UCCP has been using Elluminate to support synchronous course interactions and in support of the virtual conference aspect of its annual summer conference. That was our introduction to Elluminate (first look in summer 2004). Since then we had intermittently been looking at possible solutions, including Breeze (Macromedia) and Horizon Wimba, but settled on Elluminate as the leading solution candidate.

We obtained a pilot environment from Elluminate in late spring, and used Elluminate (rather successfully!) to support a live distributed staff meeting, with NTC staff and consultants across the country participating. As a result, broad support to pursue such a solution arose among NTC leadership, and we began to consider how and when we could fund an instance of Elluminate. Then, as we were nearing the closeout of the Goldman-Sachs grant, it surfaced that there were sufficient remaining funds (unspent in other non-IT areas) that we could use to license Elluminate, hence the somewhat sudden requisition submission in August.

I hope this info is sufficient to convey the value of this solution and that ITS can and will support us obtaining it. Let me know if I can provide any additional information.
Thanks,
Bruce
# CRSP Process Test Cases

**Note:** The “Simpson Letter” refers to policy established several years ago by EVC John Simpson in which he required that all major IT expenditures would require approval by the Vice Provost, Information Systems, Larry Merkley. For the complete email chain on this example contact Mel Barracclife.

## Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:
- Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type Using Classification Key
- Process: 1.2 Assign Work Intake Responsibility
- Process: 1.3 Refer to DL for Evaluation
- Process: 1.4 Select & Mobilize Consulting Team
- Process: 1.5 Consult with Customer
- Process: 1.6 VP IT Due Diligence
- Process: 6.0 IT Resource Planning Process - staffing manager involved at this point?
- Closure statement
- There needs to be a risk analysis of request. Does IT need to be involved? ITS is on-record for saying "these are your risks."

## Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):
- Service catalog (possibly 2.0, internal service catalog)
- DLs
- Mobilized team for consultation

## Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:
- There needs to be a policy in place for people who just want approval but they’ll implement the work themselves. IT reserves the right to be involved at any point in its implementation.
- There needs to be an evaluation where it’s renamed from a project to a work request.
- Resources need to be approved to be locked before the charter is approved.
- Resource manager who is neutral who knows the availability of ITS staff. This person can lock resources.
- Communications with customer. Setting expectations of customer (who is this person?)
- DL for ITS is needed
- ITIL pre-existing processes.

We need to have a new Simpson Letter (CRSP would define what a new letter might be like.) EVC Kliger may decide to over-rule us. What’s my down-side if I approve this?
CRSP Process Test Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>UCOP LMS Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>10/23/06</td>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Larry Merkley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**
An evident system wide need comes from OP, we are asked to participate, it could lead to a campus need to fund a shared or separate solution, it comes through the applications stream of interests. What's the role of the DL in being aware of, connecting divisional priorities with, engaging in the discussion about, supporting - any aspect of the discovery and implementation process? At what point does this enter the governance priority/advising/funding proposal stream? How does this become a "service" from IT?

larry

From: Patrick LeCuyer [mailto:plecuyer@ucsc.edu]
Sent: Thu 10/19/2006 8:03 AM
To: Willeen Mc Quitta; bperman@ucsc.edu
Cc: Larry Merkley; Celena Allison
Subject: Fwd: LMS conference call - Monday October 23

Willeen, Barbara, I'm participating in a conference call on Monday regarding UCOP's Learning Management System proposal. The call is a result of concerns raised by campus CIOs regarding UCOP HR's plans to implement a system wide LMS and how the system would interact with existing campus systems and IT infrastructure, including campus portals and authentication systems. Attached is a white paper from Kay Miller which describes the planned approach.

It looks like the plan is to implement one version of the system at a vendor-hosted site. The paper mentions "user domains" which sounds like areas where each campus will be able to manage its own data, while allowing UCOP to have a system wide view. During the conference call my assumption is that we will be focusing primarily on technical support and integration issues. However, I wanted to check in with you to find out if there are any questions or issues that you would like me to raise as well. You may already have more information about this project than I do; Kay's attached white paper is first thing I've seen. My position on this is that an LMS is important to UCSC and we want to find a way to work collaboratively with UCOP to make this functionality available to our campus.

