

Campus Email Committee

Findings and Recommendations

For the Future of Campus Email at UC Davis

Prepared on

July 7, 2011

Final report and recommendations presented to campus by the Campus Email Committee:

Felix Wu, Computer Science, CIT representative, and Campus Email Committee Chair

Jamie Butler, School of Law, College technology leads liaison

Paul Gepts, Plant Sciences, CIT representative

Francois Gygi, Senate CIT Chair

Rick Grosberg, Evolution and Ecology, At-Large Academic Senate Representative

Joe Kiskis, Physics, At-Large Academic Senate Representative

Tracy Lade, Physics, ADMAN representative

Morna Mellor, Director, Data Center and Client Services

Carl Whithaus, University Writing Program, Gmail Advisory Committee Chair

Gabe Youtsey, Project Manager, IET

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	4
FINDINGS.....	4
RECOMMENDATIONS	5
CAMPUS EMAIL COMMITTEE CONCLUSIONS.....	7
REQUIREMENTS SUB-COMMITTEE	7
ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS POLICY SUB-COMMITTEE	8
PACKAGE RECOMMENDATION SUB-COMMITTEE	9
BACKGROUND	12
PRIOR WORK REGARDING EMAIL	12
ABOUT THE CAMPUS EMAIL COMMITTEE	12
CHARGE OF THE CAMPUS EMAIL COMMITTEE	13
APPROACH TO COMPLETING THE WORK	13
RESULTS OF CAMPUS-WIDE SURVEY.....	15
SUMMARY OF SURVEY FINDINGS	15
REVIEW OF EMAIL PACKAGES.....	19
PACKAGE REVIEW BACKGROUND.....	19
EMAIL/UNIFIED COMMUNICATION PACKAGES REVIEWED	19
COST ANALYSIS.....	24
APPENDIX A – DETAILED CAMPUS EMAIL SURVEY FINDINGS	29

Executive Summary

The Campus Email Committee was formed jointly by the Academic Senate and IET in fall 2010 to identify a path forward to provide better email service and reduce costs associated with nearly one hundred email systems on our campus. Building on the work of previous committees, the faculty-led committee conducted a campus-wide survey and performed extensive analysis of possible scenarios and costs for next generation email at UC Davis.

The committee recognizes the frustration felt by many within the campus community with our older email services, the inequity among campus units using disparate email systems, and the lack of central address books and calendaring systems. We further recognize the significant apprehension felt by many community members about outsourcing email and other sensitive data to vendors such as Google or Microsoft. The committee also understands the popularity of our Google Apps service for students and some faculty and staff, and the wide use of Microsoft Exchange for email and calendaring services on campus.

The committee therefore recommends a “hybrid” model made up of email, calendaring, chat, and document collaboration services where some community members’ data resides on campus and some resides off campus in the “cloud”. The best solutions available for this hybrid model are the on campus uConnect Microsoft Exchange service, Microsoft’s new Office 365 cloud service, and Google Apps.

In alignment with the recommendations of the campus Blue Ribbon IT Excellence report, the committee strongly recommends that basic email and communications services be funded centrally and provided “free” to community members to maximize adoption across campus, thereby reducing duplicative services and allowing campus units to focus on mission priorities. The total future cost to run email for the campus is estimated at \$900,000 - \$1,000,000 annually, reduced from the \$1.8 Million - \$2.8 Million annually that it costs today.

We recommend the campus moves forward with a collaborative process between IET, academic and other administrative units to implement the service. Joint oversight by the campus constituency, continual service improvement, and a focus on quality customer service should be the themes in the campus transition to and operation of the next generational email and communication service.

Campus Email Committee
June 24, 2011

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Building on the excellent work conducted by previous UC Davis and system-wide committees, and through our own extensive work in the form of a campus-wide survey, policy review, cost analysis, system demonstrations, and much discussion, the Campus Email Committee offers the following findings and recommendations:

Findings

From the Campus-Wide Email Survey

1. Any “email” offering must contain optional unified communications tools including calendaring, anywhere access, mobile device support, document sharing, collaboration tools, and chat integration.
2. Large mailbox (5 GB and above) and attachment sizes (25 MB and above) are critical to our faculty, staff, and students.
3. The top privacy concerns regarding outsourcing email to a vendor are mining of data for commercial uses and security breaches.
4. Many faculty and staff (15-20%) are forwarding email to personal email addresses, many of them using Google Apps

From Sub-Committee Review of the Electronic Communications Policy

1. The Committee’s review concerns the narrow question of whether or not the UC Electronic Communications Policy (ECP) prohibits the outsourcing of email services for the campus.
2. The sub-committee takes no position on the advisability of such outsourcing in general or to any specific vendor.
3. The System-wide UC Information Security and Privacy Initiative are working to update the ECP in the next two years.
4. The most consistent interpretation of the present ECP is that the use of outside vendors to provide communication services is not by itself a violation of the policy.
5. All outsourced services must operate in a manner that is consistent with University policy.
6. If the campus is to make use of outside vendors, it must develop and maintain a high level of rigor in contracting and compliance monitoring.

From a Review of Various Email and Unified Communications Alternatives

1. There is no single email/unified communications solution that delivers all the features desired on campus at the lowest cost.
2. Many are concerned with possible compromises in security, privacy, and control in using cloud providers like Gmail.
3. There are extremely high satisfaction rates among students, faculty, and staff using UC Davis Gmail or forwarding to personal accounts.

4. There is much dissatisfaction with the current Cyrus/Geckomail simple email service, and close to 100 email systems around campus that provide their own service.
5. There is a wide variation in the quality of “email” service around campus, from full-featured calendaring, collaboration, and messaging to simple email.
6. Some of the possible email solutions reviewed by the committee are not used widely around campus, and would require much higher transition and training costs than those that are more widely-used on campus currently.

Recommendations

General Recommendations

1. Select a small number of complementary cloud/on premises email/unified communications systems to take advantage of the benefits of each and minimize the issues to increase satisfaction and adoption
2. Retire Cyrus/Geckomail after a transition period
3. Offer basic email, calendaring, and chat services for “free” to campus to increase adoption and decrease unnecessary email services around campus
4. Offer additional collaboration and communication services (e.g. SharePoint, VOIP) at an additional cost for departments that need them
5. Build ongoing collaborative relationships between IET and campus units to enhance the interoperability of the recommended central email/unified communications systems
6. Form email/unified communication steering and technical committees made up of campus units and IET to provide collaborative oversight
7. Develop practices for strong contract management and compliance monitoring of cloud providers
8. Support PC, Mac, Linux/Unix users on campus with a range of supported email clients and Web access to preserve a variety of choices using standards-based protocols
9. Provide accessible systems to accommodate the needs of the entire campus community

Email Package Recommendations

Building on the findings and general recommendations above, the Campus Email Committee recommends the following mix of email/unified communications services to meet the needs of the entire campus including students, faculty, and staff.

1. Microsoft Exchange through the on premises uConnect service

- 2 GB mailboxes/calendar (for those with requirements for onsite email storage)
- Chat services through Microsoft Lync (on premises)
- Optional SharePoint, Office Web App services (on premises)
- Optional VOIP services (on premises)
- Targeted toward faculty or staff with needs for on-campus email and data storage
- Preferred option for administrative calendaring

- Integrates with Microsoft Office 365 off-campus and acts as a single service
- 2. Microsoft Office 365 as the off-campus cloud component of the uConnect service in programs that elect Microsoft Office 365**
- 25 GB mailboxes/calendar – hosted by Microsoft (the default option for most faculty and staff)
 - Chat services through Microsoft Lync
 - Optional services provided through uConnect on premises
 - Targeted for a large portion of faculty and staff as it provides the largest mailbox sizes at the least cost to campus
 - Preferred option for administrative calendaring
 - Integrates with Microsoft Exchange on premises and acts as a single service
- 3. Google Apps for Education for students and faculty and staff in programs that elect Gmail**
- Provide full range of Gmail and Google Apps for students and other campus units (including faculty and staff in programs that elect Gmail)
 - Provide a Google Apps account, without Gmail, to all faculty and staff on other email services, for collaboration purposes
 - Likely faculty and staff Gmail candidates are those who prefer Gmail/Google Apps and generally do not need the heavy calendaring capabilities such as searching for available meeting times among multiple attendees or reserving conference rooms regularly.

In its evaluation of potential products that meet the needs of the entire campus, the committee was careful to support only products with full capabilities for Windows, Macintosh, and Linux operating system users. Each of the recommended products above can connect email through Outlook, Apple Mail, Thunderbird and other programs installed on user’s computers, referred to as “email clients”. Each product can also connect to the service for a full use experience through any standard browser such as Internet Explorer, Safari, Firefox, and others. Finally, each product above can connect to a variety of mobile devices such as Apple iPads/iPhones, Android devices, and Blackberries. Most users could simply continue to use the email clients, browsers, and mobile devices they are using now, with very little change as much of the proposed changes are to the underlying email service.

