College of Engineering IT Governance Committee – Meeting Minutes
November 19, 2012
3:30-5:00pm
159 Everitt

Attendees
Andreas Cangellaris (chair), Aaron Darnall, Bill Dick, Steve Franke, Negar Kiyavash, Greg Pluta, John Popovics, Elizabeth Stovall, John Wierschem (for Brian Thomas), Melissa Walters, Kris Williams, Chuck Thompson (ex officio)

Handouts
- Draft minutes for October 4, 2012 meeting (electronic)
- Draft Engineering IT FY2013 sample bills for unit heads and business managers (electronic)
- Draft Engineering IT Standardized Desktop Replacement Program (electronic)

1. The minutes for the October 4, 2012 meeting were approved with no changes.

2. Chair Andreas Cangellaris thanked the Financial Working Group for its work on the funding model and noted that significant progress has been made. Kris Williams, chair of the Financial Working Group, provided an overview of what the group has been doing which included a review of the metrics used in the model and how support services are costed.

3. Revised versions of the bills to units for Engineering IT services were presented. There are now separate versions for unit heads and business managers. The metrics used are now shown at the top along with breakout costs for major services such as supported users. The Overall Summary section includes a comparison against the units FY12 bill and the Breakout section now includes Overhead costs and Desktop Replacement Program costs. The business managers version includes more details on how some per-service costs (e.g. department computer lab system management) are calculated.

4. The committee discussed a change in the funding model to have “basic” and “full” support levels. These are equivalent in the service received to what was called “Tier2” and “full” in FY12 but are now costed differently. In FY12, the cost of “Tier2” was based on student staffing levels and in FY13 it will be based on FTE. In FY12, “full” support was a single cost component and in FY13 it will be the cost of “basic” support plus an uplift charge. It is believed that these changes will improve the ability to charge some portion of these services to grants and also allow units to pay for a base level of support while providing an option for faculty to choose to upgrade to a higher support level. The estimated cost of “basic” support is roughly 25% that of full support.

5. Kris provided an overview of additional changes that will be made to the funding model for FY14. The most significant of these will be switching to all costs being broken out by individual services as opposed to the Engineering IT org structure as was done for FY12 and FY13. There will be additional changes to the metrics and “tuning knobs” available to allow units to control what their costs and services are. There will be a consistent goal of simplifying the model wherever possible.
6. Chuck Thompson provided an overview of the draft Standardized Desktop Replacement Program. The most notable changes from the FY12 version of the model include dual displays being included; exception cases being removed; a 10% overhead added for on-shelf spares, mid-year staff additions, 4th year warranty; and Engineering IT handling redistribution of systems after the 4th year. The previous options of units using the program fee as a credit for purchasing a better system has been removed but it is hoped that a separate program with flexibility will be created in the future. It was noted that some units may wish to enroll room computers (e.g. in a conference room) in addition to people. It was also noted that enrollment in the program is independent of whether a person receiving a compute from the program has support paid for them. The committee will review the proposed program policy further and vote on it at the December meeting. Kris noted that the Financial Working Group has reviewed and endorsed the policy.

7. Chuck Thompson provided an overview of the Engineering IT ticket system. The goal of the system is to “ensure that all reported issues and requests for assistance are handled by Engineering IT in a timely and effective manner.” The overview included background on the many systems that were unified into one, stats showing that over 2,000 tickets are submitted per month, and the sets of email addresses that flow into the ticket system. The general workflow was reviewed. Some automatic routing is done based on who sent the ticket and the email address to which it was sent. Chuck also reviewed the Ticket System Commandments which are a set of rules used to help ensure performance of the system. These include all tickets being acknowledged within a business day and rules for how tickets are to be assigned and reassigned within the system.

8. Andreas noted that the communications campaign at the last meeting has not been done yet but still will be. Committee members were reminded that units will need to provide their desired escalation points. Chuck will send out a request for this information.