The conference call is at 1:00 pm on Monday so please provide me with any feedback by Monday morning. Thanks.

**Related CRSP Sub-Procedures and Activities:**
- Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type Using Classification Key
- Process: 1.2 Assign Work Intake Responsibility
- Process: 1.4 Select & Mobilize Consulting Team
- Process: 1.5 Consult with Customer
- Process: 2.2 New Service Development

This is a “Hosting service” which is already an existing service or Application Portfolio Management and Support

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**
- We need to assign a system steward.
- Service manager would be assigned
- CSAC
- There service has to be able to be split into project, technologies, roles, etc.
Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:
Does this need to go through the initiative process? We have to do this. We don’t have the choice. There needs to be an alignment activity to check to see if it’s on the radar somewhere else. Check back to the portfolio of work. Are there other sponsors? Is there redundancy? Is it in the work inventory? Is it a sub-set of work? We need to assign a system steward.

**We need more specific guidance in the distinction between app dev support and services.**
Enterprise support services processing.
### CRSP Process Test Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Fleet Management Quotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>09/15/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Larry Merkley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**
This is just the latest in a small, and growing string of applications arriving "ready to order" from the client's perspective but without a process to help them get to this point. I send this only as another case to include along with the Call Center request, the www upgrade request from PIO, and the City/Campus ticketing system as a few recent examples of projects (and they are all projects) that arrive at Purchasing having had varying levels of engagement with ITS staff, an array of interesting, if sometimes uninformed statements to customers along the way, and with none of us – ITS or client – clearly understanding the process and roles at play to avoid these requests arriving at Purchasing unprepared to move forward. Every one of these that we have encountered so far has touched CRM – in particular the DL’s, App Solutions, PMG, and occasionally Core Tech and IT Services. Basically, everyone. Clearly, we need to identify the roles and responsibilities of each key participant in this process.

From: Peter McMillan [mailto:peterm@ucsc.edu]
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2006 7:54 AM
To: Patrick LeCuyer
Cc: Larry Merkley; Bill Hyder
Subject: Re: Fleet Management Quotes

Pat,
I had written to Tom Hambelton some months ago offering my help. I know very little about this. It is not a "project" in the ITS definition. I suspect that they'll need a server to run this on. Fleet Services is now part of Physical Plant, so I guess we can ask Ilse and Jim what their plans are. Since we haven't determined how Physical Plant staffing and systems transitions will work, we might want to determine that scenario prior to resolving this issue.
Earlier in the week I asked Laura to get you, Bill and I scheduled to review Physical Plant scenarios. That should be done in the next day or so.
Peter

On Sep 14, 2006, at 5:54 PM, Patrick LeCuyer wrote:

Peter,
Bill's probably already forwarded this to you but I wanted to check in. Larry's asking for background on this project. I am unaware of it. Can you provide input on how we got to this point and whether this should move forward? Thanks.

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**
- Process: 1.3 Refer to DL for Evaluation
- Process: 1.4 Select & Mobilize Consulting Team
- Process: 1.5 Consult with Customer

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**
Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:
Number: 5  Name: Classroom Availability Web Page

Date: 10/18/06  Source: Charlie McDowell

Description:
> From: Charlie McDowell <charlie@cs.ucsc.edu>
> Date: October 18, 2006 8:56:24 PM PDT
> To: Mark Cianca <piobair@ucsc.edu>
> Subject: Fwd: [CS-faculty-all] Jack's Lounge Reservation Policy
>
> Here is a test project for you.
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
> >> How about a faculty/staff-accessible web-page showing up-to-date classroom availability on campus? That is, READ ONLY. The underlying database exists and no human effort will be involved beyond the initial coding.