Campus Email Committee Conclusions

Requirements Sub-Committee

The campus-wide email survey made clear that email is a highly personal business tool and above all, the campus community enjoys a certain amount of choice in their email services. In today's email landscape, community members use computers with Windows, Mac, and Linux operating systems. They access their email with a variety of browsers, email client software, and mobile devices. In many cases they use multiple email addresses to do their work including their official UC Davis email address, a department email address, and personal email addresses. Community members use interconnected calendars, instant messaging programs, shared documents, and collaborative team computing environments to do their work and share it with others. As the needs have grown from simple email services to interconnected, unified communications, the University's services have not kept pace on the whole. Simple email is provided centrally, but over time many departments have created their own services to provide additional services and/or reduce costs. Many individual faculty and staff members have opted to forward their campus email to personal address provide by consumer services such as Google Apps. In many cases those forwarding conduct all University-related email correspondence from their personal email addresses.

Previous UC Davis and system-wide committees have wrestled with providing next generation email services to meet the needs of the entire campus community. It is clear that centrally provided systems reduce the proliferation of services around campus and provide enhanced service and reduced cost. While the previous committees have all been very helpful at narrowing down the requirements and specific packages that meet those needs, the focus has generally been on identifying a single solution (e.g. Google Apps), or identifying a solution that meets the needs of a specific group (e.g. Microsoft Exchange for calendaring). The efforts have generally concluded with a passionate debate about whether the University should move toward cloud computing for its future email and unified communication needs, which has made consensus on a single email system very difficult.

There are very real concerns about moving campus email services to a cloud provider such as Google or Microsoft. There is a certain amount of control that is lost when doing so; University email and collaboration data would be housed at the vendor's data centers around the country or internationally. University staff would not have access to inspect the vendor's operations to ensure adequate privacy and security protections are in place, although most vendors undergo independent security audits. Many fear security breaches or that vendors will mine personal email data for marketing or other purposes. However, there are contract provisions in place to mitigate these issues.

In spite of these issues, those using Google Apps here on campus reported the highest satisfaction of all other email services. Comments from the campus-wide survey routinely listed the desire for Google Apps or a similar unified communications service. These services are provided free of charge to campus, although some staff time is required to administer them. Overall, cloud services offer a significant cost savings over on premises systems. In spite of privacy concerns, many survey respondents stated they would still use a vendor-provided cloud service such as Google Apps or Microsoft Office 365.

There are distinct advantages to providing a mixed-hosting model: housing some of the University's email and unified communications services on campus and some at a vendor's "cloud" location off campus. This committee proposes to take advantage of both methods of email and unified communications hosting: offer a small number of on premises as well as cloud computing services to meet the needs of the entire campus community and reduce the number of email services on campus from 100 to 2-3.

Electronic Communications Policy Sub-Committee

In order to fulfill the charge of the Campus Email Committee and to build on discussions regarding outsourcing last year, the Electronic Communications Policy (ECP) Review sub-committee considered the narrow question of whether or not the UC Electronic Communications Policy (ECP) prohibits the outsourcing of email services for the campus. The ECP subcommittee's review takes no position on the advisability of such outsourcing in general or to any specific vendor. Nor does it attempt to review a number of activities of other groups that are related to this topic and to the work of the Email Committee.

The ECP sub-committee is aware that the UC Information Security and Privacy Initiative are working to update the ECP, and it is possible that the ECP will be reviewed or revised within the next two years by that group. However, the Email Committee felt that it was unreasonable to wait up to two years for a possible revised ECP, and subsequently that it is appropriate to review the question of outsourcing using the current ECP.

The full ECP is available here:

<http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/policies/ec/>

It contains statements that address privacy and security and that restrict disclosure of the contents of electronic communications and of personally identifiable information. It also contains statements that anticipate the use of outside communication service providers.

Many individual statements in the policy are open to a range of interpretations when read in isolation. Thus it is instructive to read the entire policy. Consider for example the following important passage:

IV. PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY

A. INTRODUCTION

The University recognizes that principles of academic freedom and shared governance, freedom of speech, and privacy hold important implications for the use of electronic communications. This Policy reflects these firmly-held principles within the context of the University's legal and other obligations. The University respects the privacy of electronic communications in the same way that it respects the privacy of paper correspondence and telephone conversations, while seeking to ensure that University administrative records are accessible for the conduct of the University's business.

The University does not examine or disclose electronic communications records without the holder's consent. Nonetheless, subject to the requirements for authorization, notification, and other conditions specified in this Policy, the University may examine or disclose electronic communications under very limited circumstances as described in Section IV.B, Access Without Consent.

University employees are prohibited from seeking out, using, or disclosing personal information in electronic communications without authorization (see Business and Finance Bulletin RMP-8, Legal Requirements on Privacy of and Access to Information). University policy requires that its employees take necessary precautions to protect the confidentiality of personal information encountered either in the performance of their duties or otherwise (see Business and Finance Bulletin IS-3, Electronic Information Security).

University contracts with outside vendors for electronic communications services shall explicitly reflect and be consistent with this Policy and other University policies related to privacy.

Regrettably some words such as "disclose" that are used in the policy are not unambiguously defined in the context of the transmission and storage of electronic communications. The most consistent interpretation of the policy is that the use of outside vendors to provide communication services is not by itself a violation of the policy. However, all providers of such services must operate in a manner that is consistent with University policy. Thus if the campus is to make use of outside vendors, it must develop and maintain a high level of rigor in contracting and compliance monitoring.

Package Recommendation Sub-Committee

Given the recommendation for a “hybrid” on-premises/cloud email and unified communications service model, our sub-committee worked to narrow down a small number of services that would meet the campus’ needs and wants for a future email service at the lowest cost. Of the packages reviewed, the sub-committee focused on Microsoft Exchange (on premises), Microsoft Office 365 (cloud), and Google Apps (cloud). Other systems such as CalMail, Cyrus, Zimbra, and Lotus Notes were also considered. CalMail is problematic because it does not offer unified communication tools, primarily calendaring. It is very similar to our current Cyrus/Geckomail email service. Zimbra and IBM Lotus Notes are functionally close to Microsoft Exchange, but are currently little-used by our campus community. Lotus Notes is used by the Health System, but they are considering moving away from Notes in the near future. Both would have a high cost to implement, support, and train our campus users, involving a significant paradigm shift for our faculty, staff, and students. Microsoft Exchange, by comparison, is used extensively on campus and there is much expertise in both administrative and academic units.

The campus’ Microsoft Exchange uConnect service operated by IET is the committee’s recommended on premises email and unified communications service, as it is largest Exchange service on campus and contains over 4,000 users in a number of administrative and academic units. uConnect’s Microsoft Exchange service provides email, a calendaring system, and task management functions. uConnect also provides an integrated chat service and optional VOIP Internet calling and SharePoint collaboration services. It should be noted that Microsoft has new functionality that is similar to Google’s Docs and Sites Apps, using SharePoint as a team collaboration space and new browser-based Microsoft Office products. Due to the on premises storage requirements, we recommend that SharePoint and Office Web Apps be provided as an optional service, not included in basic email and unified communications services. We have performed a cost analysis of the service with mailboxes at 2 GB, but these could be customized.

For cloud services, the committee recommends both Microsoft Office 365 and Google Apps. Microsoft Office 365 “snaps in” seamlessly with the on campus version of Microsoft Exchange, and offers *free* 25 GB mailboxes to the campus community. It has virtually identical capabilities to what is described in the on premises uConnect Microsoft Exchange service above, the data is simply stored offsite by Microsoft. Because Microsoft provides basic cloud mailboxes for free, Office 365 should be offered as part of uConnect Microsoft Exchange, as part of a single service with both on premises and cloud (off campus) components. This would result in a *significant* cost savings to campus over a solely on premises Exchange service with the same functionality. The committee envisions that many faculty and staff members would prefer the cloud service due to its large storage capacity and reduced costs, while retaining the ability to perform Exchange calendaring with the current on premises uConnect service.

The committee recommends the continued use of Google Apps on campus as a third option for faculty and staff due to extremely high satisfaction rates and ability for collaboration with students. At this time Gmail should continue to serve as the default email option for students. Further evaluation should be conducted next year to determine if future enhancements to the Office 365 service will better meet students’ needs over Google Apps. For Graduate Students with sensitive research projects, they could migrate to Microsoft Exchange uConnect on premises if needed. Faculty and staff may want to use Google Apps as well, and that could be provided through opt-in options provided on the departmental, program, and/or individual levels. For those faculty and staff using uConnect on premises or in the cloud (Office 365) for their email, they could also have a Google Apps account *without Gmail* in order to collaborate through Google Docs or Sites with students if desired.

Selecting products from two different vendors, Microsoft and Google, continues to perpetuate certain incompatibilities. Scheduling meetings, reserving conference rooms, and looking up contacts campus-

wide would not work consistently without efforts to further integrate the two proprietary services. However, reducing campus-wide email systems from 100 to 2 significantly reduces the complexity of the current environment. Furthermore, with good project planning and service rollout these impacts could be greatly minimized. Additionally, we propose that the University continue working to integrate these two services, building collaborative relationships between IET and the other administrative and academic units to continually enhance the service.

