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Introduction

Background and Problem Statement
At present there is no single, overall process for work intake and response at ITS. Prior to the UCSC IT consolidation each separate IT group had developed its own processes and procedures for responding to customer needs and delivering solutions. After the consolidation into a single IT organization, these prior practices continued and additional processes were designed such as Incident Management and Project Management. To date these different processes have not been formally integrated. The result is that customer requests flowing into IT are handled in a variety of ways and it is unclear to customers on who they should contact with their variety of needs and how their needs will be considered and served. In the worst cases these requests may languish and ITS can appear to be unresponsive to its customers.

The CRSP project team was charged with solving this problem. The acronym CRSP (pronounced Crisp) stands for Customer Request to Solution Provided. The name reflects the process scope: the receipt of the request (work intake) through to delivery of the solution to the customer (solution delivery). The CRSP Project is one of several ITS initiatives intended to improve client responsiveness and to build a more process-based organization. The primary goal of the project team was to design a single overarching Customer-Request-to-Solution-Provided process that would enable all customer requests for work by ITS to be quickly responded to in a consistent, predictable, effective manner.

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 of every existing ITS process. 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 purposes.

Project Team
The CRSP Project organization is listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Role</th>
<th>Name</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 Barracliffe, SVP AVMOR 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>

Project Timing and Approach
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 CRSP process model had been built, the team tested it with a number of Process Test Cases drawn from suggestions the team and other’s experience. Thirty-six of these test cases are documented in Appendix D: CRSP Process Test Cases. The team found that the test cases were extremely valuable in
testing and designing the CRSP process. In reviewing this report and attempting to understand the CRSP process we strongly recommend that readers pick a few of the test cases and walk them through the detailed process work flow diagrams.

A draft CRSP report was issued on December 18, 2006, and on January 8, 2007 the team presented the CRSP process design to the ITS Senior Management team. Given the broad scope and implications of the proposed process, Larry Merkley, Vice Provost Information Technology requested that the CRSP project team engage the SMT in a series of work sessions to familiarize them with the details of the CRSP model and to evaluate the implications for implementation. Four CRSP validation sessions were held covering key recommendations and aspects of the model:

- CRSP: The Role of the DL & Understanding the Customer Need (February 21, 2007)
- CRSP Work Intake (February 28, 2007)
- The ITS Service Catalog and CRSP (March 8, 2007)
- CRSP and Capacity Management (April 12, 2007)

The CRSP project was closed on April 20, 2007. This report represents the teams’ final work and incorporates the major improvements and suggestions provided by the SMT through the detailed validation sessions.

**Business Processes and the CRSP Process Model Structure**

The CRSP process presented here has been formally designed by the project team using Business Process Management Analysis techniques. It is a model or “blue print” design of how the process should work. In the next phase of work this ideal design will be implemented. As this implementation occurs the CRSP Implementation team will find it necessary to refine or modify some of the ideas presented here in order to achieve the most practical result. It will also be necessary to put in place a mechanism by which the CRSP process will be continually improved in response to changing circumstances or design flaws.

A business 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. One of the founders of the total quality management movement, W. Edwards Deming said “If you can't describe what you are doing as a process, you don't know what you're doing”. In a lot of situations processes evolve in an ad hoc way from prevailing practices and customs, but really effective and efficient business processes must be deliberately designed.

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

- Process Decomposition Diagrams
- Process Workflow Diagrams
- Roles
- Process Definitions
- Data Flow Definitions
- Data Stores

The CRSP Process Workflow Diagrams on the following pages are in the form of a cross-functional flowchart with “swim lanes” representing roles that interact with the processes, and data flows that connect the process workflow. The presence of a symbol in a particular model swim lane denotes that the corresponding role has responsibility for executing that particular 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 swim lanes were chosen to indicate specific roles, however it should be remembered that a given individual may play several of these roles in the execution of the CRSP process.

The process numbering scheme in the CRSP work flow diagrams is not sequential since the hierarchical numbering represents where a particular process fits within the top-down process decomposition model that was developed by the team in parallel with the work flow model. See Appendix A: CRSP Process Decomposition. This type of diagram shows the 8 major ITS processes that are integrated by the overall CRSP process. Each of the major processes is broken down into further sub-processes, which are in turn are broken down to create a process decomposition hierarchy.
CRSP Process: High Level Process Flow

Figure 1 below represents the CRSP process flow at its highest level of abstraction.

