





# Purpose of the Commission Background

• Oversee strategic planning and set policy for the state's information systems

• Assure continuity in planning and controlling the state's investment in information systems

The Colorado Commission on Information Management (IMC) was created during the 1987 legislative session and first met on October 1, 1987. The purposes of the IMC as defined by the legislature and stated in 24-30 Part 17, C.R.S. are to:

- oversee strategic planning and set policy for the state's information systems
- assure continuity in planning and controlling the state's investment in information systems

The Commission is composed of 15 members. Eight members are appointed by the governor from the private sector. These individuals serve as volunteers and are required to have a background in information management and technology. Seven members are from state government. One from the State Senate; one from the House of Representatives; the Executive Director of the Department of Administration; the executive directors of three principal departments, designated by the Governor; and the State Court Administrator. The names of the 1993-94 Commission members are listed below. Subcommittee and Agency Team memberships and duties are identified on the back of this report.

David C. Burns is Chairman of the Commission and Steven V. Berson serves as Vice-Chairman. The Commission is staffed by three full-time employees: Clayton A. Powers, Staff Director; John Komdat, Principal Analyst; and K. Sue Gallagher, Planning and Budget Analyst. The 1994 session of the Legislature appropriated two additional positions to the Commission, a Principal Analyst and an Administrative Assistant. These positions will be filled in the 94-95 fiscal year.

# Colorado Commission on Information Management 1993-94 Membership

Private Sector Members:

David C. Burns, IMC Chairman Independent Consultant

William S. Brown, Senior Partner Brown & Goldstein

Elaine G. Callas-Williams Independent Consultant

William E. Farrell, President Executive Management Consultant

Nancy A. Griffin Independent Consultant

Wilbur Richardson, Retired University of Southern Colorado

Rolly Rounds, Director, Systems Operations Martin Marietta Western Internal Systems

James D. Thomas, Vice President Court Services Division National Center for State Courts Public Sector Members:

Steven V. Berson, IMC Vice-Chairman State Court Administrator, Judicial Department

John J. Donlon, Executive Director Department of Labor & Employment

Renny Fagan, Executive Director Department of Revenue

Barbara A. McDonnell, Executive Director Department of Institutions

The Honorable William R. Schroeder, Jr. State Senator

The Honorable Charles Duke State Representative

Vacancy

## **1993-94 ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

Total funding for the Commission in the 1993-94 fiscal year was \$378,969. The return to the state on this investment included:

# PLANNING

Expenditures for new and existing information systems in state agencies (excluding higher education) in FY 1993-94 totaled \$121,391,326. To judge the effectiveness of this expenditure and control its growth, the Legislature has specified, through the IMC, that new applications of information technology demonstrate positive, measurable benefits and value consistent with each state agency's mission and strategic direction. In 1992, the IMC completely revised the statewide information management planning process to ensure efficient strategic planning for the state's information needs. This same process was followed for the 1993-94 process cycle. Key elements of the process included:

## IMAP - Information Management Annual Planning Guide

By using the IMAP Guide to develop an information management plan, state agencies have a tool for evaluating their long-term information management needs and guiding daily information management decisions within the context of their vision, mission and strategic business objectives for the agency.

#### **IMAP Review Process Document**

State agency's plans and projects are reviewed using the criteria in this document as a guideline to ensure consistent evaluation. This document, first released in 1992, includes the plan review policy, ten criteria for IMAP evaluation, seven criteria for project evaluation, and sample formats for analysis of the agency's plan and projects.

# PLAN and PROJECT REVIEW ANALYSIS

#### **Agency Review**

IMAP plans were expected from 24 agencies; 19 were submitted and evaluated by Commission staff using the standardized criteria which includes value, resource allocation, risk, and cost/benefit ratio. The Staff Analysis, which included recommendations for approval, disapproval or modification of projects, was distributed to the state agency and the IMC Agency Team assigned to that agency. The 15 member Commission is divided into three Agency Teams, each responsible for eight state agencies. This includes reviewing agency plans and projects as well as year around contact working on the agency's information technology needs, problems and opportunities.