The goal of recommending these two complementary services is to provide the campus with a set of very high quality email services that reduce the proliferation of redundant services on campus, position the campus to take advantage of technological advances as they are launched, and save money. One potential barrier to the broad adoption of this kind of central email service is cost to a department/unit. The current Microsoft Exchange uConnect service recharges departments in order to recoup the cost of running the system. This has led to many units creating or retaining their own email services because they feel they can save money doing so; however the cost of labor *in their own departments* is generally not factored in. This creates a significant opportunity cost for department staff operating their own email services and in some cases creates unnecessary risk of system failures due to storage of email services in offices. In order to increase the adoption of these email services, the committee strongly recommends that these be funded centrally, with full support from the Chancellor and Provost, so that the choice to move to the proposed central services is compelling.

We estimate that with an overall cost increase of just over \$250,000, email could be provided to the entire campus. This would save the campus between \$600,000 and \$1,400,000 in labor and equipment spent on email services with 80% department adoption. *It is very important to note that we don't anticipate this entire cost savings to result in dollars back into the budget.* Many departments use only 5%-25% of an FTE's time to run their email services. While the expense of this time wouldn't necessarily translate into dollars saved, the time could be redirected back into other activities that further the University's overall mission. Of course, all hardware, software, and related equipment costs would translate directly into budgetary savings. Table 1 below provides an overview of the current annual email cost at UC Davis, compared with the estimated future cost. Note that the proposal includes the planned retirement of the Cyrus/Geckomail service after a transition, as well as temporary additional labor costs to roll out Google Apps to some faculty and staff.

Table 1 – Current vs. Proposed Email Cost Comparison

Current (FY 11-12) Annual Email Cost at UC Davis		Future Annual Cost of Recommended Services	
uConnect Exchange on Premises (4,000 users)	\$ 304,139	uConnect Exchange on Premises -10,000 users	\$ 456,174
Cyrus/Geckomail (15,000 users)	\$ 132,985	uConnect (Office 365) cloud - 10,000 users	\$ 84,919
Google Apps (DavisMail, 30,000 users)	\$ 5,307	Google Apps (DavisMail) - 35,000 users	\$ 106,149
Mail infrastructure services	\$ 319,226	Mail infrastructure services	\$ 378,278
	\$ 761,657		\$ 1,025,520
Department Email Service Estimate (90+)	\$ 1 - 2 Million	Department Email Service Estimate (reduced 80%)	\$ 200,000 - 400,000
Total Estimated Email Cost	\$ 1.8 - 2.8 Million		\$ 1.2- 1.4 Million

Many details remain and must be addressed in order to minimize the disruption to our faculty and staff's busy schedules. To this end, we recommend that a unified communications advisory board be formed, as well as a technical board made up of a diverse group of faculty, staff, and students from administrative and academic units. These groups would be responsible to help oversee a project to transition the central email services and provide ongoing oversight to continually enhance the service.

Background

Prior Work Regarding Email

During the 2009-2010 academic year, our campus started exploring options for enhancing the features and capabilities of email service for faculty and staff. Four major efforts took place, each leading to a set of complementary findings and recommendations.

- The Gmail Pilot Advisory Committee, led by Professor Carl Whithaus, evaluated what was learned from the Gmail pilot conducted in the spring and outlined recommendations to address concerns with outsourcing faculty and staff email.
- The Unified Email and Calendaring Strategy Workgroup chaired by Morna Mellor (IET) evaluated four alternatives to meet campus needs for a unified email and calendaring service. In addition to assessing lower-cost alternatives for administrative users (e.g., Microsoft Exchange), the group studied options to improve coordination of communication tools between faculty and students, and ways of reducing or eliminating duplication of campus email services.
- The third committee, the UC Email Workgroup led by Mike Minear, CIO at the UC Davis Health System, was established in fall 2009 to assess current email use across the UC system and formulate suggestions for improvement. In carrying out their charge, the UC group researched and identified email strategies and sourcing opportunities for all UC campuses.
- Finally, in late April, the Vice Provost-IET, and the Chairs of the Academic Senate Committee for Information Technology and the Campus Council for Information Technology, issued a joint statement announcing the decision to discontinue consideration of outsourcing options for faculty and staff email. The communication cited concerns related to the UC Electronic Communications Policy and Google's privacy practices.

The reports and recommendations issued by the three committees, along with the official statements received from campus constituency groups and the report from Academic Senate Committee on Information Technology, were reviewed by the Campus Council for Information Technology in early June 2010. The CCFIT report provides a synopsis of each study and recommendations to inform the work of this committee (See the reports at <http://ccfit.ucdavis.edu>.)

About the Campus Email Committee

Building on last year's efforts, the Campus Email Committee was established jointly by Information and Educational Technology and the Academic Senate to chart a strategy for central campus email services. The committee's discussions were informed by the reports from the Academic Senate Committee on Information Technology and the three groups who studied email alternatives this past year. Each of these perspectives was critical to defining a functional, reliable and secure email system for UC Davis that is operated by the University of California. As charged, the committee submits this report to Campus CIO Pete Siegel and Academic Senate Chair Bob Powell, and it will be shared with key campus IT groups including the Academic Senate Council for Information Technology (CIT), the Campus Council for Information Technology (CCFIT) and the campus community. The following faculty and staff served on the Campus Email Committee:

- Felix Wu, Computer Science, CIT representative, and Campus Email Committee Chair
- Jamie Butler, School of Law, College technology leads liaison
- Paul Gepts, Plant Sciences, CIT representative

- Francois Gygi, Senate CIT Chair
- Rick Grosberg, Evolution and Ecology, At-Large Academic Senate Representative
- Joe Kiskis, Physics, At-Large Academic Senate Representative
- Tracy Lade, Physics, ADMAN representative
- Morna Mellor, Director, Data Center and Client Services
- Carl Whithaus, University Writing Program, Gmail Advisory Committee Chair
- Gabe Youtsey, Project Manager, IET

Charge of the Campus Email Committee

The charge of the campus email committee was to:

1. *Develop specific guidelines to define essential characteristics of the next generation central campus email service.* This analysis should include a definition of functional, technical and privacy requirements for campus email, as well as consideration of development and hosting options, costs, and level of service to be provided.
2. *Develop a list of critical concerns regarding the University of California Electronic Communications Policy.* During the deliberations regarding outsourcing electronic services for the campus it became apparent that there is significant disagreement on how to interpret statements that the University “does not examine or disclose electronic communications records without the holder's consent” and that “in no case shall electronic communications that contain personally identifiable information about individuals be sold or distributed to third parties without the explicit permission of the individual.” There are likely to be other issues as well. The Committee should specifically consider how the policy meshes with the current environment in which faculty, staff and students often use off campus email services with their campus emails addresses. The Committee should make recommendations to the Vice Provost and the Academic Senate Chair, which can then be forwarded to the appropriate policy bodies in the UC.
3. *Evaluate alternatives that can meet the needs of a new campus email service, summarize findings, and formulate a recommendation for campus consideration.* Although the elements of the committee’s charge are critical in defining a central campus email service, they should not be viewed as limiting the depth or breadth of the committee’s deliberations. Given the current budget circumstance, however, we request that the committee carefully consider ways to ensure prudent management of scarce campus resources and consult broadly to ensure all relevant perspectives can be brought to bear.

Approach to Completing the Work

In order to complete the challenging work to address the three distinct areas of the charge, the Campus Email Committee formed three sub-committees to conduct simultaneous streams of work. The sub-committees worked in a collaborative fashion to frequently share information to the entire committee. The makeup and work of each sub-committee was as follows:

1. **Requirements Sub-Committee** (Carl Whithaus, Francois Gygi, Tracy Lade, Jamie Butler, Felix Wu, Gabe Youtsey)
 - Conduct a campus-wide survey on email needs and wants
 - Leverage work done by previous email committees to validate and document requirements
2. **ECP Review Sub-Committee**(Joe Kiskis, Paul Gepts, Felix Wu, Gabe Youtsey)
 - Review the ECP to comment on whether outsourcing to vendors is acceptable

- Review to determine who has the authority on campus to make decisions about ECP interpretation
 - Connect with the UCOP ECP initiative
3. **Package Recommendation Sub-Committee** (Jamie Butler, Rick Grosberg, Carl Whithaus, Felix Wu, Morna Mellor, Gabe Youtsey)
- Review possible email/unified communications solutions that meet requirements
 - Conduct a cost comparison of current email at UC Davis vs. future costs of a proposed solution

Results of Campus-Wide Survey

In its work to determine essential characteristics and requirements for a next generation email service, the Requirements sub-committee reviewed the extensive requirements and features matrix that was developed by the system-wide UC Email Workgroup Unified Email¹ and was customized for UC Davis by the Calendaring Strategy Workgroup². This work went a long way in defining the essential characteristics of a next generation email system, including a detailed list of required and desired features of email, calendaring, and unified messaging services. Through a review of the work conducted by these former groups, it became clear that “email” alone is not the full scope of services that were reviewed, and that any discussion of “email” and its requirements needs to include related services such as email, calendaring, instant messaging, support for mobile devices, anywhere access using a variety of browsers and devices, document sharing, and collaboration tools. A term that is now commonly in use for these related services is “unified communications”.