All Customer requests are accepted through a common Work Intake step that determines the work type and the best route for it to follow through ITS1. It is not the intent that this work intake step is a “bottleneck” performed by a single person or unit. The team recommends that ITS staff should be trained and be capable of identifying the appropriate initial routing of a customer request in a consistent manner. In practice it is anticipated that the majority of CRSP requests may flow through the ITS Help Desk or directly to ITS service providers where the correct service provider is already known to the customer. The IT Service Catalog will aid this process.

![CRSP Process High Level Flow Diagram]

Figure 1 CRSP Process High Level Flow

Four of the five request types are directly routed and dealt with, these are:
- Service Request (No Consulting Required)
- Incident
- Information Request
- Complaint

Some Service Requests requires little or no consultation with the customer and therefore can be directly invoked with the right ITS service provider e.g. new Account Set-up. Other service requests may require some degree of consultation with the customer to determine their specific needs and match it to the right service. In these cases, the Understand the Customer Need process step is performed. In most cases this step will be the responsibility of the designated DL for

---

1 Appendix C: ITS Work Types lists some example customer request types.
the customer or a specific ITS Director if the request does not fall into a specific DL jurisdiction. The purpose of this step is to understand the customer need and to be able to clearly express it as a Problem/Opportunity Statement that can be addressed by an IT Service. This Problem/Opportunity Statement is identical to the information that is currently collected on ITS Project Proposals.

The request is then routed to the following self-contained processes:

- Work Order Process
- Project Management Process
- New Service Development Process
- Service Delivery Process (Altered)

The routing of a request to either the Work Order or the Project Management Process is determined by the scale of the effort involved to develop the solution. According to current ITS Project Management standards, any effort greater that 80 hrs work effort would be considered a Project, efforts below this would be simple Work Orders. Requests for New Services would go to the ITS Service Management unit and requests for delivery of slightly altered existing services would go to the specific ITS Service Delivery team responsible for the service.

The Capacity Management process is an entirely new support process that would help the ITS management team match human capacity to the work that ITS needs to performed. The CRSP team vision for this process can be found in Develop and Implement a Capacity Management Process on page 26 of this report.

Finally all the separate processes provide the particular solution to the customer be it the resolution of an Incident, a new enterprise application, a new report, a new service or the answer to an information request. The customer request is satisfied.

CRSP Process: Detailed Level Process Flow

The test case below can be used to assist the reader in navigating the detailed CRSP Process Flow that is illustrated in the following section. The references in blue indicate the specific steps in the CRSP model that relate to the scenario described.

CRSP Process Test Case Example

The Director of Applications Solutions is notified by the Police Chief that BAS needs a new system for a business need specific to the Police Station (Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type and Intake Responsibility). The Director determines that this request requires consultation and is the purview of the DL for the BAS division (Process: 1.3 Evaluate Request). He contacts the DL who meets briefly with Police Chief to get a quick feel for the problem/opportunity. He realizes the opportunity may require a relatively large project which may involve the selection or development of an application. The DL has been in the loop with Principal Officers of the Division and understands that this opportunity is in alignment with Division priorities.

Because of the size of the potential project, the critical nature of its function, and the fact that the security issues are not well understood, the DL decides that an in-person meeting is required between the Applications Solutions, Security, Networking, and other representatives from ITS that handle consultations (Process: 1.4 Select & Mobilize Consulting Team). The DL may also determine that other non-ITS experts should be involved (Process: 1.5 Consult with Customer). The goal of this meeting is to determine a problem/opportunity statement only (Process: 1.6 Develop Problem Opportunity Statement). (In another situation, the DL may need little or no consultation with other experts to create this statement.) The group quickly determines that this is not an existing service but rather clearly represents a project. After some analysis by the subject matter experts and another meeting with the team and the client, the DL collaborates with and coaches the client team to complete a project proposal (Process: 5.1 Develop Project Proposal & Classify Project).