The three teams reviewed the 1993-94 information and either concurred with or changed staff recommendations. Agency Team recommendations were then reviewed by the entire Commission and a final recommendation was made to the Governor's Office of State Planning and Budgeting (OSPB) and the Legislative Joint Budget Committee (JBC) for consideration in state budget development.

#### **Results - Cost Savings**

The IMC reviewed 19 agency IMAPs which included 111 information management projects totaling \$55,066,943. The Commission reviews all projects regardless of funding source. The IMC recommended approval of 86 projects totaling \$40,473,960 and did not recommend 25 projects totaling \$14,952,833.

Thirty-three of the total 111 projects were Budget Decision Items, requiring \$17,895,180 in new funds. Thirty of these projects, totaling \$10,356,912, were approved by the IMC and recommended to the legislature for funding.

## **Commission on Information Management (IMC)**

Comparative Da	ata	
----------------	-----	--

Measurement	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	Totals-3 yrs	Averages
Strategic Plans Reviewed	22	21			(where appropriate)	
Tactical Plans Reviewed	19	21				
IMAP Plans Reviewed			•22	19		20.
Budget Requests Reviewed	58	57	78	33		56.
Dollar Amount of Budget Requests Reviewed	\$17,572,740	\$20,320,716	\$30,808,995	\$17,895,180	\$69,024,891	\$21,649,408
Budget Requests Approved	49	42	51	30		4:
Dollar Amount of Budget Requests Approved	\$12,035,475	\$13,806,266	\$18,561,636	\$10,356,912	\$42,724,814	\$13,690,072
Budget Requests Disapproved	9	15	27	3		13.5
Dollar Amount of Budget Requests Disapproved	\$5,537,265	\$6,514,450	\$12,247,359	\$7,538,268	\$26,300,077	\$7,959,336
I/S Projects Reviewed		164	222	111	497	165.7
Dollar Amount of I/S Projects Reviewed		\$39,942,084	\$66,741,224	\$55,066,843	\$161,750,151	\$53,916,717
I/S Projects Approved		95	146	86	327	109
Dollar Amount of I/S Projects Approved		\$21,545,489	\$46,433,200	\$40,473,960	\$108,452,649	\$36,150,883
I/S Projects Disapproved		69	76	25	170	56.7
Dollar Amount of I/S Projects Disapproved		\$18,396,595	\$20,308,024	\$14,952,883	\$53,657,502	\$17,885,834
Projects per FTE		55	74	37		55.3
Dollar Amount of Project Per FTE		\$13,314,028	\$22,247,075	\$18,355,614		\$17,972,239
Percent of Projects Approved		57.9%	65.8%	77.5%		65.8%
Percent of Projects Disapproved		42.1%	34.2%	22.5%		34.2%
Cost Per Project Review		\$1,618.96	\$1,056.59	\$2,070.89		\$1,582.15
Plan and Project Review Completion Date	Apr-91	May-92	Oct-93	Jul-94		
Average Cost of Project	Charles H	\$243,549	\$300,636	\$496,098	1	%INC 92-94 103.7%
		φ <b>2</b> 73,343	\$300,838	<b>4430,030</b>	2	103.7%
Average Cost of Project Approved		\$226,795	\$318,036	\$470,627		107.5%
Average Cost of Project Disapproved		\$266,617	\$267,211	\$598,115		124.3%

\*Strategic and Tactical Plans combined into one plan - Information Management Annual Plan (IMAP) Projects include all activities of the departments whether base or new funding. The request numbers are also included in the project numbers.

# OUTREACH

#### **Planning Retreat**

On September 24, 1993, the Commission met in special session and completed a comprehensive evaluation of current compliance with Section 24-30 -Part 17, the IMC statute. The Commission agreed upon a plan to enhance compliance with the statutes and enhance the working relationship with all the Executive Branch agencies.

The Commission reached consensus on four specific areas to improve performance. These include:

- 1. There is a need for strategic planning and guidance from the IMC, especially in areas such as compatibility, purchasing, and data interchange. This applies to both policy and technical direction.
- 2. The IMC will continue to review and approve IS plans of the departments of state government. Approval of the plans will be based on criteria that are clearly defined and documented. These criteria will change over time due to rapid changes in technology and changes in the overall state strategic plan. The IMC staff will provide advance consultation in development of department plans and other technical consultation.
- 3. IMC activities and information will be communicated to the departments on a timely basis. Commissioners who are Executive Directors are to take information back to other Cabinet members. Higher Education information system people are to be included.
- 4. The IMC will continue to provide information relevant to appropriations in a timely manner. The IMC planning cycle is to be modified to comply with the Office of State Planning and Budgeting (OSPB) and the Joint Budget Committee (JBC) timing requirements.

