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Purpose of This Document

- This document contains a summary of project proposals and recommendations from the UC Santa Barbara ‘Operational Effectiveness’ initiative, prepared for members of the Coordinating Committee on Budget Strategy, as well as members of the Academic Senate.

- The scope of OE opportunities identified and developed focused on the following four areas: Shop Services; Conferences, Events & Ticketing; Campus Personnel; and, IT & Communications.

- The project proposals contained in this report have been developed in close collaboration with the OE Project Leadership Group, co-chaired by David Marshall and Marc Fisher, as well as the OE Steering Committee (CCBS) Co-Chairs, Gene Lucas and Henning Bohn.

- Four working groups comprised of over 50 UCSB employees, guided by UCSB leadership, prepared these recommendations after six months of detailed analysis, review and discussion, with significant input from the broader campus community through surveys, interviews, group presentations and events.

- Additional information and background about Operational Effectiveness can be found at: http://oe.ucsb.edu
OVERALL PURPOSE: As a key component of the FY 2010-11 budget planning process, a subcommittee of the CCBS was tasked to evaluate administrative processes and procedures, and identify ways to improve operational effectiveness across all Campus Divisions. The subcommittee recommended the creation of an operational effectiveness initiative at UCSB.

KEY OBJECTIVES & OUTCOMES:

□ Identify duplication of effort in the management and administration of technological & business processes across Divisions, and develop a set of strategic solutions to streamline and optimize these functions.

□ Develop a set of strategic solutions to optimize space and equipment within and across Divisions.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES & CONSTRAINTS:

□ Every effort should be made to protect our ability to recruit, develop, and retain diverse and highly qualified faculty, staff, and students.

□ Support for faculty research should be preserved and enhanced so that externally funded research can be increased.

□ Strategic solutions to create operational efficiencies should focus primarily on the following operational areas: IT & Communications, Campus Personnel, Shop Services, Ticketing & Events, Finance, and Procurement.

□ Strategic solutions should protect, and where possible, improve the delivery of services across Campus.

□ Every effort should be made to prevent staff layoffs by taking advantage of normal attrition, planned retirements and voluntary reductions.
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Milestones & Timelines

Phase I: Establish Working Groups & Priority Focus
August – October, 2010
- Select Working Group members
- Coordinate OE scope of focus and timeline with Financial Migration Project Team
- Establish priority focus
- Coordinate with UCOP OE directives
- OE Orientation to kick-off Phase II Working Groups [Early Oct]

Phase II: Evaluate Current Processes
October – Feb., 2011
- Develop & prioritize efficiency initiatives
- Fact finding and info. gathering to assess the situation
- Identify key metrics and benchmarks from other UC Institutions
- Assess performance on key metrics
- Gather input from staff, student and faculty
- Analyze efficiency gains against metrics

Phase III: Solution Design & Selection
March – April, 2011
- Create ‘business case’ for priority initiatives
- Design preliminary project plan for implementation
- Combine set of recommended options for Steering Committee presentation
- Chancellor & Steering Committee select set of strategic solutions to implement

Phase IV: Implementation of Strategic Solutions
May, 2011
- Steering Committee & Project Leaders work with Divisions & Control Points to develop implementation roadmap for Phase IV
Campus Engagement

Group Meetings & Presentations:
- Approximately 8 group presentation/Q&A sessions with over 750 total attendees, including:
  - Letters & Science Chairs and Business Officers Mtg.
  - Mathematical, Life & Physical Sciences Chairs and Business Officers Meeting
  - Campus-wide MSO and Business Officers Meeting

Operational Effectiveness Summit Event
- Over 100 campus employees attended
- 5 Institutions of Higher Education were represented, including: Cornell, UC Berkeley, University of Oregon, UCOP, UC Santa Cruz

Campus OE Administration Survey:
- Distributed to 790 FTE employees, with 560 responses recorded [71% response rate]

Interviews
- Over 35 interviews with key Deans, Chairs and Faculty across 10 campus departments by the Shop Services Group

OE Website
- Provides campus community with regular OE updates
- Question and suggestion submission capability to site

Email List
- D-List messages sent to the entire campus regarding OE updates and announcements, as well as targeted announcements to campus MSOs, Managers
Summary of Findings & Recommendations

Project Recommendations from Current OE Initiative

- Cluster PPS Data Processing Activity [Phase I]
- Establish Centralized Training Function
- Implement *Kronos™* Timekeeping Campus-wide

- Consolidate Machine & Maintenance Shops
- Evaluate Procurement & Storeroom Area

- Consolidate Ticketing Platforms
- Centralize Scheduling & Calendaring Activity
- Establish ‘Virtual’ Events/Conferences Department

- Adopt One Email/Calendaring Collaboration Suite
- Outsource Student Email
- Implement Telephone and VOIP Standard
- Propose New IT Organizational & Governance Model

Project Recommendations for OE Phase II

- Redesign IT Organizational & Governance Structure

- Implement Strategic Sourcing
- Consolidate Storerooms

- Consolidate Transactional Processing into Shared Service Centers [Phase II]
Ticketing & Events Proposal Overview

Ticketing System Proposal Summary

Proposal Statement:
Initiate a process whereby ticketing systems on campus are consolidated over time.

Project Rationale:
This will create efficiencies that will provide better ticketing functionality to some departments, improve customer services, allow for regional box offices, reduce overall campus work load, potentially reduce vendor fees based on consolidated ticket volume, and the possibility of generating more revenue for each department.

Project Aim & Outcomes:

- Provide a web portal (links page) where all event ticketing for campus is represented
  - Arts & Lectures
  - Associated Students
  - Carsey-Wolf Center
  - Intercollegiate Athletics
  - Music Department
  - Theater and Dance Department
- Provide, over a period of time, one ticketing platform for Associated Students (includes Music events), Carsey-Wolf Center, Intercollegiate Athletics, and Theater and Dance
- Provide more robust ticketing functionality to these departments
  - Ticket Sales Functions such as ability to build venues in-house, adjust seating charts, configure for promotions, discounts, giveaways, renew certain seat on-line, etc.
  - Ticket Printing Functions such as in-house ticket printing, special passes, security features such as bar codes, etc.
  - Management Functions such as scanning tickets at entry, real-time/on-line management, a variety of settlement and reconciliation reports, etc.
  - Marketing Functions such as creating email blasts and tracking response, creating advertising design for digital delivery, etc.
  - Donor Functions such as managing memberships, tracking renewals, lapses, sending reminders, managing donation types, tracking pledges, etc.
- Provide more services for customers such as on-line credit card processing for student events, printing tickets at home, on-line seat
selection, best seat available option, incorporate parking permit with event ticket, etc.

