College of Engineering IT Governance Committee – Meeting Minutes  
March 18, 2014  
1:00-2:30pm  
159 Everitt

Attendees  
Steve Franke (chair), Jeannette Beck, Aaron Darnall, Beth Dennison, Wawrzyniec Dobrucki, Jay Menacher, Greg Pluta, Brian Thomas, Melissa Walters, Kris Williams, Chuck Thompson (ex officio)

Handouts  
- Draft Minutes for February 18, 2013 meeting (electronic)  
- Slides for March 18, 2014 Meeting (electronic)  
- Application Development Process Workflow (paper)  
- Sample SOW – Statement of Work (paper)

1. The minutes for the February 18, 2014 meeting were approved as-is.

2. Chair Steve Franke introduced Brad Butler, Assistant Director for Application Services with Engineering IT. He noted that Brad was asked to present on the current application development process as a direct result of the conversation at the end of the previous Committee meeting.

3. Brad noted that the development process is now role based whereas previously each individual handled every step of the development of apps for which they were responsible. Brad described the defined roles which include analyst, developer, DBA, and support specialist.

4. The Committee discussed the definitions of multiple terms, in particular sponsor, stakeholder, and user. The Committee discussed what rights each of these roles had in the development process (e.g. the ability to request or approve a particular change). Brad was asked to produce a glossary of terms and to adjust the working definitions of some terms based on the Committee’s feedback.

5. Brad described the Statement of Work (SOW) document that is now being produced for all applications to define what work needs to be done prior to development starting. The Committee discussed how it is determined when the SOW is covering the needs of a single unit versus a college-wide need versus being developed for campus-wide usage.

6. Brad described the factors he has been using to prioritize the development order for projects. The Committee discussed the factors, how they are weighted, and what their role should potentially be in the prioritization process. Also discussed were mechanisms by which a unit might “jump the queue” and elevate the priority of a project.

7. The Committee reviewed the current prioritized development list as prepared by Brad. The Committee asked for additional information about the current and future projects in order to assist them with reviewing the ordering.

8. Chair Franke stated that he did not see the full Committee having a long term role in the prioritization process. However, he noted it would be useful for them to help define that process.