# Meeting with the Cabinet

On November 22, 1993, the Commission met with the Governor's Cabinet to begin planning for improved service by the IMC to state agencies. This meeting allowed the sharing of ideas which resulted in a better understanding of the planning process and produced a new relationship between the IMC and the cabinet. The Statewide Information Architecture Study grew from the discussions at this meeting.

## **EDUCATION**

#### **Project Management**

In September 1993, the IMC sponsored a three-day Information Systems Project Management class conducted by the American Management Association. Twenty state personnel attended at a greatly reduced fee.

## Business Process Re-engineering Seminars

The Commission sponsored two seminars on Business Process Reengineering. One was conducted by the Gartner Group, a nationally recognized information technology research organization and the other by the American Management Association. Over 115 state personnel, including department executive directors, program administrators, and information technology staff, attended.

#### Library

The IMC coordinated the acquisition of eight research areas from the Gartner Group by five different state agencies. A central repository, which serves as a resource for all of state government, was established in the IMC office. The library is used by agency personnel. In addition, it is a source of information for IMC staff to respond to inquiries about different technologies.

## **Technical Assistance**

Throughout the year, the Gartner Group made available technical experts to discuss various topics with state personnel in informal sessions.

# **CONSULTING SERVICES**

During 1993-94 the IMC Commissioners and staff consulted with numerous departments about various aspects of their information systems. A representative sample includes the following:

COFRS Colorado Student Loans CATI/Education Corrections Institutions Judicial Labor & Employment Local Affairs Natural Resources Regulatory Agencies Social Services On-line Electronic reports New Client/Server Architecture NTIA Grants Several projects including Imaging Community Housing System Data Sharing with Human Services Several Feasibility Studies Property Taxation Division Mineral Information Management System User Visioning and Department Requirements Mid-tier server, Unique Client ID

Major Projects:

Institutions Education DOLE,DOSS,DOI HIMS RFP (Several hundred hours) Statewide Data Model for Schools (IMC Funds) Statewide Timekeeping System (IMC Funds)

Developed Data Sharing Model currently being discussed for data sharing and information exchange between agencies.

#### **Financial Assistance**

The Commission contributed \$10,000 to each of two statewide projects.

• Statewide Timekeeping System - A consortium of the Departments of Labor and Employment, Institutions, Social Services, and Personnel, contracted to study the availability of package software to implement a statewide time and leave keeping system that is acceptable to state agencies in need of a new system.

• Statewide Data Model for Schools - The Commission provided supplemental funding to the Department of Education to conduct a Data Analysis-Feasibility Study. This study resulted from Footnote 14a of the 1993-94 Long Bill which directed the Department of Education, in conjunction with the Information Management Commission, to report to the Joint Budget Committee and the Capital Development Committee by November 1, 1993, on the feasibility of accepting automated data transfers of information required of school districts.

# **PLANS FOR FY 1994-1995**

## 1994 Abbreviated IMAP

The Commission adopted a condensed Information Management Annual Plan (IMAP) and a revised schedule for this and following years to synchronize better with the full budget process of all branches. The Commission will be able to make recommendations on I/S plans and projects to the Office of State Planning and Budgeting (OSPB) prior to the Governor submitting his budget to the Legislature. The revised calendar also allows the IMC to complete IMAP reviews for all agencies and communicate recommendations to the Legislature before February 1 of each year as directed in Footnote #2 of the 1994 Long Bill

Abbreviating the IMAP process for 1994 does not reflect any changes in the Commission's planning policy or dedication to information planning as a vital, necessary process within agencies. The Commission has consistently stated that an agency's planning should not only set the path for information technology but also be a tool used in dayto-day information management decisions.

