On March 1, 2010, members of the Campus Information Technology Plan Committee responded to questions provided in advance by staff from ITaP. Respondents were:

- G. Logan Jordan, associate dean, Krannert School of Management
- Julie Kercher-Updike, associate vice president, ITaP Customer Relations
- Connie Lapinskas, assistant provost, financial affairs (committee chair)
- Chris Martin, Sustaining New Synergies task force
- Rabindra Mukerjea, director, Strategic Planning and Assessment
- Patrick Smoker, head, Department of Agricultural Information Technology

The session was moderated by committee member Mukerjea.

**MUKERJEA:** Q: What is the current IT General Funds budget, and how is the current IT General Funds budget currently distributed among ITaP, academic IT units and administrative IT units?

**LAPINSKAS:** A: Determining the total IT budget or cost of IT is a complex task because there is not a clear definition of IT expenditures. IT can be very broadly or very narrowly defined, producing very different expenditure pictures.

Instead of focusing on that, the committee has focused on improving processes and efficiencies in governance and spend that will create savings as a result of best practices and good business models. We are not charged to cut a percentage of the IT expenditures, but to identify a fixed amount of savings, so that is how we have approached this.

From a staffing perspective, ITaP makes up about 50 percent of the IT staffing total, while the administrative IT staff make up 20 percent and the academic IT staffing, the remaining 30 percent. However, this does not necessarily reflect the ratio of budget cuts. We will be looking at cost savings wherever they can be identified.
MUKERJEA: Q: With the mandate placed upon IT to trim expenditures by millions of dollars, what does that encompass?

MUKERJEA: A: We believe this question was answered during the presentation.

MUKERJEA: Q: Is this reduction against today's budget, the anticipated budget for those years, or an inflation-adjusted constant budget (i.e., 2010’s budget)?

KERCHER-UPDIKE: A: The reduction is a fixed dollar amount and not adjusted for inflation.

MUKERJEA: Q: What about reductions in IT budget through other means? For example, 1) transferring staff currently paid through ITaP to other areas of the University, 2) reduction in IT staff in distributed areas by consolidation of services, or 3) outsourcing?

MARTIN: A: Let me answer these as three separate questions:
1) If staff are transferred from general-fund budgets to grant funding then, yes, that could be considered.
2) Consolidating services and reducing redundancy regardless of area will be considered.
3) Yes, if outsourcing is cost-effective and meets the need without reducing services, then it will be considered.

MUKERJEA: Q: It seems like most things that can be consolidated to the center already are. The things that are left are “the harder tasks” that will be difficult. Is ITaP capable? Examples:
   a. Licensing: been trying for years, no success so far.
   b. Group purchases: not that much savings, and you’ve got no authority.
   c. When ITaP governs, inflexible policies thwart success.
   d. The possible saving through centralization mentioned in the FAQ (firewalls; networking services; files services; or communication technologies, such as telephones and email) are already mostly centralized.
   e. Energy savings: Faculty do not pay for electricity, or already do through F&A. There’s no incentive.
   f. Faculty are self-financed through grants, and central has no authority over these funds. And, the nature of grant funding won’t facilitate recurring costs.

JORDAN: A: Meeting the President’s challenge is not about ITaP accomplishing these things; it’s about the IT enterprise coming together to make them a reality. The cost-savings subcommittee will identify those opportunities with the most cost savings and that have the greatest probability for success. The governance subcommittee seeks to create an organizational structure and governance model that will create the necessary collaboration and accountability to see them through.