>> By the way, for a while now, this has been idea #23 in the list of "undergrad projects for money" that I …
>
> Charlie

Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:
- Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type Using Classification Key
- Process: 1.2 Assign Work Intake Responsibility
- Process: 1.3 Refer to DL for Evaluation
- Process: 1.4 Select & Mobilize Consulting Team
- Process: 1.5 Consult with Customer
- Consulting Required-Registrar’s office should be the customer requesting this service

Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):
Team may involve Core tech, registrars, DLs etc, App Solutions-phone call

Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:
**Description:**
Here’s an interesting use case for CRSP to think about – coming out of this, we could use guidelines about what service/acquisition requests we want to go through our process, and what we don’t want taken through the process. If we can get clarity about that, our relationship with Strategic Purchasing and our own workload would be improved.

Larry

From: Brad Smith [mailto:brad@soe.ucsc.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 04, 2006 1:00 PM
To: Larry Merkley
Cc: Kathryn Cunningham; Bill Hyder; maggemcc@cats.ucsc.edu; Brad Smith

Subject: Re: UARC Request for Upgrade

Importance: High

Larry,
I agree with approving the purchase without review.
Brad

On Oct 3, 2006, at 5:46 PM, Larry Merkley wrote:
This appears to be equipment being acquired that is connected to a research project, which normally does not require our approval. There is no software application or business process involved, which would be another criteria involved with ITS needing to review the request.

Bill/Brad - unless one of you see some reason to comment, this should be approved without our review.

Larry
-----Original Message-----
From: Kathryn Cunningham [mailto:kecunnin@ucsc.edu]
Sent: Tue 10/3/2006 5:35 PM
To: Lmerkley@ucsc.edu
Cc: kathryn Cunningham
Subject: UARC Request for Upgrade
Larry,
UARC has presented PR 2851892 for POS AV Upgrade - V4 to V5 OEM. Do you approve their requirements as well?
Kate
Kathryn E. Cunningham
UCSC Strategic Sourcing Buyer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type Using Classification Key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Process then exits back to the customer since no ITS approval required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
CRSP Process Test Cases

Number: 6
Name: Security Issues and CRSP
Date: 11/14/06
Source: Janine Roeth

Description: From: Janine A. Roeth [jar@ucsc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2006 1:32 PM
To: Mel Barracliffe
Cc: aaron Melgares
Subject: CRSP question

Mel,

From Larry after the last IT Security Committee meeting:
We need to ensure that the outcome from the CRSP project, to present the “how people get work
done” process/answers for discussion in the context of security issues. I wonder now whether the
group is working with use cases related to security questions/requests. Can you check that?
Thoughts?

Janine

Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:
• Process: 1.5 Consult with Customer
  • Need to build standard security due diligence into this process

Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):

Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:
Number: 7
Name: Requesting Service from other ITS Units
Date: 11/01/06
Source: David Foster

Description:
> From: David W Foster <tigger@ucsc.edu>
> Date: November 1, 2006 11:42:41 AM PST
> To: mcianca@ucsc.edu
> Cc: Phillip Stark <phillip@ucsc.edu>
> Subject: Customer Request Process suggestion
> 
> Hi Mark. I suggest looking at internal ITS requests as part of the
> Customer Request Process. We've experienced some breakdowns when
> requesting service from other ITS units and it seems fairly clear that
> these units don't have a process for dealing with requests that come
> from other units within ITS. It's like the request comes in the side
> door and therefore bypasses any process for ensuring the customer's
> request is served and completed. Maybe the outcome of this project can
> inform or be applied to how units deal with each other within ITS. An
> aspect of this is applying the project management criteria - we've
> seen a desire to direct internal requests into the normal work flow
> and a reluctance to make internal ITS requests a "project".
> 
> David Foster
> PC Systems Administrator
> Instructional Computing - Information Technology Services University
> of California, Santa Cruz
> 831-459-4268 (office)
> tigger@ucsc.edu
> http://ic.ucsc.edu

Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:
- See recommendation: Develop and Publish an ITS Service Provider Guide
- 1.2 Assign Work Intake Responsibility

Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):

Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:
Number: 8  
Name: JUMPSTART SW Acquisition Request

Date: 09/26/06  
Source: Larry Merkley

Description:
From: Larry Merkley [Larry.Merkley@ADM.UCSC.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, September 26, 2006 6:06 PM
To: Mark Cianca; Bill Hyder; Patrick LeCuyer; Mel Barracliffe

Subject: FW: [Fwd: Scope of Work/Platespin Order]

Just adding another case to your queue. Here’s a case of a request for services initiated by an ITS project; in this case some training and evidently software.

