

Campus Finance Committee Meeting

Date: Thursday, August 12

Time: 9am

In Attendance

Elizabeth Watkins, Gerry Bomotti, Anil Deolalikar, Brian Haynes, Christopher Lynch, Deborah Deas, Jason Stajich, Jeff Girard, Jennifer Brown, Juliet McMillian, Katherine Kinney, Kevin Vaughn, Louie Rodriguez, Mariam Lam, Rodolfo Torres, Shaun Bowler, Steven Mandeville-Gamble, Daryle Williams, Dana Simmons, Melanie Yuqing Wu, Yung Phung (representing CNAS for Kathryn Uhrich), and Stephanie Flores (committee support). ITS Guests = Josh Bright, Dewight Kramer, Shelley Gupta

Opening Comments - Liz

After hearing from faculty, staff, students (confirmed by VCSA) that the ITS unit is understaffed, the unit was asked to submit a funding proposal to the CFC for consideration from the new rebenching funding the campus is receiving in FY22. The amount was given to them with the request for a proposal.

ITS Presentation – Josh, Dewight, Shelley

ITS is appreciative of the opportunity to bring forward this proposal (see attached) in recognition of the division's role in supporting the overall success of the University and will take questions. (*Note: committee comment/questions italicized below followed by a summary of the ITS response.*)

- *Data Architect – what would you need from CFC to make that person successful?* Need to build lost resources and forward-looking needs. This position is a forward-looking need. Need to build more support into their capacity to drive the success data analytics/governance, they need the leadership support and commitment to participate in a robust data governance structure.
- *Talk about the IT Risk Management area and the role of the 2 FTE.* There is a growing set of requirements in this area. The manager level will work with campus partners on overall issues. Risk is high in the research The risk analyst is going to take on the role of working with the vendor risk management process and the Appendix DS.
- *UE has worked intimately with ITS and they have lost ~40 positions over the last 3 years and while there is routine work – day to day functions, there are also special projects. If this proposal is fully funded, would this make you whole compared to other campuses similar to ours?* The campus has challenges across the campus with staffing and this does not make us whole but it will significantly increase staff. About 85% of staff capacity is working on day-to-day required functions, 11% on project Genesis – should be completed by next summer which will redirect to special projects, 4% is available for special projects. They feel that they will be able to much more responsive to special projects next Fall. ITS reached out to sister institutions (UCSC, UCI) on ratios of ladder rank faculty and students to IT staff. While both UCSC and UCI are under 100:1, this would bring ITS to 160:1 and we are currently over 200:1.

- *Variability of one-time funding – is that a signal on priority?* One-time funding that ITS will contribute is not a signal. ITS has tried to rank-order the actual request. They have a meaningful CFD balance that they plan to use for short-term needs - implementation costs and it's also their reserve for equipment failure. Implementation of the information security policy is going to be a heavy lift and costly - \$1.3M is a two-year plan for temp employees to get through the implementation.
- *How is the unit thinking about absorbing the increases without future infusion in a couple of years?* There are critical areas that need investment – cloud resources, security – and the industry is moving away from local, customized and into cloud, vendor implemented systems. Plan is to transform ITS over time and retrain staff for the areas with the demand for services. Structural deficit will grow if the campus doesn't find ways to generate funding to cover the annual increases for licensing and maintenance of campus systems. ITS also has the network and server renewal and replacement – the upfront cost is \$6M to address those issues. Approximately 25% of the 2,500 pieces of the campus network hardware is beyond or near end of life. The majority of the campus network hardware is quite aged and the percentage at end of life increases markedly year after year without increased investment. A new Infrastructure Maintenance Fee (IMF) has been proposed to cover the fixed cost increases for licensing and maintenance as well as network and server (infrastructure) renewal and replacement.
- *Speak to the external assessment that played into the process to develop this proposal.* Have laid off or reduced 42 positions, so this proposal was to address key areas from the loss the need to address critical new services needed by the campus in the near term, and security risks. Consulted with each of the ITS leadership areas and their needs and then collaborated on the ranking of the needs across areas.
- *Given all the demands, if you receive all of the funding, does the unit have the capacity to get all these employees on board?* The IT job market is the hottest job market at the moment and so there will be challenges with hiring. They have tried to build in some thought to that and so they need an HR Business Partner to help with recruitment and retention. Staff also have been good at working their networks to bring people in. The staff is spread across various divisions and the staff are highly motivated to get staff in. It won't happen in 3 months, but it does not seem unattainable.
- *How would the new CIO influence the hiring? Should we allocate a block to ITS to incentivize the hiring of the new CIO?* It may help in the recruitment to be able to reference the recent investment. It doesn't seem likely that the new CIO would feel differently about the need to invest in security, but they definitely should have some say in the final investment strategy.
- *What is the current ITS budget and FTE?* Perm FTE is 132 and budget is \$30M across all fund sources.
- *It appears that about \$2.5M of the \$5.6M proposal is directly related to cybersecurity and that the build-back of staff is less than the total proposal?* That is correct and there is about \$2M in one-time funding from ITS cash balances allocated for security.
- *If a majority of the request is funded due to the salary savings, would it defer the IMF later than FY23?* No, the IMF will still be submitted. If the campus finds ~\$2M in new perm funds for some of the items included in the IMF, ITS would not move forward with a recharge for IMF anytime in the near future.