- Provide the future opportunity to create regional ticket centers that sell a variety of event tickets thereby increasing accessibility to students, staff, faculty and the community as well as facilitating the purchase of tickets for unrelated types of events.
- Reduce number of vendor contracts that need to be negotiated and renewed by campus
- Reduce number of ticketing processes (cash handling, PCI compliance, etc.) that need to be reviewed by campus
- Reduce number of platforms that different Information Technology groups host and support
- Increases the number of trained users and super-users who can backfill and provide support for a specific system

**Implementation Oversight:**

To create a web portal, a team consisting of representatives from Public Affairs and their technology support group, Information Systems & Computing, as well as representatives of the current ticketing departments’ systems technology groups will be required, as we recommend that this portal reside on the main campus website under Events.

Leadership for the ticketing proposal should rest with the users and super-users of the current ticketing systems as well as representatives from their supporting information technology groups.

Implementing the proposal for a ticketing systems consolidation will require significant collaboration between campus ticketing departments and their associated technology teams. A model for this collegiality exists as all but one of the departments are represented on the OE Team. An in-depth analysis and feasibility assessment of this proposal from the perspective of information technology with regard to technical requirements and costs has not been completed and would be required prior to moving forward with a comprehensive consolidation.

**Current Strategy:**

Initial ticketing needs have been documented and six potential vendors were identified by a group of users and super-users.* Ticketing departments will consult with each other as opportunities arise to consolidate. Initial consolidation efforts will involve Associated Students, Music, Theater and Dance, and Carsey-Wolf Center.

Due to contractual deadlines, Intercollegiate Athletics must continue with specific vendor negotiations that specialize in athletic events to ensure business continuity. Other ticketing departments will assess the functionality of ICA’s selected vendor’s system to evaluate if it meets all their needs.
We anticipate that the department of Associated Students (not the student government) will function as the lead unit in assessing the functionality of the Intercollegiate Athletics’ platform for use by the remaining departments. It is anticipated that they will provide management of the ticketing system to these remaining users.

We recommend that the oversight committee should be comprised of representatives of each ticketing department and their supporting information technology groups.

*For additional information see Ticketing Appendix: Campus Ticket Needs Grid

**Resources:**

**Determining resource requirements requires in-depth analysis and feasibility assessment by the respective information technology groups.**

Resource requirements for the purchase and implementation of one ticketing system is expected to be significant, estimated to be more than $250,000. The following would need to be factored into the cost for implementation:

- Software cost
- Outside consultants
- Installation of the base program and all partnering software
- Database conversion for all databases involved
- Website design and integration

The campus would need a dedicated implementation team, an operational team and a support team. The implementation team alone would potentially need a Business Analyst, a SQL programmer, a web developer, a systems engineer, as well as participation from each user department.

There are additional costs associated with hosting, security, partnering software, software development/engineering tools, hardware, on-going maintenance fees.

**Scheduling:**

Milestones and timelines will need to be established after campus information system and technology groups are able to study this proposal in-depth.

**Dependencies:**

It is highly likely that the information technology group required for the in-depth review and feasibility assessment of a comprehensive ticketing system will be Student Information Systems & Technology. Their current focus and most critical mission is the conversion of the Student Information Systems with an estimated completion of 2015.
**Risks:**

After its own in-depth analysis and feasibility assessment, the information technology group may determine that the volume of ticketing activity is not sufficient to justify the expense of consolidation. It may also suggest that the most cost effective option is minor consolidations using inexpensive and less robust systems.
Conference/Event Scheduling/Calendaring Proposal Summary

Proposal Statement:
Integrate campus-wide facilities scheduling data to produce a warehouse of academic and extracurricular programs and events information, which would serve to centralize the scheduling process for campus.

Project Rationale:
There are multiple and stand alone systems for facilities reservations and scheduling which makes it difficult for anyone, including the administration, to know what activities are taking place at any given moment and results in a multitude of event calendars.

Project Aim & Outcomes:
- Provide a single source for information required by the administration in an emergency situation
- Provide a single source for a comprehensive campus calendar for both internal and external constituencies
- Provide the opportunity for a review of all extracurricular activities in campus facilities by appropriate authorities
- Provide the opportunity to require the “registration” or “vetting” of extracurricular activities

Implementation Oversight:
This is a massive information technology undertaking and would require leadership from almost all campus technology groups and staff from all departments that are responsible for scheduling facilities.

Current Strategy:
Provide web portal to consolidate access to all calendars as well as the “Virtual Conference and Events” area until information technology groups complete campus critical projects such as the Student Information System and Financial Systems.

Resources:
UCLA created a similar data warehouse called “Events On-Line” in 2001 to consolidate the scheduling data of their numerous facilities and venues. They recently invested over $400,000 in programming costs, existing staff time and equipment to roll out a second version of “EOL” and they are still implementing portions of it. They completely changed the architecture of the program to be able to capture scheduling data downloads existing in a variety of formats from the simple to the sophisticated and in some cases they will deep link for real time updates.
Scheduling:
Milestones and timelines will need to be established after campus information and technology groups are able to study this proposal in depth.

Risks:
The proposal will not be meaningful unless there is clear direction from leadership that the entire campus must participate.
“Virtual” Events/Conferencing Department Proposal Summary

Proposal Statement:
Consolidate and integrate information on all conference and event-related processes, procedures, policies, resources, tips and tools on a single website.

Project Rationale:
Currently, UCSB has no central organization or process by which to distribute conference and event information. Queries are fielded by a variety of individuals in many different units, who may or may not know the appropriate resources and points of referral. Offering a uniform, consistent “tool kit” of information would be an effective, valuable information resource for faculty, staff, students and visitors alike. By automating the information process and making information-gathering easier, UCSB would save staff time and increase the revenue potential of events and conferences.

Project Aim & Outcomes:
- Provides an automated method of disseminating information, saving staff time
- Interactively guides conference and event organizers in the planning process, depending on the inquirer's self-selection as to who they are (staff, faculty, student, visitor, etc.) and what they want to do, saving staff time
- Provides comprehensive information on mandated policies and procedures that reduce campus liability and risk
- Provides list of venues, capacities and attributes along with their links
- Provides supplier and vendor sourcing information and links
- Provides credit card processing resources for low volume or one-time-only events
- Provides some outbound (not campus) conference and event resources (outbound conference site selection and contract negotiation services are currently under consideration by Connexus)
- Provides final referrals for direct consultation with appropriate departments

Implementation Oversight:
The existing OE committee can provide leadership for this initiative (though members whose major focus is ticketing may choose not to participate). Other stakeholders can be added during implementation. As the content for the site is built, the Committee will need to consult with administrative business units, such as Accounting, Contracts & Property, Risk Management, Police, Fire Marshall, Information Technology, etc. Each contributing department or business unit will have access to its own content areas and will be responsible for updating and observing appropriate protocols for submission.
**Resources:**

- Project manager for establishing initial content structure, continuity and flow of information, and submission protocols. This could be an existing position, though funds may be needed to backfill for their time.
- Information Technology staff time for initial setup and programming – estimated to be over 150 hours.
- Annual Technology Support (Server, CMS maintenance & support, programming updates, etc.) based roughly 100 hours.
- Full-time Event Planner (could be project manager) to provide leadership for continued implementation (slow build-out) of the site, as well as support for the periodic review of content and adherence to protocols.