What should be our own process to review and approve these requests?

Mark/Pat – is this software acquisition something you support having us acquire? Is it a big deal, little deal, … and who will provide ongoing support?

Thanks.
Larry

From: Kathryn Cunningham [mailto:kecunnin@ucsc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, September 26, 2006 5:14 PM
To: lmerkley@ucsc.edu
Cc: nnieblas@ucsc.edu; kathryn Cunningham

Subject: [Fwd: Scope of Work/Platespin Order]

Larry,
Have you been asked to approve this software acquisition?
Kate

Date: Mon, 25 Sep 2006 12:44:49 -0700
From: Dave Klein <klein@ucsc.edu>
Reply-To: klein@ucsc.edu
To: Kathryn Cunningham <kecunnin@ucsc.edu>
Subject: [Fwd: Scope of Work/Platespin Order]
Kate,
This is a quote for a training class we will be ordering as part of server consolidation. Included is a statement of work. Is this something you would be ordering, or does this go to Nancy? This whole package includes the PlateSpin software licenses also (separate quote). Thanks.
Dave Klein

-------- Original Message --------
Subject: Scope of Work/Platespin Order
Date: Mon, 25 Sep 2006 11:44:31 -0700
From: Paul Hines <phines@govplace.com>
Organization: Govplace
To: David Klein <klein@ucsc.edu>
David,
I hope you had a good weekend. I'm attaching the scope of work you requested. Please sign the attached Scope of Work and return it to us along with a purchase order as soon possible and we will get the
assessment scheduled for you. I believe you've already received the quote, but I have attached it as well for your viewing pleasure.

Please feel free to give me a call with any questions (contact information below) We are looking forward to working with you.

Regards,
Paul Hines
Enterprise IT Integration
Store.IT Secure.IT Virtualize.IT
Paul Hines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Should be treated no differently than a customer request except that today no ITS DL exists. We recommend that IT Directors be identified as the surrogate for these requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Process: 1.3 Refer to DL for Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Process: 1.5 Consult with Customer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• IT Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ITS Unit Managers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications: |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>FMP DB Hosting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>11/21/06</td>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Peter McMillan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**
I have a FMP db that is less than 10Mb in size that I would like to have hosted.
What service do you offer? How much will this cost?

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**
If we assume that there is a service description that prompts the user to have answers on a few basic questions (security – accounts, access type – client or web, development or production, etc.), we would use 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 of the CRSP process. Alternatively, if DL consultation was required, we'd use 1.5, 1.6. From 11/30 meeting minutes:
- Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type Using Classification Key
- Process: 1.2 Assign Work Intake Responsibility
- Process: 1.3 Refer to DL for Evaluation
- Process: 1.5 Consult with Customer
- Consultation with cost, account manager explains cost.
- Off the shelf service-back to 1.3

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**
- Requestor (customer)
- DL
- Application Solutions

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
Assuming that the service description includes some information about service levels, planned maintenance windows, impact in this area is minor.
Description:
I have been given a copy of business continuity software from UC Berkeley for use at UC Santa Cruz. It requires Microsoft SQL Server and Cold Fusion and IIS.

This software and the associated business processes do not yet have a campus steward, nor has this software been identified as a top priority. It is likely that this software would become a component in campus wide emergency management planning (with WebEOC, PeopleFinder, etc.). However, we want to mount and run the software so that we can run a feasibility assessment.

How do we get started in mounting and assessing this software?

Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:
- Assume DL consultation would be required. This would take us from:
- Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type Using Classification Key 1.1 through
- Process: 5.1 Develop Project Proposal & Classify Project
- Assume that we scope this as a feasibility assessment on a development server and use LITS labor only. The result of the assessment may be a new CRSP request that is a project.

Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):
- Requestor (Customer)
- DL
- Application Solutions may have a role in two aspects: 1), they may have a development server of the type we’d need for a project like this and 2), they may simply want to have knowledge of smaller projects in development so that they an align future service offerings.

Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:
The feasibility phase might not have an SLA/OLA behind it.

If a project like this goes into production, definition and requirements for policy, rules, SLA/OLA would all be required to assist in determining how we would package idea as a service.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Human Resources Information Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>11/21/06</td>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Peter McMillan, Celena Allison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**
Staff Human Resources needs to be able to track information about employees that is not included in the Payroll Personnel System (PPS). Examples include the tracking of training, performance evaluations, maximum vacation accruals and leaves of absence, etc.).

Prior to the Business Transformation Program (BTP) these types of information were tracked using a variety of sources in the 28 Service Centers.

Post-BTP, the data sources were transferred to SHR and include Filemaker Pro databases, Excel spreadsheets and Word documents.

We need ITS to assist in the design and support of an information system that will allow us to collect, track and maintain information about employees that is not part of the PPS.

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**
- Process: 1.4 Select & Mobilize Consulting Team
- Process: 1.5 Consult with Customer
- Process: 5.1 Develop Project Proposal & Classify Project

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>IT Related ADA Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>11/21/06</td>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Scotty Brookie, Susan Willats, Peter McMillan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** A lecturer who has become blind received special equipment and software from the Disability Resource Center. However, she has never received training on how to use these resources. No campus training is available. Also, the equipment is getting old, but IT staff, who did not purchase it, may not notice, and DRC doesn't do case management. As a result, the lecturer lacks the skills and resources she needs to do her job, and seems not to be on anyone's radar. These processes need improving.

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**
From 11/30 meeting minutes:
- Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type Using Classification Key
- Process: 1.2 Assign Work Intake Responsibility
- Process: 1.3 Refer to DL for Evaluation
- Process: 1.4 Select & Mobilize Consulting Team – would include non-ITS experts
- Process: 1.5 Consult with Customer - is it a potential new service?
- Process: 2.1 Service Delivery Process (Standard) - Off the shelf service-yes-this has to be in the catalog.

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
**Description:**
The Arts Division is preparing to build a new building which will house the most technical and IT-intensive aspects of several departments. At least one LITS from the lead department needs to be deeply involved in the building design throughout, to make sure the building meets the technical needs. This person may need backfill coverage for the extensive time this will take, project management assistance and possibly training. The design phase will last well over a year.

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**
- Consulting required
- Project Management may be needed. Tasks defined. It’s an ITS project that’s part of a larger project
- Process: 1.4 Select & Mobilize Consulting Team
- Process: 1.5 Consult with Customer
- Process: 5.1 Develop Project Proposal & Classify Project

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**
- This is a DL consulting service
- Arts division personnel
- NTS-off the shelf services
- Core Tech-off the shelf services
- Staffing manager NEEDS to be designed.

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
- In the beginning of new building planning, ITS needs to be consulted.
- How do we lock Lyle’s time and fund his replacement?
Number: 14
Name: IT Staffing Increase Request
Date: 11/29/06
Source: Scotty Brookie

Description:
As various aspects of art-making become increasingly technical and IT-intensive, the Art Department finds that its IT staffing level -- .62 FTE for the whole department -- is becoming more and more inadequate. More staffing support is needed, either to make the existing position full time, or to hire another part time person, or some combination.

Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:

Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):

Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:
### CRSP Process Test Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Exception to Email Attachment Size Limitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>11/29/06</td>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Scotty Brookie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**
The division administration needs to send program proposals and building plans to colleagues both on and off campus. Some of these documents are confidential and don't lend themselves to being easily posted on the web. The 5 MB attachment limit in email means that deans, assistant deans, and their staff must spend lots of time breaking up and reassembling documents in order to email them. The attachment size should be significantly increased. The assistant dean says, "I have to take these things home and mail them from Cruzio. Cruzio gives me much better service than the campus."