The proposal is forwarded to PMG to be logged into a work inventory and checked for completeness (Process: 5.2 Check Project Proposal & log in Work Inventory). Once complete, the proposal is reviewed by PMG from an IT Investment perspective (Process: 5.3 Investment Option Process). This PMG review focuses on two areas:

---

2 We have provided this example to help the reader understand the CRSP process see Appendix D: CRSP Process Test Cases for more examples.
1. A check on the “Class” of the Project (PMG has sizing guidelines around project class that relate to the level PM methodology rigor that needs to be applied to managing them.) The PMG also verifies that the project is indeed a Project and not a Work Order (A Work Order comprise less than 80 hours of labor effort).

2. A check on the alignment of the proposed Project with campus and IT objectives and initiatives.

As part of the alignment check the PMG team examines the Project Proposal to see how it relates to other proposals submitted to ITS or other ITS Initiatives known through the IT Governance, Portfolio Planning and Management processes. This provides an opportunity for ITS to see if the needs of the Police department might be combined with the needs of other customers or other planned ITS investments. In this case, the Police Department need is determined to be unique and so the Project Proposal moves onto the Customer sponsor for approval. The project is classified by PMG.

The DL provides the Project Proposal to the client for review and approval (Process: 5.4 Obtain Customer Sponsor Approval of Project Proposal). In this case, the client understands that approving the proposal simply means that they are approving further research into a potential project and they are confirming that they intend to fund the project if they approve the Project Charter later in the process. In this case, the Police Department has secured funding from the campus for this project.

The project proposal is sent to SMT for approval and SMT does deem it a worthy project to dedicate limited resources for further investigation (Process: 5.5 Obtain ITS Management Approval of Project Proposal).

A detailed Project Charter is created by an assigned Project Manager from Application Solutions in conjunction with all key expert representatives (Process: 5.6 Develop Project Charter). This Charter must define a solution, a project plan, a time line, a budget, and resources including roles required. The PMG performs a QA review of the Project Charter (Process: 5.7 PMG Review & Project Class Recheck). This project is estimated to take a 6 months and specifies when and for how long the various resources will be required in terms of Resource Staffing Units (RSU) to aid the ITS Capacity Management process. The ITS Capacity Manager would assist ITS Unit managers in understanding their capacity given existing commitments which have been pre-defined by unit managers. A partnership is formed between the Project Manager, the Unit Managers, and the Capacity Manager to determine what resources would be available across ITS units for this project and when they would be available. In this case, resources from the various groups can be brought together to launch a project in 3 months (Process: 6.0 IT Capacity Management Process).

The Project Charter is completed by the Project Manager and discussed with the DL and the client (Process: 5.8 Project Charter Sponsor Review). The DL then seeks the approval of the client for the Project Charter. In this case, the Project Charter presents a time line, a budget, and a solution that is agreeable to the Police Chief and thus it is approved. The Project Charter is then presented to SMT (Process: 5.9 Obtain ITS Management Approval of Project Charter). The Capacity Manager provides information about other projects in the queue and those that may be coming so that SMT has a clear understanding about what committing resources to this project would entail. No other project in the queue outweighs the need for the Police system and the charter is approved by the SMT. Resources specified out in the charter are now officially considered to be locked on the project for the timeframe specified. This decision is recorded by the Capacity Manager (Process: 6.0 IT Capacity Management Process).

The Project is subsequently launched (Process: 5.10 Launch Project) and the follows the remaining Project Management steps of the CRSP process to deliver the Solution to the Police department as agreed to in the approved Project Charter and Plan.
CRSP Process: Detailed Process Workflow Diagrams

This section describes the CRSP process at a more detailed level and also indicates the interaction of ITS roles with the process. As explained earlier, the CRSP process is an overarching integrative process that ties together existing ITS processes with new process steps designed by the project team. To illustrate this in the following diagrams, process symbols depicted in Blue represent current ITS process processes that the CRSP Process links to or needs to be integrated with. Process symbols in Green are new process steps that have been defined by the CRSP team.