Survey Participants

789 Faculty (24%)

2,017 Staff (21%)

275 Graduate/Professional School (14%)

326 Undergraduate (11%)

Each of the former email groups spent time weighting the importance of various email features, and ranking the various email packages on their ability to provide those features.

However, wide input from the campus community was not available for input to the committee’s review of essential email characteristics.

With the assistance of the Student Affairs Research Institute (SARI), the Requirements sub-committee developed a survey and invited all Davis campus faculty, staff, and students to participate in the survey.

Summary of Survey Findings

Following the campus-wide survey, the Requirements sub-committee conducted analysis of the results, and identified the following top findings. The full survey results, including comments from faculty members, are included in Appendix A of the report.

1. Top Email Features – Out of the six email features included in question #3, the following three were cited as the most important:
 - Large mailbox sizes, defined as 5 gigabytes and above
 - Email anywhere, through a browser, desktop client, or a mobile device
 - Support for large attachments, defined as 25 megabytes and above
2. Top Calendaring Features – Survey question #4 attempted to assess whether a system with an integrated calendar was a critical requirement to the majority of users on campus. We found that over 50% of faculty, staff, and students *need* or *would like* calendaring capabilities. The top calendar features identified in survey question #5 were the ability to:
 - Hide private calendar appointments
 - Schedule recurring meetings

¹ Email Workgroup Report - <http://ccfit.ucdavis.edu/secure/email%20workgroup%20report%20DRAFT%2005%2025%2010.pdf> (pages 37-40)

² Unified Email and Calendaring Strategy Workgroup Final Report - http://ccfit.ucdavis.edu/report/Unified_Email_Calendaring_Report_and_Features_06%2010.pdf (pages 11-17)

- Schedule multiple attendee meetings
3. *Top Other Communications Features* – Survey question #6 listed “other communications” features and included mobile device support, task management, instant messaging/chat, voice over IP, eFax, and video conferencing options, and asked participants to rank their importance. The top feature requested by a far margin was support for mobile devices. Also requested, albeit much less so, was instant messaging/chat and voice over IP.
 4. *Top Other Apps*– Survey question #7 listed “other apps” features such as shareable documents/spreadsheets/presentations, collaborative team or class workspaces, and the ability to create personal Web sites. The two most-requested features, particularly high among the faculty, were:
 - Shareable documents/spreadsheets/presentations
 - Collaborative team or class workspaces
 5. *Satisfaction Levels* – In survey question #2, those using UC Davis’ Gmail service reported the highest satisfaction levels of service on campus. Those using the campus uConnect service, as well as department-run email services also reported high satisfaction levels. Those using Cyrus/Geckomail reported the lowest satisfaction on campus; as did those forwarding campus email to personal email addresses to conduct University business (see Table 1 below).

Table 1 – Email Satisfaction Levels

		Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof Students	Undergrad
uConnect	Numbers	11	212	1	2
	Very satisfied	27%	33%		
	Satisfied	45%	42%		
	Neutral	18%	15%		
	Unsatisfied	0%	8%		
	Very Unsatisfied	0%	1%		
DavisMail (Google Apps)	Numbers	50	138	183	258
	Very satisfied	44%	45%	49%	53%
	Satisfied	48%	43%	43%	36%
	Neutral	6%	9%	7%	10%
	Unsatisfied	0%	2%	2%	2%
	Very Unsatisfied	2%	0%	0%	0%
Geckomail/Cyrus	Numbers	203	362	2	1
	Very satisfied	20%	13%		
	Satisfied	36%	38%		
	Neutral	21%	20%		
	Unsatisfied	15%	20%		
	Very Unsatisfied	8%	9%		
Department Email		Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof Students	Undergrad

	Numbers	205	780	6	3
	Very satisfied	34%	33%		
	Satisfied	49%	47%		
	Neutral	10%	16%		
	Unsatisfied	5%	4%		
	Very Unsatisfied	1%	1%		
		Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof Students	Undergrad
Forward to Personal Email	Numbers	116	137	76	37
	Very satisfied	16%	17%	21%	24%
	Satisfied	41%	27%	38%	49%
	Neutral	22%	26%	29%	19%
	Unsatisfied	15%	16%	5%	5%
	Very Unsatisfied	7%	14%	5%	3%

Comments from Dissatisfied Faculty, Staff and Students

Below is a selection of comments from faculty, staff, and students who are dissatisfied with their current email service. The full list of faculty comments is included in Appendix A. Due to space constraints, the entire list of staff and students was omitted, but is available upon request.

Faculty

- “I get too much spam”
- “Current services are nonexistent. Everyone I know currently has their email forwarded to Gmail accounts...”
- “Clarity of design, storage capacity, speed, efficiency, flexibility. I need to be able to move between pedagogical, scholarly, and personal activities seamlessly and easily.”
- “Geckomail is HORRIBLE and needs to be replaced. It makes it very difficult to do my job as a UCD professor.”
- “...The fact is, at this point I don't use the UC Email account at all. Nor do I allow my students to contact me through UC Davis email because it is just too unreliable of a system...”
- “The campus system is very slow. There is no excuse for maintaining an expensive and obsolete system. Get rid of it and go to Google. “
- “Mostly, the email program just needs to be more user friendly. All of the features mentioned would be nice, but I'd be happy if I could customize my inbox! Seriously, Geckomail is the worst email I've ever used at any university. I'm a little shocked that UCD has such bad technology. “
- “Many faculties I work with forward their Geckomail to Gmail. The number one reason for unhappiness with geckomail seems to be the size of the inbox.”

Staff

- “Students get awesome gmail-based email and staff like me get some ancient difficult geckomail.”
- “Everyone uses their own calendaring system on their telephones. I believe it will be nearly impossible to ask them to move back to a system wherein the admin staff have access to their calendars”
- “Geckomail is useless so I forward everything to my personal gmail account. Please upgrade staff to UC Davis gmail like the students have.”
- “I need more storage space. 20 MB does work for conducting collaborative scientific researcher. “
- “Geckomail is not self explanatory or it does not have basic features like sending more than three attachments, saving email addresses in a contact list. My mailbox is way too small, I can receive about 100 emails and then it is full.”

- “The inability to save and archive email messages is a critical aspect of being an academic and is why I use Gmail, circumventing the use of @ucdavis.edu.”
- “The mailbox size limit makes working on shared projects nearly impossible through email since one set of attachments can lock your account. Have another way to share large attachments could help solve this issue.”
- “I dislike that Geckomail does not have a keyword search. I dislike that Geckomail has small mailbox size, but like that it is expandable by request to IT. I dislike that Geckomail only allows for 3 attachment files to be uploaded to an outgoing e-mail.”

Students

- “I think outsourcing student email services to Google App is an ignorance of students' privacy. Graduate students communicate with professors more frequently than undergraduate students, and usually their emails contain sensitive research information, which should not be stored in Google Inc.'s servers.”
- “Google provides an awesome collaborative platform with google docs and sites, but professors don't know how to use them.”

Review of Email Packages

Package Review Background

The UC Email Workgroup³ conducted a Request for Information (RFI) in 2010 that invited email vendors to present information about their products to the UC, including pricing. From the vendor responses received, the workgroup selected a small number of those email services that best met the requirements of the UC and presented those, with their detailed features, in the UC Email Workgroup Report. These same packages were reviewed the UC Davis Email & Calendaring Strategy Workgroup⁴, who concluded that Microsoft Exchange has the best functionality to meet campus' needs for a combined email and calendaring service. Simultaneously, the Gmail Pilot Advisory Report reported very high satisfaction levels with Google Apps among students, as well as faculty and staff pilot participants on campus.

Building on the work done by the previous email groups, the campus-wide survey conducted by the Requirements sub-committee, and the findings of the ECP sub-committee, the Email Package Recommendation sub-committee conducted further analysis of the email/unified communications offerings available that were best-suited for UC Davis.

Email/Unified Communication Packages Reviewed

The sub-committee began by reviewing the packages previously inspected, but also included Microsoft's newly-announced Office 365, which has been described as "Microsoft Exchange in the cloud". The following email/unified communications packages were reviewed:

1. **Microsoft Exchange (on premises)** - The on premises (housed at UC Davis) versions of Exchange were considered, which are currently used extensively around campus for the central uConnect service and by various departments for email and calendaring.
2. **Microsoft Office 365 (cloud)** – Microsoft announced a brand new cloud email offering that can be used by itself or “snapped in” with Exchange for a mixed solution in late 2010. This service will be offered in June 2011.
3. **Google Apps for Education (cloud)** – Gmail and related applications, which is used by students on campus and a number of faculty and staff who are remnants from the Gmail pilot program.
4. **UC Berkeley CalMail (private cloud)** – An open source option offered by UCB; similar to existing Cyrus/Geckomail system and does not contain native calendaring features.
5. **Zimbra (on premises)** – A lesser-known competitor to Exchange. Used by 1-2 departments on campus.
6. **IBM Lotus Notes (on premises)** – IBM's competing package to MS Exchange. Currently used by the UCDHS.