Discussion – all attendees

Thank you to the CFC for the great questions. Please share your thoughts:

- Unquestionable need for staff. Proposal for 25 staff, but we would not hold them to hire this directly plan, but leave some space for the new CIO to have input. The opportunity for professional development to retrain within the ITS org to keep our great employees.
- Concern about making a big financial investment without addressing the infrastructure need – it seems risky. Provost and VCPB will work with ITS to use salary savings from unfilled positions to address one-time infrastructure priorities.
- ITS does affect all of us – all orgs and faculty, staff, and student.
- IMF Fee is a concern because it will affect all Orgs that have just taken budget cuts. Unfortunate to have to deal with any of the costs with a new fee, so consider funding from core funds with new funding.
- Rarely do we fund an entire proposal and so if \$2.5M is for security, then that means only \$3M rebuilds ITS, so it seems the entire proposal needs to be funded.
- Concern that the proposal was not forward-leaning enough. Do we need to hit the reset button with ITS? The proposal needs to be funded, but we need to better understand the long-term needs in ITS maybe a strategic ITS plan needs to be requested. There needs to be an RI focus. Provost reminds the groups that there is a IT Governance Committee that includes several CFC members and faculty and so the dialogue with ITS will continue and have oversight.
- We shouldn't focus on FTE changes in ITS because there has been a gradual change in the business they are doing – continual reduction of custom-built applications.

Action Items

In closing, please send an email to Liz about how much you would like to spend on this proposal by the end of the day. We will be doing this for FY23 and FY24 as well, so we need to think about the infrastructure needs along with other staffing investments on campus in future conversations.

Outcome: Based on near-unanimous support from the Campus Finance Committee members, the Chancellor and Provost have approved an increase of \$5.6M to the permanent budget of Information Technology Solutions to address staffing, security system, and process gaps.

Next Meeting

Thursday, August 26 at 9:30am

University of California, Riverside
Information Technology Solutions

Budget Proposal - July 2021

| Priority | Description | Permanent Funding | | NOTES | One-Time Funding to be provided by ITS |
|----------|--|-------------------|-----------|---|--|
| | | FTE | \$ | | |
| 1 | Identity and Access Management (IAM) System Replacement | 1.00 | \$305,833 | 1.00 FTE - IAM Architect and Annual Software Subscription | \$271,162 |
| 2 | Network Support | 2.00 | \$302,110 | 1.00 FTE - Network Analyst & 1.00 FTE Network Admin. | \$7,000 |
| 3 | Business Intelligence Support | 1.00 | \$202,391 | 1.00 FTE - Data Architect | \$3,500 |
| 4 | Academic Personnel/HR Applications Programming Support | 2.00 | \$362,893 | 2.00 FTE - Application Programmer | \$7,000 |
| 5 | Project Management Support - Network | 1.00 | \$202,541 | 1.00 FTE Project Manager | \$3,500 |
| 6 | General Assignment Classroom Support | 2.00 | \$294,825 | 1.00 FTE Multimedia Technician/1.00 FTE Multimedia Coordinator | \$7,000 |
| | | 7.00 | \$276,067 | 14 student workers at .50 FTE each. | |
| 7 | Additional Network Support | 1.00 | \$202,541 | 1.00 FTE - Network Engineer | \$3,500 |
| 8 | Project Management Support - Enterprise Solutions/Security | 1.00 | \$202,541 | 1.00 FTE Project Manager | \$3,500 |
| 9 | Student Learning Systems Support | 1.00 | \$167,132 | 1.00 FTE Learning Systems Analyst | \$3,500 |
| 10 | Help Desk and Managed Desktop/Mobile Device Management Support | 3.00 | \$430,892 | 2.00 FTE Help Desk Technicians and 1.00 FTE Mobile Device Administrator | \$10,500 |
| 11 | Internal (ITS) HR Support | 1.00 | \$181,446 | 1.00 FTE HR Business Partner | \$3,500 |
| 12 | Unified IT Logging System | 1.00 | \$662,611 | 1.00 FTE Systems Administrator | \$153,500 |
| 13 | IT Risk Management Support | 2.00 | \$379,049 | 1.00 FTE Risk Manager/1.00 FTE IT Security Analyst | \$1,340,804 |
| 14 | IT Support for Research | 2.00 | \$325,223 | 2.00 FTE System Administrators | \$7,000 |
| 15 | Additional Business Intelligence Support | 1.00 | \$181,446 | 1.00 FTE Business Intelligence Specialist | \$3,500 |

| Priority | Description | Permanent Funding | | NOTES | One-Time Funding to be provided by ITS |
|--------------------|---|-------------------|--------------------|---|--|
| | | FTE | \$ | | |
| 16 | Firewall Service - Web Applications | 0.00 | \$50,000 | Software to mitigate Denial of Service attacks | \$0 |
| 17 | Configuration Management Database Support | 1.00 | \$181,446 | 1.00 FTE Application Programmer | \$203,500 |
| 18 | Vulnerability Management Support | 0.00 | \$380,016 | Software to manage IT security vulnerabilities. | \$448,723 |
| 19 | Additional Student Applications Programming Support | 1.00 | \$181,446 | 1.00 FTE Application Programmer | \$3,500 |
| 20 | Business Systems Analysis Support | 1.00 | \$145,434 | 1.00 FTE Business Systems Analyst | \$3,500 |
| GRAND TOTAL | | 25.00 | \$5,617,885 | | \$2,487,688 |

NOTES:

Total FTE does NOT include student workers.