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>END</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Assign Work Intake Responsibility</td>
<td>Process Step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 Project Charter Sponsor Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>————— Request —————</td>
<td>Data Flow (Name of flow indicated deliverable passed and process precedence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>————— —————</td>
<td>Control Flow (Flow signifies precedence only)</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 bars indicate that the process has sub-processes and its own internal workflow definition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Flow connector between a process step and a role (source or sink)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Off Page Connector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 A four-page tabloid size version of the CRSP Work Flow diagram may be downloaded in Adobe PDF format from the CRSP Project Team web page on the ITS web site.
CRSP Process Descriptions

Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type and Intake Responsibility
All incoming Customer Requests are classified into a type of IT work that corresponds to a Work Taxonomy developed by the CRSP team. The taxonomy classifies and routes the customer request into one of 5 output flows:

- Service Request (Off-the-shelf IT Service)
- Incident
- Service Request (Consulting Required to use the service)
- Information Request (General inquiries)
- Complaint

A dichotomous key job aid was developed by the team to aid in this task. This job aid could be implemented as a manual or electronic reference card or as a web page dialog e.g. Dichotomous Key Example. This process step also records the Customer Request and its work type into a central ITS system of record and identifies the specific ITS role/individual with responsibility for overseeing the ITS response to the customer. An internal ITS Service provider directory is used to determine this information. 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 Evaluate Request
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 this example the request would be referred to the ITS Director of Application Solutions.

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 meets with the customer to clarify and understand their needs. This may take the form of a face-to-face meeting(s) or a phone discussion(s).

Process: 1.6 Develop Problem Opportunity Statement
The DL or Consulting Team works with customer to develop a problem/opportunity statement which clarifies the request and describes high level requirements.

Process: 1.7 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?
Process: 1.9 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: 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 Proposal is not approved the process ends and the Project Proposal is kept by ITS PMG as a permanent record of
the request together with the reasons for its disapproval. If the Project Proposal is approved at this phase, then it moves on for a “Go/No Go” approval by the SMT.

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. If the Project Proposal is not approved for further consideration then the reasons for ITS not approving it and the initial Project Proposal serve as a record of the governance process. If it is approved, then the next level of detail, the Project Charter, will be developed by the Project Manager.

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 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 move the project from concept to launch: customer approval and ITS approval.

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 locked (assigned for the duration of their specific project assignment) and the project may be officially launched. For more details of resource locking see the recommendation section: Develop and Implement a Capacity Management Process.

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 identified 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 and to the satisfaction of the customer.

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.
- Unlock staff assignments to the project
- 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 Capacity Management Process**

This is an entirely new process proposed by the CRSP to introduce formal IT human capacity planning. This process also involves a new role of “ITS Capacity Manager” to facilitate and perform this process. The goal of the process is to reach the best decisions on ITS ability to take on new work and to assign and manage the human capacity of the organization. The ITS Capacity manager be a neutral broker and facilitator for enabling management to make 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. See the section “CRSP Team Recommendations” for more details.

**Process: 7.0 Release Management**

The Release Management process manages the distribution of software and hardware, including license controls into the ITS production environment. There are currently different variants of this process at ITS.

1) Release management has relationships to:
   a) Change management  
   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

**Role Descriptions**

**Role: Help Desk**

The existing ITS Help Desk staff within the CRM unit.

**Role: Customer**

Any member of campus who is entitled and authorized to use the services provided by ITS.

**Role: ITS Staff Member**

Any member of ITS.
Role: DL/Account Manager
The Divisional Liaison for the customer or their equivalent “Account Manager”. If a request is from an organization unit for which a clear DL jurisdiction has been defined e.g. an academic unit, this role will be played by the appropriate Divisional Liaison. Where this is not the case, the CRSP team recommends that a specific IT Director be assigned to predefined request areas or jurisdictions. For example requests for Enterprise Applications should be the responsibility of Director of Application Solutions. One outstanding issue to be resolved is to determine who performs the DL/Account Manager role for individual ITS staff members e.g. addressing individual or collective ITS personal computing needs.

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

Role: ITS Units
This role represents a number of specific ITS sub-units engaged in the CRSP process. The most common being IT Service Management, Project Managers and ITS Service Providers.