Analysis of Email Packages

In order to further evaluate the benefits and issues of each email/unified communications package reviewed, the sub-committee created the following table (See Table 2) to examine each.

Table 1 – Email Package Comparison Matrix

³ Email Workgroup Report - <http://ccfit.ucdavis.edu/secure/email%20workgroup%20report%20DRAFT%2005%2025%2010.pdf>

⁴ Unified Email and Calendaring Strategy Workgroup Final Report - http://ccfit.ucdavis.edu/report/Unified_Email_Calendaring_Report_and_Features_06%2010.pdf

	Google Apps	Office 365	MS Exchange	CalMail	Zimbra	IBM Lotus
Mailbox Size	7.5GB	25GB	Custom	10GB	Custom	Custom
Accessible Anywhere	Yes	Yes	Yes	Limited web	Yes	Yes
Cross Platform Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Customizable Spam Filters	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
File Attachment Size	25MB	25MB	150MB	50MB	Custom	Custom
Address Book/Contacts	Yes Global	Yes Global	Yes Global	No Use client	Yes Global	Yes Global
Ability to delegate mail	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Integrated calendar	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Ability to schedule events with others	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Mobile device support	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Instant messaging/chat	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
VoIP Integration	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Shareable documents	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Collaborative Team Workplace	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Personal websites	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Hosting Location	Off campus	Off campus	On Campus	On Campus	On Campus	On Campus
Cost Includes	Free basic service Admin	Free basic service Admin	Hardware Software Support Hosting Backups Power Cooling	Hardware Software Support Hosting Backups Power Cooling	Hardware Software Support Hosting Backups Power Cooling	Hardware Software Support Hosting Backups Power Cooling
Uptime SLA	99.99%	99.99%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Some of the key findings from this analysis, as noted in previous reports include:

- CalMail does not have the ability to provide an integrated calendar.
- Microsoft Exchange is the only package with the capability for voice over IP.
- Only Gmail, Microsoft Exchange, and Microsoft Office 365 have shareable document features at this time, a highly desired feature by campus.
- Only Gmail, Microsoft Exchange, and Microsoft Office 365 have collaborative team workspace features at this time, a highly desired feature by campus.
- Both basic Gmail and Microsoft cloud services are free to campus. The only cost is administration. All others include hardware,

The sub-committee conducted a brief analysis of the benefits and issues of each email package below.

1. Microsoft Exchange

- *Cost:* Estimated at \$729k annually to house 20k faculty and staff, \$391k to house 5k faculty and staff, and \$456k to house 10k faculty and staff.⁵
- *Where Hosted:* UC Davis
- *Where used on campus:* IET, ARM, Student Affairs (uConnect), and a number of academic units

Benefits	Issues
“snaps in” seamlessly with existing Active Directory on campus, Office 365	High cost, though much of the cost is for the AD infrastructure
Data housed at UC Davis run by staff	Document collaboration and shared workspace features cost extra
Used heavily for email/calendaring by most administrative groups on campus	Smaller mailboxes are likely (2 GB) due to higher storage costs
High satisfaction rates among users	No additional apps like Gmail
Used extensively on campus; much technical expertise exists	
Completely customizable mailboxes, features	

2. Microsoft Office 365

- *Cost:* Software is free for basic service, \$85k to administer annually (.80 FTE)⁶
- *Where Hosted:* In named Microsoft data centers in the United States
- *Where used on campus:* This service is not in use on campus at this time as it is not yet released. However, it is a “cloud” version of Microsoft Exchange, which is used widely on campus by many academic and administrative units.

Benefits	Issues
Low cost – no onsite infrastructure or storage needed	Certain restrictions against hosting data outside the UC’s “care, custody, and control”

⁵ This assumes that the remaining 15k and 10k faculty and staff are housed in Office 365, respectively

⁶ This assumes 15k users in Office 365, and 5k users in on premises Exchange

“snaps in” seamlessly with existing Active Directory/Exchange on campus	Fears about mining of private data
Used heavily for email/calendaring by most administrative groups on campus	Document collaboration and shared workspace features cost extra
High satisfaction rates among users	Fears about possible security breaches
Large mailboxes (25GB mailboxes)	No additional apps like Gmail
Used extensively on campus; much technical expertise exists	

3. Google Apps for Education (Gmail)

- Cost: Software is free, \$58k-\$106k to administer annually (.5-1 FTE)
- Where Hosted: In undisclosed Google Data Centers worldwide.
- Where used on campus: By all students, some faculty and staff. Administered by IET.

Benefits	Issues
Low cost – no onsite infrastructure or storage needed	Certain restrictions against hosting data outside the UC’s “care, custody, and control”
Includes desired collaboration and shared workspace features	Fears about mining of private data
Currently used by students, and by many faculty and staff for personal email	Limited calendaring interoperability
High satisfaction rates among users	Fears about mining of private data
Large mailboxes (25GB mailboxes)	Fears about possible security breaches
Increasing numbers of useful apps	Some difficulty adapting to Google’s email and app interfaces

4. CalMail

- Cost: Estimated at \$200k+ annually paid to UC Berkeley, 1 administrator at \$106k - \$300k+ total estimated to house 20k faculty and staff.
- Where Hosted: UC Berkeley
- Where used on campus: N/A – although CalMail is a Cyrus product (IET’s older email system that also runs Geckomail)

Benefits	Issues
Data housed at UC Berkeley run by UCB staff	Additional features expensive: push email, calendaring over \$40 per user per month
Large mailboxes (10 GB)	Email, calendaring, mobile devices not well integrated
Lower cost than onsite options – no onsite infrastructure, storage needed	No document collaboration or shared workspace features
	No additional apps like Gmail
	Limited expertise on campus to support the CalMail components
	Future of CalMail uncertain as other systems are considered at UCB

5. Zimbra

- *Cost:* Estimated at \$200k annually for software, and \$1M for hardware/administration - \$1.2M+ total estimated
- *Where Hosted:* UC Davis
- *Where used on campus:* Library

Benefits	Issues
Data housed at UC Davis run by staff	High cost
Completely customizable mailboxes, features	Document collaboration and shared workspace features cost extra
	Smaller mailboxes are likely (2 GB) due to higher storage costs
	No additional apps like Gmail
	Very limited expertise with Zimbra on campus by both users and administrators
	Would still need the Active Directory environment – duplicate costs

6. IBM Lotus Notes

- *Cost:* Estimated at \$300k annually for software, and \$1M for hardware/administration - \$1.3M+ total estimated
- *Where Hosted:* UC Davis
- *Where used on campus:* Health System

Benefits	Issues
Data housed at UC Davis run by staff	High cost
Completely customizable features	Document collaboration and shared workspace features cost extra
	Smaller mailboxes are likely (1 GB) due to higher storage costs
	No additional apps like Gmail
	Very limited expertise with Lotus Notes on campus by both users and administrators
	Would still need the Active Directory environment – duplicate costs
	Low satisfaction by the Health System

Cost Analysis

The sub-committee, with support from IET, conducted a detailed cost analysis of each email package from several perspectives.

Cost Comparison of Each Package

In Table 3 below, the sub-committee conducted cost comparisons of each software package reviewed, calculating the estimated cost for 20,000 faculty and staff. For comparison purposes, the sub-committee did not include students in this cost calculation, but the estimated costs below could be increased proportionately to reflect email costs for the entire campus. Some assumptions made during the cost calculations include:

- The complete cost of labor (salary, benefits, and training/PC) is used at roughly a Programmer 5 level.
- Active Directory (AD), mail routing, mail hygiene, and Sympa list service costs are applied uniformly across each alternative, as they would be needed in each case. These costs include the hardware, software, and labor costs need to run each of these services.
- Labor has been factored with the assumption that the same team would operate the AD service.
- Some costs have not been included in the estimate below as they are needed in each scenario.

Examples of those include:

- Help desk cost
- Employee supervisory time
- System operator cost to monitor the availability of data center services
- One-time costs (primarily labor) to transition the campus to the service

Table 3 – Cost Estimate at 20,000 Faculty and Staff

Cost Estimate at 20k Faculty and Staff	uConnect On Premises	uConnect Cloud	DavisMail (Google Apps)	CalMail	Zimbra	IBM Lotus
Hardware	\$ 50,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,400	\$ 50,400
Support Contract	\$ 8,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,000	\$ 8,000
Software	\$ 185,111	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 300,000
Other Infrastructure Costs	\$ 14,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,000	\$ 14,000
Storage (SAN)	\$ 88,980	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 88,980	\$ 88,980
Backup	\$ 71,221	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 71,221	\$ 71,221
Housing	\$ 103,884	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 103,884	\$ 103,884
Total FTE	3.2	3.2	1	1	3.2	3.2
Labor	\$ 339,678	\$ 339,678	\$ 106,149	\$ 106,149	\$ 339,678	\$ 339,678
Total Mailbox Costs	\$ 861,274	\$ 339,678	\$ 106,149	\$ 306,149	\$ 876,163	\$ 976,163
Active Directory	\$ 135,233	\$ 135,233	\$ 135,233	\$ 135,233	\$ 135,233	\$ 135,233
Mail Routing	\$ 92,808	\$ 92,808	\$ 92,808	\$ 92,808	\$ 92,808	\$ 92,808
Mail Hygiene	\$ 90,082	\$ 90,082	\$ 90,082	\$ 90,082	\$ 90,082	\$ 90,082
Email List Service	\$ 60,115	\$ 60,115	\$ 60,115	\$ 60,115	\$ 60,115	\$ 60,115
Total Mail and Related Costs	\$1,239,510	\$717,914	\$484,386	\$684,386	\$1,254,399	\$1,354,399

Hybrid Cloud/On Premises Model

In Tables 4 & 5 below, the proposed hybrid model has been calculated with two scenarios:

1. *Optimistic*: 5,000 faculty and staff in uConnect on premises, 15,000 faculty and staff in uConnect cloud (Microsoft Office 365), 30,000 students in Google Apps (plus an additional 5,000 faculty or staff who may want to join Google Apps).
2. *Conservative*: 10,000 faculty and staff in uConnect on premises, 10,000 faculty and staff in uConnect cloud (Microsoft Office 365), 30,000 students in Google Apps (plus an additional 5,000 faculty or staff who may want to join Google Apps).

