



Information Technology Steering Committee

PERMITTED INTERACTION GROUP Report and Recommendations Submitted November 20, 2017

TO: Information Technology Steering Committee

FROM: Permitted Interaction Group

SUBJECT: Methodology for the Evaluation of the Chief Information Officer

This report conveys to the full Information Technology Steering Committee (ITSC) the recommendations of the Permitted Interaction Group (the Group) assigned to make recommendations on methodology and metrics to be used in the evaluation of the Chief Information Officer (CIO).

INTRODUCTION

In its quarterly meeting on August 24, 2017, the ITSC voted to form a Permitted Interaction Group to:

- assess current metrics to be used in the evaluation of the CIO;
- consider new metrics; and
- evaluate status in light of any new requirements since the last legislative session.

Members of the Group are:

- ITSC members: Jared Kuroiwa, Todd Nacapuy, Michael Nishida, Christine Sakuda, and Kevin Thornton
- Office of Enterprise Technology Services (ETS) staff: Keith DeMello

The Group convened on:

- October 26, 2017

BACKGROUND

For the first time, the ITSC in 2017 will evaluate the CIO based on several metrics, organized under the seven priority areas identified in the 2016 CIO Annual Report: IT Governance, IT Workforce Development, Cybersecurity, Enterprise Programs and Projects, Services-Oriented Infrastructure, Open Data, and Cost-Transparency. The intention is to include a summary of the evaluation in the 2017 CIO Annual Report, which is due by December 28, 2017 (20 days prior to the start of the 2018 legislative session).

DISCUSSION

The Group clarified that all metrics cover the calendar year 2017 timeframe unless otherwise stated.

It was also reiterated that the ITSC's intent, when approving the metrics in February 2017, was to set "stretch" metrics that are challenging. The purpose is to measure the CIO's ability to bring value to the technology program. It should be noted that the success of meeting certain metrics may not entirely be under the control of the CIO and may also depend on the availability of adequate funds and resources, as well as other factors. For example:

- The State's ability to "issue a request for proposals in line with the recommendations of the Access Hawai'i Committee" (an Open Data Metric) will depend on the voting decisions of that committee in its public meetings, the quality of vendor responses to requests for information, and requirements of the State's procurement process.
- The Legislature's transferal of several positions to ETS midway through 2017 may make it more challenging for the office to meet its 2017 goal of reducing vacancies to less than 10 percent of its total position count (an IT Workforce Development Metric); therefore, the ITSC may wish to consider basing its assessment of this metric on the pre-existing position count at the start of calendar year 2017.

It is the Group's intent to present its report and recommendations at the ITSC's next regularly scheduled meeting. In accordance with Sunshine Law, an additional special meeting of the ITSC will need to be scheduled in December 2017 to: 1) discuss and take appropriate action on the Group's recommendations and 2) complete metric scoring.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Group recommends the ITSC adopt the following with regard to the [Metrics for Evaluation of CIO](#) (click to view current metrics).

Framework & Process

- ITSC will use the following scoring framework, as applicable:
 - A = Completed 100% on time, on budget
 - B = Completed but not on time, on budget (up to 10% variance)
 - C = Completed but not on time, on budget (11-20% variance)
 - D = Completed but not on time, on budget (greater than 20% variance)
 - F = Not at all
 - I = Not scored (with justification)
- Scoring will be conducted in executive session, pursuant to [Hawai'i Revised Statutes sections 92-5\(a\)\(2\) and \(6\)](#), and disclosed as part of the final 2017 CIO Annual Report due to the Legislature by December 28.
- ITSC is to arrive at final scores by consensus (i.e., discussion vs. tabulated individual scores).
- ETS will be tasked with presenting evidence to support reported status.

Metric Amendments

ENTERPRISE PROJECTS & PROGRAMS METRICS (2017)

Metric Description	Measurement	Deadline	Status	Grade
Issued RFP for State Web Portal Program (eHawaii.gov)	Yes or no	12/1/17		
<i>Demonstrate successful implementation of the following enterprise initiatives:</i>		12/1/17		
1) Tax System Modernization Project, Phases 2 & 3	<u>Addressed technical IV&V assessment as of date critical concerns and ensured technical aspects of project are on time, on budget</u>	12/1/17		
2) Enterprise Payroll and Time & Attendance Modernization, Payroll Phase	On <u>Technical aspects are on track, on budget</u>	12/1/17		
3) Kauhale On-Line Eligibility Assistance (KOLEA), Phases 1 & 2	On <u>Technical aspects are on track, on budget</u>	12/1/17		

COST-TRANSPARENCY METRICS (2017)

Metric Description	Measurement	Deadline	Status	Grade
Collected departmental IT roadmaps, under new authority provided under HRS 27-43	Quality of departmental participation <u>Published statewide IT roadmaps</u>	7/1/17		
Created ETS IT strategic roadmap, incorporating and aligning information from departmental IT roadmaps	Yes or no <u>Published</u>	7/1/17		

Published ETS IT strategic roadmap setting clear goals and benchmarks for the CIO's priority areas and priority projects/programs by the deadline to submit Executive Budget Request to the Legislature	Yes or no <u>Published</u>	7/1/17		
Created a publically accessible online dashboard to track progress, as a companion to the roadmap	Yes or no <u>Published</u>	12/1/17		