**Scheduling:**

- Reform OE Committee for this initiative
- Select an information & technology group for programming and hosting
- Select a project manager for the initial content structure and protocols
- Select a management unit
- Identify Funding

**Dependencies:**

This is an information technology-dependent project, and all information technology groups are in the midst of campus critical projects.

An outside programmer could be hired to build this website, though we assume the fee would be higher.

**Risks:**

During the research, transition, and implementation of desired outcomes, there may be resistance to change as procedures are modified and new protocols are introduced.
Shop Consolidation Proposal Summary

Proposal
We propose further study and evaluation of shop consolidations (11 scenarios in Appendix A) with three committees. We proposed that Pierre Wiltzius, Dean of College of Letters and Science and Larry Coldren, Acting Dean of Engineering co-chair to review consolidation of sciences and engineering shops. We propose Dean Marshall chairs further review of Music and Theater and Dance consolidations. We propose that Marc Fisher, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor chairs a further review of consolidations of FM and Housing Maintenance shops.

Rationale
At the conclusion of this fact finding exercise, there was enough information gathered to believe that the further study proposed above would result in all or some of the following objectives.

- Increase safety with utilization of power equipment (reduction of liability).
- Increase shared knowledge with specific equipment, projects and/or tasks.
- Space availability and possibilities for the utilization of that space.
- Energy savings with shared space.
- Equipment savings and equipment sharing as some shops have the same equipment.
- Possible attrition savings.
- Possible procurement efficiencies with equipment.

Project Aims and Outcomes
- Availability of space for other uses.
- Possible attrition savings as retirements are on the horizon for some.
- Energy costs savings with consolidations.
- Efficiencies with more centralized purchasing that would result in savings.
- Equipment costs savings with consolidation.
- Avoidance of safety risk exposure with no one person shops with power equipment.

Implementation Oversight
We are unaware of any existing committees that would fit these studies. We think the proposed committee chairs should include Department Chairs and frequent users of the shops on the committees for proper representation.
Resources
An administrative staff person would be needed to set up the processes (appointments, meetings, paperwork etc) and to evaluate the financials.

The chairs probably will need to spend 90 hours between meetings, research, consultations and analysis.

Scheduling
We propose a 3-month period [1st Q, FY 2011-12] for this evaluation work, with meetings every other week. At the end of this period, a recommendation for which shop consolidations to implement would be presented to OE leadership.

Dependencies
The 3-month schedule is based upon effective collaboration and cooperation within the committees, as well as effective leadership oversight.

Risks
To successfully implement any consolidations, the Chairs and Leadership must effectively engage and address the associated politics.

Gaining access to the financials would be essential for the evaluation process.
Phase II Procurement & Storeroom Proposal Summary

Proposal Statement:
We propose that a Phase II OE project committee is formed, focusing on campus procurement, as well as an evaluation of the storerooms for potential consolidation. We propose that Richard Watts chair this committee.

Rationale:
- Space availability
- Procurement savings and efficiencies
- Staffing attrition
- Some potential energy savings

Project Aims and Outcomes
- Availability of space for other uses
- Possible attrition savings
- Efficiencies with centralized purchasing that could result in savings

Implementation Oversight
- We are unaware of any existing committees that fit this study. We suggest the committee representation include: storeroom supervisors, users of services and purchasing.

Resources
- An administrative staff person would be needed to set up appointments, meetings, paperwork, etc.
- The chair would probably to spend 120 hours working on the study and evaluation.

Scheduling
We propose six months for this study with meetings every other week, dependent on the implementation timeline of an eprocurement system.

Dependencies
A key dependency is the inclusion of an eprocurement module in the new financial system implementation, as well as the timeline for that project. This committee would need to coordinate and collaborate closely with that system implementation team.

Risks
To successfully implement, the Chair and Leadership must effectively address the politics associated with strategic sourcing, as well as the impact of potential storeroom consolidations.

Gaining access to the inventories and ordering information would be essential.
Campus Personnel Proposal Overview

Time Keeping Proposal Summary

Proposal Statement:
Implement Kronos, an on-line timekeeping system, campus-wide.

Project Rationale:
The majority of departments on the UCSB campus continue to use a manual process for recording and reporting time worked as well as time off. The current process is not efficient. The process is labor intensive, prone to errors, and outdated. Existing efforts and systems on a system-wide basis, at other campuses, and at UCSB, make data gathering and possible implementation a realistic accomplishment. The current system-wide payroll and HRIS replacement process includes the move to an on-line process, however the timekeeping portion will be in a later phase of the project. It is expected at this point that there will be some flexibility for campuses that already have a system in use to remain with that system. Kronos is already in use at UCSB, including modifications to address specific campus needs. This provides the campus with a base of experience to draw on as a system is used on a wider basis. UC Irvine is also in the process of developing a home-grown timekeeping system, which provides another possible alternative in terms of a product to adapt for campus use. The committee considered both the Kronos and UCI systems for possible implementation. Based on the functional capabilities of the two systems (see Appendix B) Kronos is being recommended as the best option for UCSB at this time.

It is apparent from the campus survey that departmental personnel are in large part ready to move to an on-line system and would welcome this change.

Samples from the campus survey:
Would an on-line timekeeping system be beneficial to your department?:
145 managers responding
69 yes 37 already have on-line
15 no 24 maybe, don’t know

“I think that the campus should move towards using online systems …… I feel that we need to move toward streamlining the programs we all use so that we can all collaborate together.”
“It is very time consuming to have to compile leave information from several difference sources to reconcile. Automated calculation of accruals on time cards, time taken and time earned; especially for staff on multiple funds sources would be helpful”
Sample time savings:
Because Kronos is already in use on parts of the campus, a savings comparison was conducted. Accounting Services & Controls is currently using Kronos. The unit is comprised of 134 employees – career, limited, and students. Their reduction in administrative time spent doing paper timecards vs. Kronos = 80%

Applying the savings recognized in Accounting Services & Controls to the Library, currently doing timekeeping in a manual, paper environment, could recognize the following savings:

- The Library has 305 employees – career, limited, students, academics
- They currently spend 2,256 hours/year doing administrative timekeeping tasks at a cost of $42,042/year
- Online timekeeping is estimated to save the Library 1,805 hours/year and $33,634/year

This same methodology could be applied to other units on campus to estimate savings, noting that differences will occur depending on the types of employees in the unit.

