Email & Calendaring

We received 23 comments on post-its for email and calendaring with all responses as positive or neutral, no responses were negative.

• “No brainer…could be implemented with very little sacrifice (if any)”

• Cost of calendar inefficiencies should be included, one commenter estimated 1.4M wasted hours per year in dealing with inoperable calendar issues

• “Where do the savings come from? Our hardware is hand-me-down from research, software is open source, running it takes a small amount of staff time.”

• Be mindful of new trends in technology – any new system must be able to synch to smart-phones

• If multiple calendar systems are implemented, they must be able to enable cross-campus viewing / scheduling
Data Center Aggregation

We received 5 comments on post-its for data center aggregation with all responses as positive or neutral, no responses were negative.

• Three comments said “No”
Computer Bundles

We received 8 comments on post-its for computer bundles with all responses as positive, no responses were neutral or negative.

• “Painless way to reduce costs for students”
• “Can we expand this to software and licensing?”
Space

We received 15 comments on post-its for space with all responses as positive or neutral, no responses were negative.

• One questioned data
• One questioned whether UW is an outlier here
• Several suggested alternate course delivery mechanisms to reduce the need for as many classrooms
Demand Management (Strategic Purchasing)

We received 12 comments on post-its for demand management with all responses as positive or neutral, no responses were negative.

• Several suggested additional commodity areas
• Most suggested “no brainer”
• “Saves money with little sacrifice”
• Some concern over “sustaining change”
Web Survey

As of 6PM on Thursday, we had received 18 responses via the web survey. The themes of the responses were generally:

- While campus acceptance may be challenging, linking savings to strategic priorities (e.g., pay plan, mitigation of tuition increases) would have a positive impact.

- Concerns, where expressed, were variations on a theme of worries over diminution of service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Email &amp; Calendaring</th>
<th>Data Center Aggregation</th>
<th>Computer Bundles</th>
<th>Demand Management</th>
<th>Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savings too low</td>
<td>Excellent, these types of saving are well documented in the public literature. I would not be surprised if you exceeded your savings expectations, based on savings we've seen by moving to data centers and virtual servers.</td>
<td>Great! If both Mac and Windows platforms</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Makes sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savings too high</td>
<td></td>
<td>Awesome if departments can get what they need</td>
<td>Significant Savings</td>
<td>Wonder if this goes far enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seems reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td>No brainer</td>
<td>Go for it</td>
<td>Great!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Would save time if better than Wiscal</td>
<td>Service improved</td>
<td>Same systems will create additional efficiencies in fix support</td>
<td>Seems better in every way if system is nimble enough to meet changing requirements</td>
<td>If scheduling rooms / amenities is easy than no concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office compatibility</td>
<td>Security improved</td>
<td>&quot;This is low hanging fruit that needs picking&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduling ability would be tremendous</td>
<td>Concerns about vendor lock-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Deans / directors required to make this happen</td>
<td>Some concerns about loss of control and service levels</td>
<td>Better sales job</td>
<td>I don't care if campus doesn't like the limitation on some types of spending - there will always be exceptions and if that purchase can be justified, well then let the bit of extra work be done to justify the exception.</td>
<td>More data needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptance depends on functionality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Engage customers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Encage customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poke and prod and you will get acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td>May be the hardest sell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>