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**
- Process: 2.3 Service Delivery Process (Altered)

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
Number: 16
Name: Media Equipment Upgrade
Date: 11/29/06
Source: Scotty Brookie

Description:
Media equipment in smaller general-assignment classrooms is substandard, and inadequate for teaching visual material. It needs to be upgraded.

Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:

Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):

Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:
### CRSP Process Test Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Instructional Space Equality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>11/29/06</td>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Scotty Brookie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**
There is an increasing divide between registrar-controlled classrooms and division-controlled classrooms and labs, at least, those controlled by the Arts Division. Labs often lack equipment-renewal money, and classroom spaces which before didn't need media equipment now must have it, but funding is increasingly tight. There needs to be conversation about how to achieve parity in instructional spaces across campus, regardless of "owner."

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**
- Registrar’s Office
- Divisional resource planning
- ITS
- Sub-committee on Classrooms, parent committee at Senate
- Learning Technology Committee, Committee on Teaching, Media Services
- Support statement from ITC of commitment to equipping classrooms and other spaces with more equity.

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
Description:
A department manager needs to track expenses of visiting prospective grad students. She currently uses a combination of Filemaker, Excel and Word, but would like a more standardized and robust system. This could be additions to existing systems, like GARP, or something new.

Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:
- Incoming request turns into proposal for functional change in GARP. CRSP process needs to route this request to the steering/exec committee processes that oversee existing enterprise systems.
- Should functional change be denied, would we resubmit for an external, work around system?
- Process: 5.1 Develop Project Proposal & Classify Project

Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):
- Requestor
- DL
- GARP Steward

Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:
Number: 19  Name: Viewing Computer Over Shoulder Question
Date:  Source: Julie Goldstein

Description:
My supervisor frequently comes into my area and watches me work on the computer over my shoulder. Is it really OK for her to do this?

Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:
- We don’t do that
- Referral to HRP or Miss Manners
- Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type Using Classification Key
- Process: 1.2 Assign Work Intake Responsibility – Note that work intake responsibility may sometimes lie outside of ITS with other “Service Providers” in this case HR.

Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):

Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:
Description: I Googled my name and found a UCSC web page with my Social Security Number and grades. Please take it down immediately.

Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:
- Incoming request is not an existing “service”, but needs to be routed into Incident Management?
- Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type Using Classification Key
- Process: 1.2 Assign Work Intake Responsibility -- Incident

Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):
- Requestor
- DL
- Ticket System
- Local Web Admin

Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:
- SSN policies
- B&FB’s from UCOP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Credit Card Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Julie Goldstein</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** I need to set up a way for people to pay with a credit card. What do I do?

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**
- Is this a new service? Is it a project and a new service? If this is the 3rd time someone has asked for it, does a new service need to be created?
- Maybe it’s a referral out to a vendor
- Process: 2.2 New Service Development

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**
- Requestor
- DL
- AppSolns
- Accounting, Audit offices
- Core Tech – IT Security

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
- Accounting takes the lead on reviewing and certifying credit card processing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Privacy Notice Posting Required?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Julie Goldstein</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** Can you tell me whether the UCSC Fire Department is required to post a privacy notice for what they do with people's information?

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**
- This is not a service, nor incident, so we could classify it as RFI. We could push it out at 1.5 and refer to Services group; back to Julie.
- Process: 1.2 Assign Work Intake Responsibility

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**
- Requestor
- DL?
- Services group

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
- Julie would probably have the reference to the policy or at least a practice.
- Peter and FD chief would make sure the notice is posted there and on the FD website.
## CRSP Process Test Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>MS Office Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Julie Goldstein</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** My cat needs Office. I'm not sure what kind of computer she uses, but I know she needs it.

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**
- Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type Using Classification Key - This is a service request – albeit a strange one.

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number: 24</th>
<th>Name: ADA Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Source:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** How would I find out if PDFs are ADA compliant?