Role: PMG
The ITS Portfolio 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: Request
In most cases, this flow represents the original Customer Request from an external customer. However it may also represent requests from internal customers (ITS units and staff). For example an ITS Application Solutions may request a Source Code Management software tool to support their work.

Dataflow: Service Request (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.

Dataflow: Service Request (Consulting Required)
This dataflow represents a service request that requires some consultation to determine and deliver the service effectively.

Dataflow: Information Request
This dataflow represents a general request for information from a customer or other party.
The Customer View of CRSP

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 is section summarizes the customer’s view of the entire CRSP process in terms of a communication diagram between a customer and ITS.
CRSP Team Recommendations
This section summarizes the major recommendations that need to be adopted in order to successfully implement the CRSP Process as designed by the team.

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

Adoption of an ITS Work Classification Key
The team recommends that a “ITS Work Classification Key” should be used at the front of the work intake process to provide consistency around how customer requests are routed. The key should be usable by the widest audience (ITS and users) and it would be used to classify, assign and route all work flowing into ITS. The key would classify incoming requests into the 5 types handled by the CRSP process, namely:
- Service Request (Off-the-shelf IT Service)
- Incident
- Service Request (Consulting Required to use the service)
- Information Request (General inquiries)
- Complaint

All ITS staff should be trained to use the key but one of the primary users will be the ITS Help Desk Staff. The team recommends that a simple web tool or other job aid to support work classification be created and made available to all staff (Appendix B: ITS Work Classification Key).

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 Touch points
Key Service touch point staff should be identified for every ITS service provider group to support the CRSP work intake process. This information should be included in the ITS Service Provider guide (Internal IT Catalog).

Use a single system to log and track 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. The current IT Request system may be a candidate for this purpose but this and other alternatives should be formally examined. Ideally this information should be made visible to customers on the ITS web site like tracking a FEDEX package.

The system should track the status of the different request types through their various paths in the CRSP process from start to finish. For instance an Incident and a Service Request for a project would have different paths at the end of the process but would have a similar path at the beginning of the process. As a first step toward implementation we would have to identify the precise states that the different request types go through and determine which of these steps or states would be meaningful to a customer. Figure 2 CRSP Request State Transition Diagram shows some of these states for the different types customer requests.

Such an approach would help manage expectations and visibility to the customer. ITS and staff and customers would have a common reference point for where a specific request is in the process.
Develop and Publish an ITS Service Provider Guide (Internal IT Catalog)
As Figure 3 CRSP and the IT Service Catalog shows, the IT Service Catalog is key component of the CRSP process. The stronger and more complete the catalog is, the quicker the CRSP process will flow, especially at the front end of the process.

The DL should play a major role in overseeing a request through the CRSP process, but if a request comes through to the Help Desk or other ITS staff member they may not know what all the relevant services are, the details about a service, who the service provider is and whether the customer is eligible to receive them. The IT Service Catalog will be an invaluable tool to solve this problem.
Figure 3 CRSP and the IT Service Catalog

The IT service catalog fosters self-service, but there will be times when customers have more detailed questions beyond the current level of specification of the IT Catalog or need some further interpretation of the service description. The CRSP team recommends that a more detailed internal ITS IT Services reference guide be developed and implemented for reference by the entire ITS staff. 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 “Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type and Intake Responsibility”. Much of this work has already been conceived and prototyped by the IT Services group, we simply need to implement it to support 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 we have too many current service offerings to relate CRSP work intake against. For example, 70 global and 572 local services have been identified by ITS. We need to rationalize and reduce this set. Work was begun by the DLs to agree on common terms, service names and granularity of the services that they deliver. This work should be completed as a prelude to ITS Service Specification.

From a CRSP implementation standpoint, the entire IT Service Catalog may take years to specify in its entirety and will constantly be evolving as customer needs change. So where should we start? This initial set of services needs to be rationalized and reduced. The global and local views of services need to be reconciled from the customers’ point of view and we need to continue to align ourselves around a global catalog.

