## Faculty Senate Resources and Environment Committee Meeting Minutes September 29, 2015

Present: Richard Bernhard, Fred Cubbage, Chris Gunter, Marguerite Moore, Darby Orcutt, Harry Perros & Samuel Sotillo
Absent: Phillip Sannes
Excused: James Bartlett, Sophia Kathariou, Bryan Laffitte
Guests: Marc Hoit, Ginger Burks Draughon & Gregory Sparks (to discuss increased costs of telecomm /Internet use).

Darby opened the meeting with statement of purpose and introduction of committee members and guests. Marc Hoit addressed the group, beginning with some background on the ComTech rate policy (he shared the memo sent by Charlie Leffler to the colleges, July 2015).

## **Background**

Prior to the current model, costing was based upon three components: the 'backbone' infrastructure, the network (connections on campus) and access to buildings and telephony. The administration contributed \$2 million to the colleges' costs related to connections with buildings components. Greg Sparks works with the colleges to understand Internet usage. An FTE model was proposed for determining costs, and differentials were given to the colleges for distribution to the units.

Marc Hoit's office is approximately \$1M short each year on their budget. Marc explained that his group tries to stay slightly ahead of demand for communication technology rather than overcommitting to capacity and investing in equipment that may be obsolete by the time its utility is realized. IT security presents an added concern to the growing costs of ComTech. Funding for security is obviously important and is expected to increase for the foreseeable future.

Prior to using the new FTE model, Ginger Burks Draughon and Greg Sparks met with multiple stakeholder groups within the university and examined peer models and could not identify a superior solution to the FTE model for determining cost. Marc also pointed out that we are ahead of our peers in terms of cost and quality of our services.

## <u>The Future</u>

The "backfill" dollars given to the colleges in this first year of the new model (to in turn distribute to departments) are recurring funds. Each year following, the budget will be reviewed and costs redistributed based on FTE changes in the colleges and other units. Greg reiterated that the transition to the new costing method was essentially a reallocation of funds with no winners and losers. As more operations rely on ComTech resources, the model will be reevaluated. Mark explained why a central model is difficult to implement in the university environment.

Marc added that next year we should not expect significant changes in the costs based on the new model. (That is if the new CIO does not decide to enact a cost increase to cover their \$1M budget shortfall). Further he pointed out that costs related to security compliance are expected to continue to increase in the future.

## Additional Points

- Phone costing is \$7 per month to departments per headset (subsidized from \$8).
- Marc confirmed that there is no university wide policy that requires the departments to have phones for faculty. Mark also pointed out that cell phones for faculty are still cost prohibitive and introduce other issues with implementation (when thinking about moving from land lines to cell phones for faculty).

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 PM.