Project Aim & Outcomes:

Time and monetary savings:
- Leave usage uploaded directly from Kronos – eliminates manual input
- Kronos exception report expedites review process
- No tracking down paper timecards

Risk aversion and compliance:
- More accurate timekeeping
- Easy view of missing timecard approvals
- Automatic time calculations

Flexibility for units in dealing with possible future budget cuts or organizational changes.
Time savings will not produce immediate savings in positions because various aspects of the process are done by different people. The savings might be an FTE over a unit, but divided up as a percentage of five or six employees’ jobs. This savings allows employees to “work smarter” in the short run, while also giving more flexibility in the future in terms of reconfiguring/reassigning duties.

Implementation Oversight:
A project team should be established to oversee the implementation. The team should consist of individuals from control points and departments from both
academic and non-academic units as well as individuals involved in running the current Kronos application in use at UCSB. Administrative oversight will reside in Administrative Services, particularly Human Resources and Payroll. Subject experts from Accounting Services, Human Resources and Academic Personnel should be consulted throughout the process.

**Resources:**

The implementation of Kronos campus wide will include both initial start-up costs and on-going costs. These are outlined in Appendix C. Some costs are not yet known, or difficult to estimate as they would be dependent on other decisions that will need to be made, such as where the system will be hosted.

A funding model will also need to be developed. It is recommended that the implementation team, or campus leadership, make this determination. One possible model is to roll the ongoing expenses into the IT infrastructure fee that is assessed. This would give control points flexibility in terms of applying the charges across their unit.

**Scheduling:**

- Project team established by Summer 2011
- Phase 1: Roll out to administrative units, non-grant funded; Similar to units already on Kronos by January 1, 2012
- Phase 2: Roll out to campus as a whole; units with multi-funded/multiple appointments (mainly academic units)

**Dependencies:**

In its current form, Kronos does not easily support multi-funded appointments or multiple appointments. Until this issue is resolved, Phase 2 cannot occur. Administrators of the current campus Kronos system are currently in consultation with Kronos to improve this functionality. Additional cost will be incurred to add this functionality. This cost is built into the roll out estimate provided with this report.

**Risks:**

The current system-wide PPS replacement project includes a time-keeping element. It is unclear at this time what that system will be or if one time-keeping system will be mandated. It is possible that within three to five years there could be a system-wide solution other than Kronos. However, this proposal is made with the assumption that the time-keeping element will be an "add on" to the one central payroll/HRIS system. It is also assumed that because of the number of other campuses already using Kronos, it is very likely that Kronos will be compatible with the central payroll/HRIS system solution.
Proposal Statement:

- Phase 1: Implement various types of “shared services” models across campus.
- Phase 2: Move to further centralized data input as part of the system-wide implementation of a new payroll and HRIS system.

Note that remainder of proposal will address mainly Phase 1.

Project Rationale:

The current procedures and processes for data gathering for PPS input are not standardized or well documented. The process is very manual, complicated, and therefore error prone, particularly in areas with low volume input. Because the UCSB campus is very diverse, with varying needs and levels of independence, there currently is not a “one size fits all” solution. While it is important for the campus to find new ways to handle PPS input and processing, this has to be done in the context of the ongoing system-wide projects for the payroll and HRIS replacement systems. Proceeding in two phases is recommended because it allows the campus to move forward at this time, while remaining flexible enough to adapt to the new systems. Use of the proposed models can evolve over time in response to other projects and campus needs. Reducing the number of PPS users in the immediate future can create “expert” users prior to implementation of system-wide payroll/HRIS replacement systems which may ease that transition. Moving forward with Phase 1 also begins to change the campus culture in terms of delivery of service and processes.

Based on results from the campus survey, it is very apparent that the current data input process is not effective and that at least a portion of the campus is open to revising the way PPS input is done.

Sample campus survey results

*Would you be willing to have some or all of your department’s pps data input done by a unit outside of the department?*

60 yes
71 no

*Of the ‘No’ answers the three largest responses were:*

19 our unit is large enough to support doing this work internally
23 “other” (often a combination of reasons)
19 concern that data input would be done incorrectly.

“It is ridiculously cumbersome, confusing, and irritating to use, especially for someone like me who is only a backup preparer and in a small dept.(7 people);
thus, we have very few PPS transactions a year and on the rare occasions I am required to prepare an entry it is almost like starting over from scratch."

The work group recommends presenting decision makers and control points with a variety of “shared service” models for PPS data input that could be adapted as appropriate. Each unit would need to be evaluated by the control point to determine which model would work best. There is assumed to be a critical mass of approximately 100 to 300 employees, depending on the type of employee, which can be handled under the various models. Larger units would continue to work independently, or take on smaller units. Smaller units would be strongly encouraged to be incorporated into one of the models. It is important to note that consultative, strategic and non-transactional activities, including decision making, remain in the department. Only the data entry, i.e. transactional piece, is consolidated.

Sample models for PPS data processing:

**Non-Academic Divisions** *(Administrative Services, Student Affairs, Institutional Advancement)*

Regional Service Centers formed based on size, volume, and/or type of transaction. These centers would manage all PPS activity including hiring, funding/title changes, promotions, transfers, separations and payroll.

**Academic and Research Divisions** *(Academic Affairs, Research)*

Based on “critical mass”: (1) Small units roll up to their control point for all PPS activity, (2) Small/medium sized departments cluster and create a new unit that provides all PPS activity, (3) Large departments take on PPS functions for small units

*Example*: Social Sciences Division of Letters and Science defines critical mass as 100 employees.

- **PPS for Asian American Studies** (19 employees), Black Studies (30), Chicano Studies (36), Feminist Studies (17), and Military Science (1) roll up to the Social Sciences control point with a total of 103 employees.
- Anthropology (80) and Communication (58) cluster with a total of 138 employees.
- Political Science (71) takes on PPS for Global Studies (41), bringing their total to 112.
- Sociology (99) and Economics (127) continue to maintain their own PPS activity.