Another key consideration is the minimum degree of specification of the service catalog that would be required to enable the CRSP process to work. The IT Service Management team has recently created a Service Definition Document that describes a set of standard elements that would comprise a complete ITS service definition. Using the Service Definition Checklist in this document as a reference we have identified the following elements as the minimum required to support CRSP implementation. All valid IT services should be specified to this level.
Figure 4 Minimum IT Service Specification Level to Support CRSP

DLs should be Account Managers

The DL is the primary Client Relationship Manager and is critical to the CRSP Process. Acting in the capacity of Account Manager, the DL should be the primary channel for understanding the needs and requirements of clients and moving them through the CRSP process. The DL should have their “finger on the pulse” of the Division, understanding and predicting various technology needs and issues across the Division, working within the DL council to identify needs that involve multiple Divisions, and maintaining a relationship with Principal Officers so as to understand and represent the priorities of the Division.

The “Account Manager” aspects of the DL role have been envisioned from the very beginning of the IT Transformation Program (ITTP). The goal of account management is to build long-term, mutually beneficial client relationships through value added service delivery.

The team developed the following role definition for the DL/Account Manager:

- **Be the primary relationship manager for the client**
  - Build a long-term working relationship between the ITS and the client that goes beyond individual service requests
  - Be a trusted advisor to the client
  - Help the client build their network and knowledge of how to use IT
- **Understand and anticipate client needs and match them to the service offerings of ITS**
  - Understand the client’s issues and help them serve their constituencies
  - Understand the client’s culture, environment and discipline
  - Understand ITS service offerings (ITS Service Catalog)
- **Bring the right resources, services and solutions to the client**
  - Source and coordinate service delivery from ITS teams and Subject Matter Experts (SMEs)
  - Oversee service delivery quality and benefit realization
- **Solve the client’s problems and deliver value!**

The fact that the DL is designated as a primary relationship manager does not mean they would be the only person who would talk or interact with clients – they should simply be “in the loop” on all communications that impact their customer base. Clear “Rules of Engagement” need to be established and followed to support this principle. For example:

- 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 (Process: 1.4 Select & Mobilize Consulting Team)
- 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.
Some customer requests may not fall into a particular DL jurisdiction. In these cases, a specific ITS Director should be named as the “Account Manager” for that customer and their constituency e.g. Enterprise applications that impact all groups on campus. With this in mind, the team used the “DL+” notation to indicate DLs plus a limited number of ITS directors who would play the Account Manager role.

The team also developed a set of skills, knowledge and abilities that a top performing Account Manager would need:

- **Leadership:**
  - Can lead the team: proactive, action oriented, takes responsibility for obtaining an effective process result for the client
  - Ability to build trust and respect with client and ITS staff (trust and relationship building allows DL to get involved in an idea earlier in its inception).
  - Strong sense of stewardship (takes care of the clients IT assets and interests)
  - Understand the criticality of their role in the CRSP process and it relationship to other roles
  - Maintains a campus-wide perspective

- **Strong client management skills:**
  - Have the customer’s best interests at heart and respect their interests
  - Diplomacy
  - Ability to challenge the client’s thinking for their own best interests when necessary (not just an “order taker”, mitigates risk for the client and the campus)
  - Broad knowledge and understanding of the two worlds: Clients world and ITS and the ability to match ITS capabilities to client needs
  - In-depth understanding of customer organization (processes, operating model, terminology etc.) and ITS capabilities

- **Team Player:**
  - Collaborative - works as a partner with their ITS colleagues and the client for the best result
  - Supports other team members

- **Interpersonal and Communication Skills:**
  - Effective listener
  - Has respect, confidence, optimism
  - Possesses both communication and technical skills
  - Strong communication skills (written and presentation)
  - Negotiating skills

- **Objective, analytical and conceptual thinking skills:**
  - Ability to objectively uncover client needs and translate them into accurate requirements
  - Ability to put the details into a strategic context and relate them to client objectives (balance 30,000 ft versus street level details)
  - Process driven, rational, methodical in approach without being pedantic.
  - Strong problem solving ability
  - They know how to seek out and find information

This is a challenging role and ITS needs to invest training and development resources to assist the DLs in fulfilling it.

