

Technology Recharge Fee Advisory Committee

November 6, 2012

Meeting #3

Agenda

- Review decision points
- Review rate scenarios
- Identify areas of agreement and areas to explore further
- Define next steps
- Summarize Status for the IT Service Investment Board

TRF Advisory Committee Charge

- Support the IT Service Investment Board in its annual review and assessment of the Technology Recharge Fee by providing analysis, identifying issues, and making recommendations.

TRF – General Principles

- Provides a stable foundation for UW's critical technology needs
- Costs will be fully recovered
- Head count will be a proxy for use
- Results will be actionable
- Process will be transparent
- Simplicity should be maintained
- Administration should be easy

TRF Annual Review Timeline

Month	TRF Advisory Committee	IT Service Investment Board
September	Meeting 1: September 28 History, current model, identify issues	
October	Meeting 2: October 23 Review budget base, services, & discuss methodology issues	Meeting 1: October 9 Charge, Scope, TRF background and context
November	Meeting 3: November 6 Review preliminary TRF rate and allocation model	Meeting 2: November 13 UW-IT Funding, TRF investments, TRF issues
December	Meeting 4: December 11 Review and make final TRF rate recommendation to Svc Investment Board	Meeting 3: December 12 Review TRF Advisory Committee rate recommendations

Review Decision Points

5 Steps and Key Decision Points

1. Identify cost of services
2. Classify services
 - A. Reclassify specific Univ Supported Svs?**
 - B. Bring Info Management into the TRF process?**
3. Allocate Basic Services to Per Capita groups
 - **Change current allocations?**
4. Allocate GOF/DOF to Per Capita groups
 - **Cost of students funded with GOF/DOF or spread to units?**
5. Determine employee and student headcounts
 - **Change how we count employees or students?**

Key Decision Points

Large Impact:

Students funded with GOF/DOF or allocated to academic units?

Bring Info Management into the TRF process?

Moderate Impact:

Reclassify specific Univ Supported Svs?

Change current allocations of Basic Services to Per Capita Groups?

Lower Impact:

Change how we count employees?

Key Decision Point

How GOF/DOF is applied to:

Students?

and

Information Management?

How do we allocate GOF/DOF to Students?

Current GOF/DOF allocation method:

- 1st to University Support
- 2nd to Students
- Balance to Campus Employees
- 0 to Medical Ctrs

Alternative GOF/DOF allocation method:

- 1st to University Support
- Balance to Students and Campus Employees equally
- Use ABB methodology to allocate Students to academic units
- 0 to Medical Ctrs

Impact of Allocating Students to Academic Units

Apply Students to Units	
Admin	(1,274,200)
Academic	2,914,439
Med School	(1,657,797)
Med Center	47,531

Discussion – FOR

Changing Current Method

- Students are major cost drivers of IT
- Over-emphasis of GOF/DOF to instruction and under-emphasis to research
- ABB allocates tuition revenue to academic units

Discussion - AGAINST Changing Current Method

- Overemphasis on impact of students on technology
- Assumes students are responsibility of individual units rather than UW as an institution
- ABB, as currently implemented, may not be not be structured to support IT cost of students
- Administrative complexity

Should we bring Info Mgmt into the TRF Process?

- Information Management is not included in the TRF model.
- Currently funded by GOF/DOF
- OIM merged with UW Tech in Spring 2010, after WTC cost study
- Modernization projects, funded by Provost would not be included

Information Mgmt - Services

- Finance Program (FIN, EIO, MyFD, BGT)
- HR/Payroll Program (HEPPS, OPAS, OWLS)
- Student Program (SDB)
- Enterprise Information and Integration Svcs (Data Warehouse)
- Facilities Services
- Alumni & Advancement
- Chemical Tracking System (EH&S)

Modernization efforts including HR/Payroll Replacement, eFECS, Kualu Student, Document Imaging, MyPlan are funded separately by the Provost as specific projects.

Impact of Info Mgmt into TRF process

IM Added to Model	
Admin	(812,300)
Academic	(1,256,147)
Med School	(1,255,376)
Med Center	3,353,820

Discussion FOR

Including IM into TRF

- IM integrated into UW-IT after original TRF was created
- All units share in the benefit of the IM systems
- Allocation of cost would be consistent with other IT services in the TRF
- Less administrative complexity

Discussion AGAINST Including TRF into TRF

- Medical Centers utilize Admin Business Systems at different capacity than campus
- Under current model, Medical Centers already contribute their per capita share of 50% of Admin Business Systems
- Admin Business Systems do not meet the needs of the Medical Centers
- Should be treated like University Support

Review Rate Scenarios

Discussion

Areas of Agreement

Additional data analysis?

Discussion on Moderate and Lower Impact Issues

Key Decision Points

Large Impact:

Students funded with GOF/DOF or allocated to academic units?

Bring Info Management into the TRF process?

Moderate Impact:

Reclassify specific Univ Supported Svs?

Change current allocations of Basic Services to Per Capita Groups?

Lower Impact:

Change how we count employees?

Summarize Status for the IT Service Investment Board

- Key points to convey?
- What input from Service Investment Board would we like?

TRF Advisory Committee

Next Meeting

- Discussion and review of issues
- Finalize Recommendation

Next Meeting – December 11th