Some assumptions made during the cost calculations include:

- The complete cost of labor (salary, benefits, and training/PC) is used at roughly a Programmer 5 level.
- Active Directory (AD), mail routing, mail hygiene, and Sympa list service costs are applied uniformly across each alternative, as they would be needed in each case. These costs include the hardware, software, and labor costs need to run each of these services.
- Labor has been factored with the assumption that the same team would operate and AD service, and that the same team would operate both the on premises Exchange and cloud Office 365 as part of a combined uConnect service.
- Some costs have not been included in the estimate below as they are needed in each scenario. Examples of those include:

- Help desk cost
- Employee supervisory time
- System operator cost to monitor the availability of data center services
- One-time costs (primarily labor) to transition the campus to the service

Table 4 – Optimistic Hybrid Model Cost Estimate

5k On Premises 15k uConnect Cloud 35k Google Apps	uConnect On Premises	uConnect Cloud	DavisMail (Google Apps)	
Hardware	\$ 31,200	\$ -	\$ -	
Support Contract	\$ 4,000	\$ -	\$ -	
Software	\$ 4,037	\$ -	\$ -	
Licenses	\$ 34,600	\$ -	\$ -	
Other Infrastructure	\$ 10,069	\$ -	\$ -	
Storage (SAN)	\$ 23,885	\$ -	\$ -	
Backup	\$ 29,051	\$ -	\$ -	
Housing	\$ 33,852	\$ -	\$ -	
Total FTE	3.2	0.8		
Labor	\$ 318,447	\$ 106,149	\$ 106,149	
Total Cost	\$ 391,313	\$ 84,919	\$ 106,149	\$ 582,382
Active Directory				\$ 119,058
Mail Routing				\$ 92,808
Mail Hygiene				\$ 90,082
Email List Service				\$ 60,115
Total Mail and Related Costs				\$ 944,444

Table 5 – Conservative Hybrid Model Cost Estimate

10k On Premises 10k uConnect Cloud 35k Google Apps	uConnect On Premises	uConnect Cloud	DavisMail (Google Apps)	
Hardware	\$ 41,897	\$ -	\$ -	
Support Contract	\$ 4,000	\$ -	\$ -	
Software	\$ 4,037	\$ -	\$ -	
Licenses	\$ 69,200	\$ -	\$ -	
Other Infrastructure	\$ 10,069	\$ -	\$ -	
Storage (SAN)	\$ 39,429	\$ -	\$ -	
Backup	\$ 39,615	\$ -	\$ -	
Housing	\$ 43,524	\$ -	\$ -	
Total FTE	3.2	0.8		
Labor	\$ 318,447	\$ 106,149	\$ 106,149	
Total Cost	\$ 456,174	\$ 84,919	\$ 106,149	\$ 647,243
Active Directory				\$ 135,273
Mail Routing				\$ 92,808
Mail Hygiene				\$ 90,082
Email List Service				\$ 60,115
Total Mail and Related Costs				\$ 1,025,520

Current Cost of Email at UC Davis

Estimating the current cost of email at UC Davis is a challenge due to the large number of email systems maintained by varying departments in computer rooms and offices around campus. Through the sub-committee’s work, we identified over 90 email systems in use across the campus, only three of which are managed centrally by IET. These email services are of greatly differing sizes, serving just a few users to over 10,000. It is important to note that most departments running email systems on campus do not devote an entire staff FTE to email; it only takes a portion of one staff FTE’s time (generally around 5%-25%) to run an email service. For simplifying the process, the committee divided email services on campus into two primary categories:

1. Those that are operated centrally by IET (Cyrus/Geckomail, uConnect, DavisMail), and
2. Those that are operated by departments around campus.

Some assumptions made while calculating the current cost of email for the campus include:

- The complete cost of labor (salary, benefits, and training/PC) is used at roughly a Programmer 5 level.
- Some costs have not been included in the estimate below as they are needed in each scenario.

Examples of those include:

- Help desk cost
- Employee supervisory time
- System operator cost

1. *Central Email Costs* - The sub-committee worked with IET to obtain current costs of the central email/unified communication services operated by IET for 2010-2011.

Table 5 – Current Cost of Central Email at UC Davis

Current Central Email Service Cost at UC Davis	Cyrus/Geckomail		Mail Routing and Hygiene						List Service	uConnect Exchange	DavisMail (Google Apps)	TOTALS
	Cyrus	Geckomail	Proxy	Mail Routers	AV	RBL	Bayes	DCC	Sympa			
Hardware ²	\$ 24,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 500	\$ 3,168	\$ 1,000	\$ 528	\$ 31,200	\$ -	\$ 79,396
Support Contract ³	\$ 6,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,000	\$ -	\$ 10,400
Software										\$ 33,793		\$ 33,793
Other Infrastructure Costs										\$ 12,369		\$ 12,369
Storage (SAN)	\$ 1,890	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,260	\$ 23,610	\$ -	\$ 26,760
Backup	\$ 11,090	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 779	\$ 703	\$ 371	\$ 1,676	\$ 29,051	\$ -	\$ 43,671
Housing	\$ 19,500	\$ 12,030	\$ 1,842	\$ 3,354	\$ 3,354	\$ 240	\$ 9,432	\$ 1,032	\$ 3,576	\$ 33,852	\$ -	\$ 88,212
Total FTE	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.50	0.25	0.05	0.25	0.05	0.50	2.00	0.05	4.40
Labor ⁵	\$ 26,537	\$ 26,537	\$ 26,537	\$ 53,075	\$ 26,537	\$ 5,307	\$ 26,537	\$ 5,307	\$ 53,075	\$ 212,298	\$ 5,307	\$ 467,056
Active Directory												\$ 76,035
Total Cost	\$ 89,417	\$ 43,567	\$ 30,379	\$ 62,429	\$ 35,891	\$ 6,827	\$ 39,841	\$ 7,710	\$ 60,115	\$ 304,139	\$ 5,307	\$ 761,657

2. *Department Email Costs* – As department email systems are very widely-dispersed across campus, it was not possible to calculate the *actual* total current cost of email including the departments on campus. However, the sub-committee surveyed email costs directly with multiple diverse departments running email systems. The costs ranged from \$20,000 - \$50,000 annually per service, with outliers that were both higher and lower. Less expensive services typically include open source-based Unix/Linux-based email services that provide backup and storage to users with a modest amount of staff time spent on maintaining the service. More complex email/calendaring/unified communications services, such as Microsoft Exchange and Zimbra, involve more costly equipment and more staff time devoted to administering the system in general. Given the cost range above, and close to 100 email systems on campus, a conservative range for department email (non-IET) costs at UC Davis is \$1,000,000 - \$2,000,000 including both labor and equipment.