**Project Aim & Outcomes:**

**Decrease the number of PPS preparers**

An example of potential savings can be found in the Humanities & Fine Arts Phelps Hall cluster (Departments of Spanish & Portuguese; Germanic, Slavic & Semitic Languages; and French & Italian). Prior to the clustering .45 FTE spread across 6 positions (.40 @ AAIII level, .05 @ Analyst III level) had PPS
input responsibilities. After the clustering, .30 FTE spread across 4 positions (all @ AAIII level) have PPS input responsibilities. While the numbers of both positions and FTE are small, this example demonstrates a 33% savings.

**Flexibility for units in dealing with possible future budget cuts or organizational changes**

Time savings will not produce immediate savings in positions because various aspects of the process are done by different people. The savings might be an FTE over a unit, but divided up as a percentage of five or six employees’ jobs. This savings allows employees to “work smarter” in the short run, while also giving more flexibility in the future in terms of reconfiguring/reassigning duties.

**Decrease campus exposure to risk**

Currently PPS data input is performed at the department or unit level. Some units are very small and do not have enough employees to fill all of the necessary roles of the PPS audit process. In addition, due to low volume, preparers may only input a specific kind of action occasionally, and are therefore more prone to error. Without necessary checks and balances, errors also are more likely not to get caught. Beginning the transition to a more centralized model will decrease these problems and therefore decrease campus exposure to risk.

**Preparing the campus for upcoming system-wide payroll and HRIS transitions**

Phase 1 will begin the move to more centralized functionality that is expected to be part of the new payroll and HRIS systems. Given UCSB’s current decentralized culture, it will be helpful to begin this transition now rather than making a large change to a centralized process all at once.

**Implementation Oversight:**

The work group recommends that a “Payroll/HRIS transition team” be established. This committee would provide oversight and coordination of campus efforts related to all payroll and HRIS transition projects, including, but not limited to, the OE payroll data input recommendation and the system-wide Payroll/HRIS replacement project. The committee should be jointly led by the Human Resources Director, Academic Personnel Director, and Controller. The committee would report to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor for Administrative Services. Decisions related to implementation of Phase 1 of the OE recommendation would be made by control points.

**Resources:**

Staff and administrative time
- Human Resources consultation with departments to review organizational changes, job duty changes, job descriptions changes, and impact on Collective Bargaining Unit work.
- Central office leadership time to oversee and coordinate changes.

Shifting resources
- Space and FTE needs for units taking on more work. The actual resources needed in this area will vary depending on the models selected by control points.

**Scheduling:**
Implementation of Phase 1 to begin immediately.

It is noted that Phase 1 is intended to be an ongoing process, until implementation of the system-wide payroll/HRIS replacement system. Control points should be given general goals but also flexibility to implement changes as opportunities arise over time.

**Dependencies:**
Phase 2 is dependent on the implementation of the system-wide payroll/HRIS systems. The new systems may present an entirely new approach to campus processes and it is assumed that major changes in staffing and campus methodology will take place at that time. Implementation of the system-wide project is projected to be approximately two years out.

Regionalizing or centralizing functionality will require additional resources at those levels. Work cannot simply be absorbed using current regional and central resources.

**Risks:**
The exact timeline for implementation of the system-wide changes is unknown. If the new system changes delivery processes significantly and those occur quickly, it might make more sense for the campus to focus time and effort on the system-wide project rather than other campus changes.

Units that are taking on more work will have to see some value in that change. There will need to be significant communication and education about the benefits of, and reasons for, the changes.
Centralized Training Proposal Summary

Proposal Statement:
Develop a centralized Training & Development support function that coordinates and facilitates training and resource services related to Personnel and Payroll processes and policies.

Project Rationale:
Over the next few years there will be a significant number of transitions to new systems and changes in the way the business of the University is done. A well trained workforce is imperative for success of these initiatives. Regardless of systems in place, efficiency and effectiveness will not be realized if staff are not trained and supported. Training and resources can also be used to support the transition to new ways of doing business. At the Operational Effectiveness Best Practices Summit on February 14, 2011, the importance of training as part of transition to more centralized systems was a recurring theme among the panelists. The current training model at UCSB is for each central unit to develop, coordinate, and deliver its own training and support resources. This leads to inefficiencies, difficulty for staff in finding resources, duplication of effort and resources, out of date technology, and a workforce that is not as well trained as it could be. The most recent system-wide Partnership for Performance report on various payroll related items shows that UCSB lags far behind every other campus in terms of training on payroll issues (see Appendix E). Centralized training models exist on other UC campuses and can be used as models. This model can also be expanded over time to integrate staff training with other areas such as EH&S, Contracts & Grants and other mandatory campus training. In a time of reduced staff, higher workloads, and no pay increases, providing training opportunities can also be a way to address staff morale issues.

UC Davis is currently undergoing a campus wide shift to service center models and has identified training as key to the success of that effort. They are offering a 22 hour, 6 course program to all staff impacted by the changes as well as specific manager “tool-kits” and other training and educational resources to facilitate the transition. Robust training efforts such as this cannot be successful with the current structure of the training function at UCSB. The UC Davis program is used as a model for this recommendation. Their program may be more fully explored via their web site at http://www.hr.ucdavis.edu/sdps.

UCSB currently uses the Learning Management System (LMS) for Human Resource training and some other campus compliance training. The centralized training and resource functionality can in large part be built off of LMS.

Results from campus survey:
The campus survey contained a number of questions related to learning styles, preferred training options, and a number of open ended questions concerning
training. An overwhelming number of responses came in related to training. The responses to these questions provide a great planning tool for the offices that currently do training in the areas of personnel and payroll related activity. The survey responses also show that providing an improved training and resource function is highly desirable for the campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of comments</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>“what do you like about the training?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>“what could be done to improve?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>“other comments about personnel &amp; payroll?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trends from survey comments
Staff like the training that exists and recognize the effort put in by central offices
Staff want more training; more often, more types of delivery, more levels of training
Centralized functionality, on-line resources, better communication all highly desired

**Project Aim & Outcomes:**
A robust campus Staff Training & Development unit, housed in Human Resources:
- Facilitates training, education & support for staff training; “subject experts” provide actual training
- Coordination of campus training efforts, including those in support of system and staffing transitions that will occur over the next few years
- Logistics supported by Learning Management System
- Centralization and less duplication of technical resources and staff time.
- Targeted and coordinated communication to staff
- Web site for all personnel/payroll resources in a coordinated, cohesive, easy to use format that includes: forms and toolkits, updates and FAQs, links to home pages, contact information, and list-serves tailored to specific topics to provide targeted updates and information

Savings will be realized in terms of the creation of a more high-performing, better trained, more stable workforce. It is difficult to estimate actual savings but it is recognized by various studies and reports that this is an important aspect of an effective business. Clive Shepherd, of Fastrack Consulting, writes in a 1999 article:

“The financial benefits of training cannot be measured in terms of student reactions, nor the amount of learning that has been achieved; not even the
extent to which behavior may have changed. The real benefits come from improved performance – traditionally the hardest training outcome to forecast or measure.”