**Develop and Implement a Capacity Management Process**

The team recommends that a new Capacity Management Process be defined and implemented for ITS (Figure 5 CRSP ITS Capacity Management Vision). The goals of this process would be to:

- View capabilities, commitments and availability of staff
- “Lock” and “Unlock” staff 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 Capacity 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 enabling the best ITS staffing decisions to be made by ITS management. The goal would be to maximize the work accomplished by the unit.
and to provide opportunities for staff to develop their skills and competencies. This 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.
Conclusion & Next Steps

This project has focused on the design of the CRSP Process using a multi-disciplinary team drawn from across ITS. It has been both a stimulating and challenging task – with much debate. From the testing the team has done with the process test cases and the detailed discussions held with the Senior Management Team (SMT) the team is comfortable that the model presented here can work to address the ITS issues of responding to customer requests in a more consistent, timely and effective manner. We also believe that the CRSP process has the potential to make the working lives of all ITS staff a little easier by breaking down internal ITS organizational silos and providing a robust cross-functional process to enable different ITS staff to work together to serve our customers.

As with any design, the final proof will come with implementation. To this end, the team recommends that a CRSP Implementation Planning effort be started immediately to determine the best approach for taking the “blueprint” presented here and making it a reality. Since the scope of the CRSP process is so broad, it is recommended that CRSP implementation be broken down into multiple project efforts and management initiatives. Some of these implementation activities may be merged with other existing ITS projects e.g. DDSLA, Change Management Implementation. Some of these efforts such as Capacity Management Implementation may be implemented as a new project.

CRSP is a cross-functional ITS process. As Rummler and Brache\(^4\) have noted: “The greatest opportunities for performance improvement often lie in the functional interfaces – those points at which the baton (for example, production specs) is being passed from one department to another … critical interfaces (which occur in the “white space” on an organization chart) are visible in the horizontal view of an organization”.

The CRSP team sincerely hopes that our work presented here provides a clear picture of what that “horizontal” process view could be for ITS and its customers and that it moves us forward in our goal of becoming a process driven organization.

The CRSP Team
April 20, 2007

Appendix A: CRSP Process Decomposition

The following diagram is an alternate view of the process model that shows the 8 different ITS processes that the CRSP process integrates.
Appendix B: 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?" – in terms of engineering IT Services and delivery processes.
<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>Toggle in ITR (not in the service catalog): incident / non-incident. Or, incident / non-incident / consultation.</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>1. What’s an incident? (see above;). 2. There’s a shortage of information in some parts of the Service Catalog about whom to contact and what action to take to access the service. Some units’ descriptions are more complete than others. 3. Just because it’s in the Service Catalog doesn’t mean it’s available to me at my service level.</td>
<td>Sorting/routing/tracking overload for DL’s and Directors. Too many instances of “That’s a great question!”</td>
<td>Every off-the-shelf service needs either a self-service link or an associated contact (Instructional Computing’s services are a good example).</td>
<td>B. Contact info -- ITR routing, email or phone -- for receiving service. C. Quantifiable service level.</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? 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. “Consultation required” flag.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We don’t do that.”</td>
<td>None of the above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Service Request (Consulting Required)
- Application and system changes
- Contractor referral requests
- Need help with a Customer Project (not ITS managed)
- Small customized database
- Division IT growth (Anticipate/Solicit needs/Client Conversations)
- General IT consulting and advice
- Need help specifying a new building for IT Infrastructure
- Help with compromised server
- “Help me figure out what I need”
- “Help me fix my existing application” (Departmental or Enterprise application)
- HW and SW needs
- Ideas, needs
- IT Management and Planning Requests
- ITS generated project ideas
- New features in existing service
- New services
- Professional faculty website
- Need for a Project Manager
- Project requests
- Request for a small application/upgrade
- Request for exception to standards
- Request for project that has wider applicability
- Requirements analysis
- Server hosting
- Simpson letter requests
- Small database application with possible campus application
- Staffing needs
- Strategic Initiatives
- Support for proposed grad program
- Urgent IT support (Department, Unit or Division)

Service Requests (Off the Shelf Services – Little or no consulting required to understand need)
- Request for an existing service e.g. Desktop Support, Account Management
- “I Need new reports (AIS)” (If simple need)
- Operational day-to-day requests