The Commission and Agency Teams will continue to use the review and guidelines outlined in the 1992 Information Management Annual Plan Review Process document. Plans and projects will continue to be examined with an emphasis on information technology as a sound financial investment for the state. These investments, whether funded from base or requested new funds, must demonstrate a positive cost/benefit ratio and support the vision, mission and business objectives of the agency. In addition, conformance to the State Strategic Information Plan will be scrutinized.

#### **Summer Team Meetings**

The IMC wishes to continue the successful and informative summer meetings with agencies, separate from the review process. Each Agency Team will try to meet with its assigned departments during the summer to gain additional understanding of each others objectives and concerns.

#### Audit Recommendations

In the next year, the Commission will continue to work on fulfilling commitments to recommendations that resulted from two audits:

- Information Systems Risk Analysis State of Colorado Information Resources
- Cost of Information Systems

## Statewide Information Architecture Study

The Commission rolled forward contractual funds from FY 93-94 to supplement FY 94-95 funding for the completion of a Statewide Information Architecture Study. The study, funded for \$184,800, will:

- develop the framework for clear understanding of architectural requirements that will be used to evaluate subsequent implementation projects.
- generate a clear and compelling change imperative within all levels of state government
- ensure participatory development of the architecture by both the business and information technology communities
- establish effective communication channels within and between agencies related to development, adoption, and realization of an architectural approach toward information technology

This architecture will provide a guide for procurements by state agencies to ensure compatibility and enable information exchange in the future. The architecture will specify standards which any new systems must meet so that over time, as we replace the existing state information infrastructure, we will achieve the high level of compatibility required.

This works toward fulfilling the IMC's statutory responsibility to oversee strategic planning and set policy for the state's information systems and to assure continuity in planning and controlling the state's investment in information systems, to develop an approach for achieving statewide compatibility or accessibility of information systems, and to approve a set of minimum standards to control purchases by state agencies and approve criteria to be used in approving or rejecting agency procurements.

# **Commission on Information Management**

1993-94 Subcommittees and Agency Teams David C. Burns, Chairman

Planning and Budget Subc	ommittee Pol	icies and Standards Subcommit		
<b>Members</b> David C. Burns, Acting Chairma Steven V. Berson William S. Brown John J. Donlon William E. Farrell Senator William R. Schroeder, J. James D. Thomas Vacancy	n Elai Rolly Repu Ren Nan r. Barl Will	Members Elaine G. Callas-Williams, Co-Chairman Rolly Rounds, Co-Chairman Representative Charles Duke Renny Fagan Nancy A. Griffin Barbara A. McDonnell Wilbur Richardson David C. Burns (ex officio)		
<ul> <li>State Strategic Plan</li> <li>IMC Strategic Plan</li> <li>Plan Review Guidelines</li> <li>Agency Plan Formats</li> <li>Annual Budget Package</li> <li>Budget Review Guidelines</li> <li>Budget Priorities</li> <li>Budget Appeals</li> </ul>	APR 1 4 1995 · SP Re TE DUBLICATIONS R	atablish State Policies andards for Software, Equipment, perating Systems pecial Study Projects i.e. GIS, Disaster ecovery FP Issues ata Center consolidations		
Agency Team 1	Agency Team 2	Agency Team 3		
<b>Agencies</b> Judicial Local Affairs Natural Resources Public Defender Regulatory Agencies Secretary of State Transportation Treasury	Agencies Corrections Education Health Institutions Law Military Affairs Public Safety Social Services	Agencies Administration Agriculture Governor Higher Education Labor & Employment Legislature Personnel Revenue		
Members William S. Brown, Chairman Elaine G. Callas-Williams Rep. Charles Duke Nancy A. Griffin Vacancy Agency Team Responsibilities:	Members William E. Farrell, Chairm John J. Donlon Renny Fagan Sen. William R. Schroeder, James D. Thomas • Review Agency Plans	David C. Burns Barbara A. McDonnell		
	<ul> <li>Review and Recommend Agency Budget Requests</li> <li>Semi-annual Progress Reviews with Agencies</li> <li>Potential RFP Reviews</li> <li>Oversight and Technical Project Review</li> </ul>			
	• Oversight and Technica			

For information or inquiries please call (303) 866-3222.