The same article lists a number ways in which savings can be recognized through increased and effective training (see Appendix D)

**Implementation Oversight:**

The Training & Development unit is housed in Human Resources. Immediate oversight is the responsibility of the Director of Human Resources. The implementation process should involve personnel from the other main stakeholders, namely Academic Personnel and Accounting Services.

**Resources:**

The existing Training & Development unit in Human Resources is staffed at a level of 1.75 permanent FTE and 1.0 temporary FTE. The Training & Development Directors at UCLA and UCD, two campuses with a training function similar to that being recommended, were consulted regarding the based amount of staffing necessary for the recommended type of program. Both indicated that 3.0 FTE (Director, Analyst, Administrative Assistant) were the absolute minimum required. In addition, both the UCLA and UCD program draw on the wider Human Resources staff to provide IT support and Analytical support for training programs that feature Human Resource related subject matter. A proposed staffing and funding model is attached (Appendix F).

The work group recommends that the funding be provided from central resources and that it *not* be included in any budget reduction measures. These positions should not be a trade-off for elimination of other positions or be considered part of Human Resources base structure against which reductions are figured. It is also strongly recommended that mandatory training, or training directly related to an individual’s job, be offered at no cost. Career Development of other non-mandatory training could be offered at a cost, providing the unit with revenue to reduce the long term cost of the recommended plan.

**Scheduling:**

Implementation could begin immediately, with a goal of having a fully staffed team and program in place prior to campus adoption of new system-wide payroll and HRIS processes. In the longer term, the Training & Development unit would integrate training support for other units such as Contracts & Grants and all mandatory staff training programs, to establish one central campus source of all training and resource support for staff.

**Dependencies:**

A strong commitment to staff training by campus leadership is essential to the success of this recommendation. While specific areas of UCSB (Housing &
Residential Services for example) have made training a priority, the campus culture has not been overly supportive. The proposal requires a commitment of FTE and funding from central campus administration. Perhaps more importantly, the proposal requires a shift in campus culture in terms of the value placed on staff training. This shift has to start with campus leadership and then passed on to control points, departments, and supervisors.

**Risks:**

Staff training and development would need to be seen as a campus priority and protected against anticipated budget cuts at least until major campus transitions such as those related to financial systems and the system-wide payroll and HRIS system have been completed.

**Campus Personnel Appendices:**

A. Survey
B. Comparison chart Kronos vs. UC Irvine Reporting system
C. Costing estimate for Kronos implementation
D. Exerts from *Assessing the ROI of training* by Clive Shepherd
E. Exert from system-wide Partnership for Performance report
F. Training and Development Unit funding requirements
Enterprise Collaboration Services Proposal Summary

Proposal Statement:
This project proposes the adoption of a standard suite for the purpose of email, calendaring, messaging, and content management to enable campus-wide collaboration.

Project Rationale:
A consistent campus-wide collaboration suite with consistent email and calendaring will enable efficient communication across all campus organizations.
A standard campus approach and single implementation allows the campus to eliminate duplication of effort currently associated with multiple email and calendar installations. While there are no “cost savings” to be captured by eliminating this duplication of effort, the elimination of email administration tasks will allow individuals to focus on tasks that are more closely aligned with campus goals.
Consistent calendar tool allows administrative staff to effectively schedule people and resources across campus.
Consistent collaboration tools allow UCSB staff to change departments or work cross-department without interruption of collaboration services.
Consistent collaboration tools will allow the growth of a UCSB culture which will identify the most effective best practices associated with the use of the tools.
There are cost savings to be realized related to reduced license and support costs on a per user basis.

Project Aim & Outcomes:
The project aim is to provide the campus with an approach to campus-wide collaboration which enables efficient communication, provides effective user and infrastructure support, provides manageable and anticipatable costs and provides standardized interfaces to other campus enabling technologies so collaboration can be leveraged.
The result of this project will be lower cost per mail account. The lower cost per email account, will likely not translate into budgetary savings to departments, but rather will translate into the ability to apply more resources to core needs and into future cost avoidance.

Implementation Roadmap:
ITPG subcommittee on Calendaring and Email has been actively pursuing alternatives for Corporate Time and is actively evaluating suites which provide the necessary collaboration capabilities.

The committee is currently evaluating vendor products including Microsoft Exchange, Google, and Zimbra.

Potential implementations include hosted (cloud), and locally installed.

The committee hopes to complete product evaluation and obtain buy-in for a pilot project by early in Fiscal Year 2011/12.

Resources:

- Required budget resources will be determined as part of the evaluation/pilot process.
- Required staff resources will be determined as part of the evaluation/pilot process.

Scheduling:

- Pilot Project – start late summer 2011
- Full Implementation Complete – To Be Determined.

Dependencies:

- A consistent campus-wide collaboration suite is dependent upon a comprehensive Identity Management strategy and enabling technologies for both managing authentication and resource access.
- Obstacles or issues anticipated with implementation

Risks

- Lack of adoption by campus departments will minimize the operational effectiveness of a campus wide collaboration suite.
Student Email Outsourcing Proposal Summary

Proposal Statement:
The OE working group for Information Technologies and Communications proposes the outsourcing of the UCSB student email service as part of the proposed efforts for improvement and achieving efficiencies in the campus communication and collaboration services.

- The potential solutions for outsourcing the student emails are: Google, Microsoft live.edu (now Office365) or MS Exchange, IBM Lotus, or Zimbra.
- The two leading vendors, who provide the most viable and comprehensive solutions are:
  1) Google (Google Apps Education Community)
  2) Microsoft Live@edu (now Office365).
- Both solutions offer free email hosting with additional functionality, like calendaring, storing documents, or using other productivity tools.
  - Google suite includes: Google Docs, Google Sites, Google Mail, and Google Calendar.
  - Microsoft solution offers: Outlook Live (10GB inbox/user), 25GB of free online storage on Windows Live SkyDrive, and access to Office Web Applications.
- In both cases, archiving will be a directly supported fee based service.

Project Rationale:
Outsourcing student email and calendaring will allow UCSB to get out of providing these commodity type services - such as maintaining an email and calendaring system - and focus on the things that we are uniquely equipped to do, like providing more resources to be able to better support teaching, learning, research and student life.