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**
This is another RFI. We may need to consider RFI's as a service and route to Services group or other depending on the nature of the request.
Process: 1.2 Assign Work Intake Responsibility

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**
- Requestor
- DL
- Services group

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
### CRSP Process Test Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Secure Empty Trash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Source:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** Thanks for the info about securely deleting files from a PC. Do you have similar info for a Mac OSX for situations where the user did not use "secure empty trash?" There are a couple of free utilities on Apple's website for securely erasing files (I found ShredIt X and Permanent Eraser after a quick search), however I don't know if this is what you would recommend or not.

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**

Process: 2.2 New Service Development

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Securely Deleting Files from PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Julie Goldstein</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** I have a person asking about securely deleting sensitive files from her PC. She has been putting them in the recycle bin and immediately emptying it.

- **Question 1:** Is there a way to do the equivalent of "secure empty trash" on a PC, or is what she is doing good enough?
- **Question 2:** Is there anything she needs to do (or ask ITS to do) to securely erase the files she has already deleted as described above?

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**
- Process: 2.2 New Service Development

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
## CRSP Process Test Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number: 27</th>
<th>Name: Anonymizing Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Source:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** A research group on campus wants transactional data from ITS that could potentially map individuals to time, location and activity data. Other than “anonymizing” this data, is there any need to further modify or redact it? Who would authorize the release of this data and certify that it has been appropriately anonymized, etc? How do we establish whether this is a legitimate business need?

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Access to Log-In Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Source:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** Can we use access log info to contact people after the fact who used the computing lab?

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
**CRSP Process Test Cases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number: 29</th>
<th>Name: New software module – Student Affairs ITS implementation expected NOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Source: Laurie Carnahan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** Dining Services uses a program called FoodPro to manage inventory, recipes, and to generate orders for next day delivery in order to feed our student (and staff!) population. Dining Services also has a catering unit that caters high end as well as medium to low end functions. This used to be split into two separate locations/offices with the University Center catering all of the high end functions and the dining hall at Cowell handling the medium to lower end functions. These offices have been merged into one operating out of the University Center. Currently they are using a program called Jonas (a club management system) to handle the catering needs but they want/need to integrate more fully with Foodpro. Foodpro has a catering module available for purchase and Dining is interested in seeing how it works and whether it will suit their needs. They are in the process of scheduling a demo for later this month.

They have expressed that they want this to happen as soon as possible. Provided that the Foodpro product meets their needs, they will want an aggressive implementation timeline. We already have a Foodpro server in place but this module will require a full fledged Exchange server. Dining understands that they will need to pay for the software as well as the new server and Exchange.

One of the great things about Dining Services is that they are very savvy to what they need in regard to software. If the Foodpro product does not meet their needs, they have other products they will investigate. They do include us (Karalee, Tammy and myself) in this process but they are definitely used to doing the research and picking out what will best suit their business model and then they turn to us for implementation. The problem is that very often they want implementation to occur as soon as possible.

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**
This is a typical project proposal that maps well to the current CRSP flow. Process: 5.1 Develop Project Proposal & Classify Project
CRSP Process Test Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Requestor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CUHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Application Solutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Number:** 30  
**Name:** New POS System  
**Date:**  
**Source:** Tammy Heinsohn

**Description:** We want a new Point of Sale system that will work with our existing meal plan system (CBORD Odyssey) and will allow us to accept credit card payments. (This is our Micros POS system that went live in June 06.)

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**
- This appears to be a typical project proposal.
- Process: 5.1 Develop Project Proposal & Classify Project

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**
- Requestor
- DL
- CUHS
- Application Solutions
- Accounting – CC processing team
- IT Security

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
Number: 31
Name: New Work Schedule Management System
Date: 
Source: Tammy Heinsohn

**Description:** We need a system that will help us manage work schedules for 200 staff (full and part time) and 500 students (part time) working at 15 different locations. We'd want to integrate this scheduling application with a time clock application (employees swipe in/out with cards) that can allow data integration into a timesheet generation application (Cruzpay, CUHS Time & Attendance application or other). We operate 18 hours per day and at some point may move to a 24 hour operation. We need to reduce the amount of time management staff must spend managing data in individual employee time records as our current systems now require. We also need our management staff to have access to up to the moment information, e.g. which staff are currently clocked in; is a certain staff person clocked out on break right now; is a certain staff person not taking their breaks, or not clocking in/out for their breaks ....