Appendix A – Detailed Campus Email Survey Findings

	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof Students	Undergrad Students
Number of surveys completed per community group	789	2017	275	326
Percentage of recipients that completed the survey	24%	21%	14%	11%

Q1 Which campus email service do you use primarily?	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof Students	Undergrad Students
uConnect	1% (11)	10% (212)	0% (1)	1% (2)
DavisMail (Google Apps for Students)	6% (50)	7% (138)	65% (183)	79% (258)
Geckomail/Cyrus	26% (203)	18% (362)	1% (2)	0% (1)
Department email	26% (205)	38% (780)	2% (6)	1% (3)
Forward to personal email	15% (116)	7% (137)	27% (76)	11% (37)
Do not know	12% (96)	7% (146)	2% (6)	6% (21)
Other - please specify	13% (101)	13% (262)	2% (6)	2% (5)

Q2 How satisfied are you with your current campus email service?	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof Students	Undergrad Students
Very satisfied	35% (597)	28% (579)	40% (111)	48% (158)
Satisfied	45% (772)	43% (877)	42% (116)	38% (127)
Neutral	12% (213)	17% (341)	14% (39)	11% (36)
Unsatisfied	6% (95)	8% (171)	3% (8)	2% (7)
Very Unsatisfied	2% (39)	4% (73)	2% (5)	0% (1)

Q3 Please indicate how important each of these email features is to you	Very Important				Important				Neutral				Somewhat Important				Not Important			
	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad
Large Mailbox Size (5 GB and above)	59%	65%	64%	37%	26%	24%	27%	33%	9%	7%	6%	18%	3%	2%	1%	6%	3%	2%	2%	5%
Delegate mailbox use to someone else	3%	5%	3%	6%	5%	9%	6%	10%	30%	30%	37%	45%	4%	5%	3%	6%	57%	51%	51%	33%
Email available anywhere (browser, mobile phone, desktop client)	68%	67%	73%	62%	19%	21%	18%	23%	7%	6%	5%	5%	2%	2%	2%	5%	4%	3%	1%	5%
Customizable spam and message filters	37%	42%	40%	37%	42%	39%	36%	43%	15%	13%	17%	14%	4%	3%	5%	4%	3%	2%	3%	3%
Support for large attachments (over 25 MB)	64%	56%	75%	67%	25%	29%	21%	27%	7%	10%	3%	4%	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%	3%	0%	1%
An address book that provides contact information for the entire campus	21%	32%	18%	30%	29%	31%	28%	33%	30%	23%	30%	25%	6%	6%	9%	7%	14%	8%	15%	5%

Q4 Do you need an integrated email and calendar that provides capabilities such as scheduling meetings with others and reserving conference rooms and equipment on campus?	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof Students	Undergrad Students
I need this	13% (228)	39% (804)	19% (53)	14% (45)
I would like this	40% (688)	30% (603)	46% (130)	43% (141)
I'm neutral	23% (398)	15% (300)	20% (56)	24% (78)
I don't need this	24% (404)	16% (329)	15% (41)	20% (65)

Q5 Please indicate how important each of these calendaring features is to you	Very Important				Important				Neutral				Somewhat Important				Not Important			
	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad
Ability to schedule multiple attendee meetings	18%	40%	20%	17%	34%	29%	41%	33%	25%	16%	24%	29%	4%	3%	5%	3%	20%	12%	11%	18%
Search for available times among attendees	20%	38%	23%	21%	34%	30%	40%	37%	22%	17%	22%	23%	4%	3%	3%	3%	20%	12%	11%	17%
Book conference rooms and equipment (e.g. projectors)	17%	29%	18%	13%	33%	31%	42%	29%	26%	21%	22%	31%	4%	4%	4%	5%	20%	15%	13%	23%
Delegate calendar scheduling to someone else	8%	16%	2%	10%	19%	21%	23%	16%	33%	30%	40%	45%	5%	5%	3%	4%	34%	27%	31%	24%
View multiple calendars simultaneously	18%	39%	20%	22%	33%	28%	35%	33%	24%	17%	27%	26%	4%	3%	5%	4%	21%	12%	13%	15%
Schedule recurring meetings	23%	42%	27%	19%	32%	29%	36%	32%	21%	14%	20%	30%	4%	2%	4%	2%	19%	12%	13%	17%
Hide contents of private appointments	29%	46%	27%	25%	27%	27%	34%	30%	22%	14%	23%	27%	3%	2%	4%	1%	19%	11%	12%	17%

Q6 Please indicate how important each of these other communications features is to you	Very Important				Important				Neutral				Somewhat Important				Not Important			
	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad
Mobile device support for email and calendars (e.g. iPhone, Blackberry, Android, iPad, etc.)	51%	46%	52%	52%	21%	23%	25%	12%	12%	16%	12%	12%	3%	2%	1%	2%	13%	12%	10%	12%
Task management function to contain to-do lists	21%	20%	20%	29%	28%	32%	37%	26%	27%	28%	28%	26%	6%	6%	2%	7%	19%	14%	12%	10%
Instant messaging/chat program (e.g. Google Chat, Microsoft Office Communicator)	19%	15%	23%	29%	22%	21%	31%	19%	24%	33%	26%	19%	6%	6%	7%	7%	28%	24%	12%	11%
Voice Over IP (e.g. Skype, Microsoft Office Communicator)	20%	13%	17%	16%	28%	22%	28%	30%	27%	36%	35%	30%	7%	7%	6%	7%	18%	22%	14%	16%
eFax	6%	10%	8%	6%	16%	21%	16%	41%	33%	34%	34%	41%	9%	8%	8%	7%	37%	27%	34%	35%
Voice, video, or Web Conferencing (e.g. ReadyTalk, Adobe Connect, Microsoft Office Communicator)	15%	20%	13%	14%	27%	25%	24%	35%	30%	30%	36%	35%	8%	6%	9%	7%	21%	18%	18%	18%

Q7	Please indicate how important each of these other apps are to you	Very Important				Important				Neutral				Somewhat Important				Not Important			
		Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad
	Shareable document, spreadsheet, and presentation programs (e.g. Google Docs, Microsoft Office Web Apps)	42%	30%	48%	60%	31%	34%	35%	29%	14%	22%	11%	8%	4%	4%	2%	2%	9%	10%	4%	1%
	Collaborative team or class workspaces (e.g. Microsoft SharePoint, Google Docs)	37%	18%	41%	52%	29%	28%	37%	34%	18%	32%	15%	9%	4%	5%	3%	1%	12%	17%	5%	3%
	Ability to create personal web sites (e.g. Google Sites, Microsoft SharePoint)	20%	10%	17%	27%	25%	18%	27%	23%	31%	37%	34%	30%	6%	6%	5%	4%	19%	29%	16%	16%

Q8	Is there a single new email feature that would especially motivate you to switch email services?	Faculty				Staff				Grad/Prof Students				Undergrad Students			
		No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
	No			85%	(1391)			83%	(1629)			89%	(233)			89%	(270)
	Yes			15%	(242)			17%	(342)			11%	(29)			11%	(32)

Q9	How concerned are you about these aspects of email-hosting vendors (e.g. Google, Microsoft)?	Very concerned				Concerned				Neutral				Somewhat concerned				Not concerned			
		Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad	Faculty	Staff	Grad/Prof	Undergrad
	Data stored outside the U.S. could be accessed by foreign governments	17%	25%	15%	17%	24%	28%	24%	30%	23%	21%	24%	27%	8%	7%	9%	8%	22%	19%	28%	19%
	The vendor may "mine" email data for marketing purposes	38%	40%	32%	32%	34%	31%	29%	31%	7%	12%	15%	20%	7%	7%	14%	9%	9%	9%	11%	8%
	Breaches of the company by hackers could occur, exposing email data	35%	43%	28%	38%	33%	32%	33%	31%	10%	11%	14%	17%	9%	7%	13%	7%	7%	7%	12%	8%
	Storing email data at a vendor may not be consistent with best practices	18%	30%	16%	21%	30%	33%	26%	30%	26%	21%	29%	33%	7%	5%	10%	5%	16%	11%	18%	11%
	UC Davis could lose critical technical skills regarding email if outsourced to a vendor	16%	28%	14%	29%	28%	28%	29%	31%	24%	22%	24%	23%	7%	6%	6%	8%	20%	16%	28%	10%
	Having only one email system causes too much dependence on that single system and vendor	23%	19%	11%	14%	30%	29%	22%	31%	27%	26%	25%	29%	9%	8%	15%	8%	19%	17%	27%	18%

Q10	Which of these concerns, on its own, would be enough to prevent your recommendation to host email at a vendor (e.g. Google, Microsoft), regardless of its features and benefits?	Faculty				Staff				Grad/Prof Students				Undergrad Students			
		No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
	Data stored outside the U.S. could be accessed by foreign governments		22%			30%	(512)			22%	(43)			34%	(87)		
	The vendor may "mine" email data for marketing purposes		46%			43%	(721)			51%	(101)			42%	(106)		
	Breaches of the company by hackers could occur, exposing email data		39%			55%	(922)			47%	(94)			56%	(143)		
	Storing email data at a vendor may not be consistent with best practices		18%			21%	(350)			11%	(22)			13%	(34)		
	UC Davis could lose critical technical skills regarding email if outsourced to a vendor		16%			22%	(368)			12%	(23)			24%	(62)		
	Having only one email system causes too much dependence on that single system and vendor		23%			25%	(420)			15%	(29)			24%	(62)		

Faculty Comments

My other concern is the email filter in our system, there are some emails coming from foreign countries that go to mail filters and consider as spam. Sometimes I was late to respond because of late delivery of filtered/clean email messages.
vacation auto responses that a) save past vacation messages (at least the most recent one) and b) can be scheduled to turn on an off at certain dates and times would be very helpful (it was a feature at my old university, and was very valuable)
concerns about email outage, downtime.
Get rid of spam; make more space available; enable access of iphone to mail and calendar
I really like Gmail, and currently forward all my UCD email to a personal Gmail account. I like the organization, searchability, Priority Inbox feature, compatibility with Google Calendar, amount of space, and filtering system. I think a UCD account through Gmail would be ideal.
I just need to have access to my messages every day and all day. Simple as that!
as I mentioned b4, space is my main concern; I am quite fed-up w/IT messages re my having reached my full quota; my e-mail is my archive; I need the space:)
Happy with Outlook. Email and calendar must be accessible on mobile devices. Security for University as a whole critical.
When you send a survey about email, make it about email. When you add all sorts of other features such as scheduling, reminders, calendars, it blurs the issue. If it's about email, make the survey ABOUT email. You didn't ask, for example, how satisfied we are with the way that Google creates threads rather than folders, etc...
vacation mail settings. UCD's are archaic and must be turned on and off at time of departure and return. should be programmable to activate at specified dates.
access world wide. large file transfer.
Please do NOT produce a new email upgrade that is riddled with glitches and is awkwardly design like Smartsite.
I like being able to sort mail into "mailboxes" (or labels as in gmail). I also like to keep old emails for records, so large capacity is important. Related to these, the ability to download/store mailboxes on my own computer (as in Thunderbird) enables me to keep old email without tying up resources on the server.