Incidents
- As currently defined in IT Request
- Urgent IT support (Personal Computing)
- “Help me fix my existing application” (Personal computing)
- Software functional help
- Problems

Information Request
- Referral of Non-ITS Requests (Library, Campus general)
- Referral to appropriate person, contact information
- Outage information
- Information on IT Policies and Standards
- Information on Forward Schedule of Changes (FSC)
- Training

Complaint
- Dissatisfaction with ITS service
- Suggestion for improvement
- Praise and adulation
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Appendix D: 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.
Number: 1  Name: Requesting Funds for Local Service Requests
Date: 09/09/06  Source: Larry Merkley

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 Evaluate Request
- Process: 1.4 Select & Mobilize Consulting Team
- Process: 1.5 Consult with Customer
- Process: 1.9 VP IT Due Diligence
- Process: 1.7 VP IT Funding Review

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

Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number: 2</th>
<th>Name: “Simpson Letter” Review of Elluminate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: 09/18/06</td>
<td>Source: Larry Merkley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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 Barradiffi.
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**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**
- Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type
- **Error! Reference source not found.**
- Process: 1.3 Evaluate Request
- Process: 1.4 Select & Mobilize Consulting Team
- Process: 1.5 Consult with Customer
- Process: 1.9 VP IT Due Diligence
- Process: 6.0 IT Capacity Management 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?
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<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-Processes and Activities:**
- Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type and 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.
Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Fleet Management Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>09/15/06</td>
<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 Evaluate Request
- Process: 1.4 Select & Mobilize Consulting Team
- Process: 1.5 Consult with Customer

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

Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Name: Classroom Availability Web Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>10/18/06</td>
<td>Source: Charlie McDowell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 and Intake Responsibility
- Process: 1.3 Evaluate Request
- 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:**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>UARC Purchase Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>10/04/06</td>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Larry Merkley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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
### Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:
- Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type and Intake Responsibility
- Process then exits back to the customer since no ITS approval required

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

### Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Name: Security Issues and CRSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>11/14/06</td>
<td>Source: Janine Roeth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**
From: Janine A. Roeth [jar@ucsc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2006 1:32 PM
To: Mel Barrcliffe
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:
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
- Process: 1.1 Determine Work Type and Intake Responsibility

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

Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>JUMPSTART SW Acquisition Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>09/26/06</td>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Larry Merkley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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/Par – 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.
Appendices

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

**Related CRSP Sub-Processes and Activities:**
- 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.
- Process: 1.3 Evaluate Request
- Process: 1.5 Consult with Customer

**Actors involved (People, Organizations, Roles, Systems etc):**
- IT Directors
- ITS Unit Managers

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number: 10</th>
<th>Name: FMP DB Hosting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: 11/21/06</td>
<td>Source: 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 and Intake Responsibility
- Process: 1.3 Evaluate Request
- 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.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td><strong>Restarting UCB/UCSC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>11/21/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Peter McMillan, Jeff Trapp, Asst. Fire Chief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 and Intake Responsibility 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.
### 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:
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 and Intake Responsibility
- Process: 1.3 Evaluate Request
- 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: 1.9 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: 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:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Arts Division New Building</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 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?
### IT Staffing Increase Request

**Number:** 15  
**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:**
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:
### Media Equipment Upgrade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Media Equipment Upgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>11/29/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Scotty Brookie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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:**
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:
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
- **Error! Reference source not found.** – 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 and 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
### Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>22</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
- DI.
- 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: 23</th>
<th>Name: Privacy Notice Posting Required?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Source: 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.
- Error! Reference source not found.

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>24</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 and Intake Responsibility - This is a service request – albeit a strange one.

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

**Policy, Rules, SLA and OLA Implications:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>ADA Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Source:</td>
<td></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.

*Error! Reference source not found.*

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>Name: Secure Empty Trash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Source:</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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number: 27</th>
<th>Name: Securely Deleting Files from PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Source: 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:**
### 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:
### 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:
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
Appendices

<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>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>New POS System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>Tammy Heinsohn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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:**
### 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:
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
## Appendices

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


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


### 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>Number:</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>New Program Needs Placement Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Source:</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:**