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**
- This appears to be a typical project proposal. Modifications to CruzTime or SlugTime would require change requests or perhaps RFI/RFP to get vendor info. Looks like it could be an enterprise level development.
- Process: 5.1 Develop Project Proposal & Classify Project

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**
- Requestor
- DL
- Application Solutions
- Purchasing
- CUHS
- CruzPay Team

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
**Description:** It seems that the Health Center staff selected the three systems they wanted and intended to implement them without direct involvement with ITS. ITS was brought into the picture later.

It has taken work by the following ITS groups to implement the medical practice management systems:
- Applications (project management, SQL Server install and management, AIS file transfer)
- Wincore (server configuration and admin, Active Directory configuration)
- Network Security (firewall)
- Networks (new network)
- Operations (servers racked in data center, tape backup, server monitoring)
- Client Relationship Management (workstation support, help desk)
- IT Services (HIPAA guidance, SLA for servers)
- PMG (advice, project tracking)

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
CRSP Process Test Cases

Number: 33  
Name: AHR Wants Programming Environment

Date:  
Source: Leslie Geary

Description: Academic Human Resources wants to rewrite Div Data (faculty information system) in PHP and wants Apps solutions to host dev and prod environments and provide programming advice. AHR programmers are not part of ITS. Ideally for something of this size/import we would want to develop this in house (in fact, our developers feel that the PHP/MYSQL choice was not appropriate) but the client had already begun work and we simply didn’t have the time to step in and do this ourselves.

Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities: Classified as consultation required.  
What is division? EVC. Request goes to Bomi.  
Bomi contacts Apps Solutions and discusses project answering certain questions, for example: how large is this project likely to be, is it appropriate to allow the client to handle the project, is it to be shared between ITS and the client? If so, what are the roles/agreement.

Need to have standards for application development based on size, risk, etc. When can we let them do it alone, when must we step in to do parts of it? When must we deny the client based on risk, lack of time etc. There should be criteria on which this is determined.

Application request:
- Off the shelf: deliver without much consultation - web locker, etc. Survey?
- Mid tier: small application development (filemaker, php, etc.) time set aside for this as global service. Everyone can ask. Cost is????
- Larger: Seems like this should be initiated by the DL. DL and Apps Solutions talk and confirm it is a larger project.

Must address the outliers – those in dining hall or fleet svcs who have basically their own tech staff – even though they are within Apps Solutions – still they are assigned to a Division or dept.

Developed application: application build/buy decision recommendations, programming, application/database hosting, dba services, platform consultation, business analysis, co-development?, maintenance? ) In this case, we may have suggested another programming language, however the client could only program in PHP.
- Process: 5.1 Develop Project Proposal & Classify Project
### CRSP Process Test Cases

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### CRSP Process Test Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number: 34</th>
<th>Name: <strong>Academic Senate: Online Grant Request and Review System</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Source: Leslie Geary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** Academic Senate comes to apps solutions directly and asks whether we can create an online grant application and review system. This is probably a work request although could go over 80 hrs. (In the end, this was a FMP database which lives on existing apps solutions servers.)

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Number:</strong></th>
<th>35</th>
<th><strong>Name:</strong></th>
<th>New Program Needs Placement Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Source:</strong></td>
<td>Leslie Geary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** Maria Kerschen highly concerned that we are not providing new program (Cal Teach) with a Filemaker Pro application. We took Donna who “could have done this for us without bureaucracy” and they expect our attention.

This is similar to Curriculum and Leave Planning project which

Medium sized projects requested directly from Apps Solutions that have thus far been “approved” at the department level.

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**