Project Aim & Outcomes:
The expected efficiencies to be achieved by this project are:
- lowering the cost for hosting and technical support of student email
- as part of the outsourcing of the email, providing additional free services like online document storage, calendaring and other productivity tools

Implementation Roadmap:
- The project approach will depend on the selected solution. In the case of Google – the implementation will depend on the integration with campus IdM infrastructure, while in the case of Microsoft – the solution will be able to utilize the student services security framework.
- In any case, the roadmap will have to go through the following stages:
Q1: Selection and preparation
Q2: Agreement and project organization
Q3: Prototyping and pilot
Q4: Email synchronization, routing and transferring of accounts -> go live

Resources:
- Although both solutions provide free service, the implementation will require one time investment in project resources (for project management and technical FTEs), especially as related to the identity integration infrastructure (for provisioning and the support for SAML).
- In addition, the overall service will require on-going support personal similar to the current levels (2-3 FTE for: management, technical support and help desk; plus, student assistants).

Scheduling:
- The estimated implementation timeframe is 1 year after approval and funding. There are dependencies (see below) that can alter this timeline.

Dependencies:
- Both solutions depend on integration with UCSB Identity and Student Information System.
  - The Google solution would have integrate with campus IdM.
  - The Microsoft solution eventually offers identity that could be coupled with ADFS to provide single sign-on for end users. This is in line with Student Affairs enterprise security project.

Risks:
- Per Matthew Dunham, Manager, Electronic Communications, Instructional Computing, he has zero time to participate in this effort now.
- Both solutions need to be evaluated as related to:
  - Accessibility (ADA compliance)
  - Meeting FERPA and HIPPA policies (Microsoft claims that their solution include tools to support HIPAA compliance)
  - Archiving and decommissioning
Telephone/VoIP Proposal Summary

Proposal Statement:
To continue to provide reliable centralized telephone service that will serve the campus for at least the next 5-7 years. This solution involves updating the CPUs and software for the currently paid-off telephone switch and acquiring initial VoIP capability. We will be re-allocating existing funds to cover the update cost.

Project Rationale:
There are four main goals that we want to achieve with this project:

- We must have vendor support for our telephone service equipment, and updating the telephone switch is the most cost effective way to do this.
  - Analog-only telephone service, such as emergency phones and elevator phones would still be supported.
  - Existing telephone customers are not required to purchase new telephone instruments to accommodate a new telephone system.
- The added VoIP capability provides for a lower cost solution for certain use cases.
  - For a new building where existing copper pairs are not available, or would be cost prohibitive to use.
- The added VoIP capability provides a more effective solution for certain use cases.
  - The department Panasonic digital telephone system is no longer being manufactured. The only real option for this type of functionality being manufactured today is a VoIP system. Having VoIP native in our telephone switch provides better integration and reduces complexity. This would allow us to develop a new standard for new department digital telephone systems or for replacement of existing Panasonic systems.
  - There is a distance limit imposed by our current telephone switch for certain business telephone functions. VoIP would not have that limit, so certain customer service departments would have the ability to use VoIP to provide them with features such as automatic call distributor (ACD) that would allow them to be more effective with their customer service.
  - VoIP instruments can reduce the complexity and lead-time required when relocating departments and staff.
- It allows evolutionary change to VoIP for departments that want to take advantage of VoIP’s additional features:
- Voicemail delivered as email, telephone instrument portability, and presence.

There is still some uncertainty in the extent to which wireless telephone technology will supplant or augment wired telephone technology. Our approach allows us to limit our short term investment cost into VoIP technology, while still making it available in the instances where it is the more cost-effective solution, or where it provides the best business telephone functionality.

**Project Aim & Outcomes:**
- Provide a current and maintainable telephone system, supporting campus’s existing investment in telephone equipment.
- Provide the capability to implement VoIP where it provides required features, or is the most cost effective solution.

**Implementation Roadmap:**
- Submit purchase order to vendor - Completed.
- Finalize contract details for maintaining maintenance coverage until the update is complete – In Process.
- Determine Statement of Work for update – Completed.
- Coordinate service outages with campus – Specific dates, times, and durations are still being finalized but none are expected to be very long in duration or overly disruptive.
- Perform update – Tentative schedule is for the not-too-early morning of Saturday, August 27th, 2011.
- Modify backend systems to interface with new switch software – In progress, no immediate show stoppers.
- Begin implementation of in-house VoIP functions – this sub-project cannot commence until we have fully accepted the telephone switch update, but we expect to have this in process by 12/31/2011.

**Resources:**
- The final cost for the update is $298,000 including tax. We will be re-allocating existing funds to cover this cost.
- Existing Communications Services Staffing

**Scheduling:**
- Updating the telephone switch requires Communications Services to minimize the amount of change activity to the switch for several weeks, and will also cause a brief interruption of telephone service.
Therefore this work should be scheduled for Summer 2011, avoiding peak activity periods. We are in the process of preparing for an anticipated cut over date of 8/27/2011.

**Dependencies:**

- There is some minor power work that will need to get through Physical Facilities.
- Wider deployment of VoIP to departments will necessitate increased cooperation and coordination between OIT/Communications Services and departmental network support personnel.

**Risks:**

- Our vendor, NEC, has responded that the disaster in Japan will not affect any of the project goals.
- It is anticipated that budget cuts may cause departments to continue to disconnect telephone lines. The biggest risk is that, because there is a fixed cost base, a diminishing customer base could eventually result in a higher cost per customer. This is, however, a situation which may be encountered even without the proposed project.
Proposal Statement:

There was strong consensus among the members of the IT Operational Effectiveness Committee that the lack of well defined organization and governance structures is a weakness which prevents IT to be effectively utilized to support the strategic plan and vision of the campus or to address campus-wide needs. The Organization and Governance concepts presented here represent the IT Operational Effectiveness Committee’s vision of effective structure. It is the strong recommendation of the IT OE Committee that these concepts be passed to a follow-on committee made up of control-point level IT consumers to fully develop these concepts and put them into operation. The follow-on committee is envisioned to be separate and distinct from existing campus IT committees.

Project Rationale:

Currently, there are no formal organization or governance structures in place that facilitate coordination necessary to ensure effective cross-campus IT efforts. The lack of organization and governance structures results in duplication of effort and ineffective campus level IT support. To achieve long-term and sustainable effectiveness of the UCSB campus-wide information technologies and communications, the UCSB IT Operational Effectiveness team recommends the following:

- **Guiding Principle.** The UCSB information technology community shall function in a cohesive collaborative manner to provide nimble, effective, and streamlined IT services aligned with the strategic needs of the university constituencies and the university as a whole. The UCSB IT community shall also act as a strategic partner and resource for other campus operational effectiveness investments and initiatives.

- **Goals and Objectives.** A multi-year rolling plan to identify strategic campus IT goals. The following represents an initial example.
  1. Year One: enhancing the effectiveness of campus-wide Information Technology by first addressing the enterprise Communications with a focus on unified a) Enterprise collaboration systems (email & calendaring), b) Student email solutions, and c) the future of telephone services.
  2. Year two: focus on IT Infrastructure, Security and Disaster Recovery.

- **Organization.** A federated model utilizing pockets of excellence, economy of scale, and economy of scope with strong alignment with UCSB divisions and executive control points

**Project Aim & Outcomes:**
The aim of the project is to provide the campus with organizational and governance concepts that are fully endorsed by the IT Operational Effectiveness Committee. Diagram 1 below depicts the Organizational Structure Concept that is fully endorsed by the IT OE Committee. Diagram 2 below depicts the Governance Structure Concept that is fully endorsed by the IT OE Committee. These are concepts to be used as a starting point for follow-on discussion and action.

UCSB IT Organization Structure Concept

To achieve long-term and sustainable effectiveness of the UCSB campus-wide information technologies and communications, the UCSB IT Operational Effectiveness team recommends the following:

Guiding Principle.

The UCSB information technology community shall function in a cohesive collaborative manner to provide nimble, effective, and streamlined IT services aligned with the strategic needs of the university constituencies and the university as a whole. The UCSB IT community shall also act as a strategic partner and resource for other campus operational effectiveness investments and initiatives.

Goals and Objectives.

The IT Operational Effectiveness team will engage in a multi-year process to enhance the effectiveness of campus-wide Information Technology. Year one will address enterprise Communications with a focus on a) Student email solutions, b) Enterprise collaboration systems (email & calendaring), and c) the future of telephone services. Additional years will focus on other areas, such as IT Infrastructure and Unified Enterprise Systems and Services.

Diagram 1: This diagram depicts the IT OE Committee’s concept for the UCSB IT Organizational Structure. Follow-on action is required to complete the definition of the roles responsibilities, and dotted line relationships required to implement this concept.
UCSB IT Governance Structure Concept

Diagram 2: This diagram depicts the IT OE Committee’s concept for the UCSB IT Governance Structure. Follow-on action is required to complete the definition of the relationships, resourcing, and funding required to implement this concept.

Implementation Roadmap:
- The OE Steering committee must create a follow-on committee comprised of control-point level IT consumers and a small contingent of senior IT representatives to fully develop these concepts and put them into operation.
- The follow-on committee must address items to include explicit scope addressed by the organization and governance structures, organizational dotted line relationships, roles, responsibilities, resource allocation, and funding.
- The following IT consumers are suggested as potential committee members: David Marshall, Michael Young, Willie Brown, Jody Kaufman, Eric Sonquist, Donna Trimble, Karen Hanson, Chuck Haines, Tom Putnam, Doug Drury.
- The committee should engage a consultant to evaluate similar structures that are being successfully utilized at other research campuses to achieve goals similar to UCSB’s.
The committee should provide a recommendation based on the work of the consultant with committee input.

Resources:
- Committee members to allocate up to 4 hours per month each.
- Consultant fees – estimated at $25,000.

Scheduling:
- Consultant recommendations within 4 months of engagement.
- Committee recommendation to the campus within 6 months of committee formation.

Dependencies:
- Consultant statement of work and procurement
Project Proposal Investment Summary

**Phase I Upfront & Ongoing Investment Costs**

- **Campus Personnel**
  - 3 FTEs for centralized training function: $210K
  - Kronos licensing & implementation; FTEs for project management; hosting costs: $1.2M initial; $240K ongoing

- **Shop Services**
  - Reconfiguration of shop spaces: $500K

- **Ticketing & Events**
  - Ticketing system licensing and support: $250K
  - Calendaring system programming: TBD
  - ‘Virtual Events’ website development and hosting; FTE project manager/event planner: $75K initial; $75K ongoing

- **IT & Communications**
  - Collaboration Suite licensing and support: TBD
  - Student email set-up cost: TBD
  - VOIP platform costs and support: $300K

**Anticipated Investment Areas for OE Phase II Projects**

- **IT & Communications**
  - 3 FTE for enterprise project management
  - IT management consultant cost

- **Procurement & Storerooms**
  - New systems configuration
  - Training and process redesign support
  - Reconfiguration of storeroom spaces

- **Finance**
  - FTEs for project management
  - Training and process redesign support
  - Service Center Space Reconfiguration
# Potential Project Savings Summary

## Phase I Potential Cost Savings

- **Campus Personnel**
  - FTE equivalent in time savings [80% time reduction for time-keeping processing across 31 FTE aggregate] $1M - $1.5M
  - FTE equivalent in time savings TBD by control points

- **Shop Services**
  - Attrition of 4 – 7 FTE Shop Personnel $350-700K
  - Equipment purchase cost avoidance $100K

- **Ticketing & Events**
  - 5 – 10% Increase in ticketing Sales TBD
  - Reduce licensing & support costs to maintain multiple email/calendar systems $200-300K

- **IT & Communications**
  - Reduce student email hosting & support costs TBD

## High-Level Investment & Savings Summary for Phase I & II

### High-Level Phase I Initiative Investment & Savings Scenario

- **Investment Costs** $2 – 3M initial investment; $250 - $350K ongoing
- **Potential Savings** $1.5 - $3M recurring on annual basis

### High-Level Phase II Initiative Investment & Savings Scenario

- **Investment Costs** $4M - $6M over first 3 years, then $1M annual ongoing investment beginning in 4th year.
- **Possible Savings** $5 - $7M over first 3 years, $8- $10M thereafter
OE Phase I Investment & Savings Overview

Phase I Estimated Investment & Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2011-12</th>
<th>FY 2012-13</th>
<th>FY 2013-14</th>
<th>FY 2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$-1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High-Level Estimate

**Investment Costs:** $2M - $3M over first 3 years, then $350K annual ongoing investment

**Upfront Costs Includes:**
- FTEs for centralized training function, project management
- System licensing and implementation costs
- VOIP platform costs and support
- Shop reconfiguration costs

**Ongoing Costs Includes:**
- FTEs for central training function, event planner
- System licensing and support fees, ongoing system training

**Potential Savings:** $1.5 - $3M recurring on annual basis by 4th Year

**Savings to include:**
- Attrition of 4-7 shop personnel
- FTE equivalents in time savings for PPS and time-keeping administration
- Increased revenue from ticketing sales
- Reduction in licensing and support costs for multiple calendar/email systems
- Reduction in student email hosting & support costs
Please See OE Final Summary Report Appendix Attachments