Avoid proprietary solutions (especially microsoft). Use GPL open source software wherever possible. I favor a hybrid strategy combining a campus gmail option with a simple campus operated email server as well, leaving the choice to the user.
I use my email records as permanent archive of much of my professional activity, with thousands of folders that I still occasionally consult and that I want to remain easily accessible. Switching to an outside vendor is likely to be disruptive for my work for that reason.
improve out of office reply functionality
I already forward all my mail to my personal gmail account. this is unlikely to change.
EXTREMELY worried about export controls.
It is obvious that you are looking for an excuse to drop Gmail. Shame on you! It is so much better than what we had before. Leave it alone please.
I use mail (mac) and google calendar--so I use two different systems.
Current services are nonexistent. Everyone I know currently has their email forwarded to Gmail accounts because our IT staff have completely failed to provide the professional services we need. It is pathetic that we have to use private email accounts.
Clarity of design, storage capacity, speed, efficiency, flexibility. I need to be able to move between pedagogical, scholarly, and personal activities seamlessly and easily. Otherwise, I will avoid the UCD email system and all and any UCD systems if I possibly can. so far, they are all pretty bad.
It is critical that whatever the campus does be platform independent. We have significant campus investments in Wintel, Apple and Linux OSs--campus shouldn't make the decision on which platform is best. It varies according to department, teaching and research needs.
MOBILE ACCESS BY PHONE AND WEB, LARGE ATTACHMENTS, AND LARGE MAILBOX SPACE ON SERVER
Even if email stays the same, users should have an option to temporarily load large files and send links to other team members to download the files. (So, a large file exchange service).
The ability to show images and non-english fonts (ancient Greek!).
Safety and security of data within e-mails is of the utmost importance to protect UC's interests of patentable and other types of information and intellectual property - if this is compromised by out-sourcing, the results would be disastrous!
Ease of use and flexibility
The campus should focus on what is unique to campus and not try to provide what is routinely available outside. Users will tend to use commercial programs (MS Office, not web docs).
As an original user of Bitnet, I am discouraged with where this system has gone. I am not at all pleased with the time I now must expend to manage my email account. Even with filters, we have too many people FW announcements, slipping through the system filters and my many, many filters and causing me to spend valuable time monitoring what is in my inbox. I have 40-50 emails each day that I delete without reading. That does not help me do my job; it only helps to justify yours.
i love the google/uc davis option and i would be very sad to see it go because of concerns about data stealing.
I regularly need to attach photos/albums/powerpoints to my e-mails. If the service cannot do this, I will not use it. Also, I need to quickly and easily create e-mail groups and access the address book I've created in Hotmail over many years. Not being able to access this content and create e-lists would be problematic.
A service that offers simplicity and less ergonomically taxing but basic features. e.g. old Eudora versions.
I find campus e-mail primitive and in some respects silly. I began with gMail 2-3 years ago and find that I'm gradually using mostly gMail. But I much prefer to keep my @ucdavis.edu account. Additionally, as it happens, I continue to use Thunderbird client for both UC Davis and gMail--that's primitive too, huh?
keeping costs as low as possible (but also keeping email service working as close to 100% as possible).
accessibility when off campus ability to accept large files (over 25 mb) occasionally
uc davis staff and faculty email should be owned by uc davis and not an external vendor. So if an external vendor is engaged for email service it should be with the explicit agreement that uc davis staff and faculty email belongs to uc davis
Seriously, the concerns just raised are disingenuous to put as reasons for or against Gmail and other vendors. The incidence of hacking Google or Microsoft, whose entire business rests on preventing that is far lower than the hacking that occurs on campuses like UC Davis, where IT is seriously stretched across multiple needs. Access by foreign governments seems very much a red herring - what is an example of this happening to google or microsoft stored email for a US university? Best practices are evolving and outsourcing email is one of them. Our current dependence on many different vendors is already endemic. UC Davis might not lose critical skills, it may even gain in the specific skills needed to maintain our own needs rather than trying to maintain email servers in the face of hackers, attackers, etc. The fact that email storage is still severely limited on campus this many years into the new century is proof of this.
Privacy of content and potential to be sued for making such content (e.g. department related discussions, SIDs, etc. public)
privacy issues, sending and receiving research papers and data in excess of 8MB
I am a law librarian and often send large files to faculty members while they travel. The ability to send large files or multiple files without having to zip them is a primary need that isn't being met by Outlook.
I like it very much just the way it is - although it would be nice to be able to use foreign language characters.
able to download mail to desktop; retain "To" information in sent mail
Students are all able to access Google Docs through their UC Davis accounts, but faculty and staff are not. I think that all university affiliates should be able to access some system that has online editing of documents (equivalent to Google Docs).

Need ability to bring in- and out-going mail from campus system into whatever other email application user may wish to better organize and archive messages (eg, directories or 'mailboxes and folders'. The google search-based handling of messages doesn't suit everyone. I can't imagine using it to manage complex projects with communications needing filing across many types of criteria.
others on the previous list of concerns would also trigger a no-go vote for an outside vendor email service.
I think there is no more need for campus email. Gmail, e.g, is as safe an email service can be, and it costs nothing. Cancellation of the campus email would save a lot of money, we should go for it.
I am using gmail exclusively now, as it has already most or all of the requirements that you guys seem to want to implement from scratch, based on the previous questions. So...you are planning to beat Google? Should we laugh about it?
Please keep the ucdavis.edu system to uphold our corporate identity
Web access from multiple computers is key.
Having separate 'accounts' for teaching/advising related traffic and one account for all other emails
My iPhone can receive email in Europe but not reply because of UC Davis email address
Not for me. I am retired.
Sending 100 MB size files is required. Large storage space.
Must be able to access email when traveling.
Need competent IT specialists who pay attention to the problem being presented and need to be able to reach these people as needed. Need an address book that is similar in scope to those seen with Thunderbird or Google, not the ridiculously limited one currently available with Gecko mail.
Do our own and keep it simple, Vendors first priority is to themselves.
The current system is not broken, so I see no reason to fix it. Just because people may want the latest lights, buzzers, whistles, and apps, is no reason to give it to them. Let them have their UCD email forwarded to their private email vendor for that stuff. Let's keep UCD email simple.
Confidentiality issues.
I dislike geckomail when I have to use it
Geckomail is HORRIBLE and needs to be replaced. It makes it very difficult to do my job as a UCD professor.
I would be wary of any hookup with Microsoft.
It is very important that one service works and works well than having many services that fail to work. I would pay extra to not have a cal that the university can open
Ability to label messages as important (as far as I can tell Geckomail does not allow it). Ability to direct attachments to where I want them (I can never find Geckomail attachments). Ability to select one of a number of e-mail addresses from a single alias.
This is less about e-mail than about SmartSite, with is user unfriendly (grade book??) and can't handle uploads of large files like podcasts of lectures. Talk about dumb limitations considering the intended users!
Seamless use of Thunderbird and iPhone mail is essential to me so I can calendar and e-mail anywhere, anytime!
I find Google's mining policy UNACCEPTABLE and, in fact, deceptive - they can change it a will... I would never use Google-based e-mail under any circumstances.
distinguishing between email support for different types of activities is obviously necessary. It is important to recognize the fundamental role of email in academic and research activities. There must be a rock solid infrastructure.
I use Geckomail when traveling (nat. or internat.). I would prefer to continue using Geckomail.
If everyone was on an exchange server it would satisfy my needs (Outlook works fine for large groups). Multiple email systems are really inefficient and should be replaced by one uniform system across UC.
Important are: increase the allocated storage space, spam filtering with user input and training of the filters, robust virus and hacker security. We need a secure campus FTP system to transfer large data files. This would prevent the need of large file transfers via email.
Make it easy to read campus email on the iPhone.
HATE having to input ID and passphrase twice to get into the email!
Ease of access, use, security
I am against farming out the e-mail system to outside vendors. PLEASE KEEP IT IN UC DAVIS, DIRECTLY UNDER UC CONTROL!!!!
A big problem with many mail systems is that they perpetuate multiple copies of attachments - back and forth editing of a report with a grad student can easily generate 10-15 versions of a 10 MB report. I now use DropBox to help with this but DropBox is not email integrated so it is not ideal.
My only real needs: reliability, large attachments permitted, and external access by laptop and mobile devices. Conversely, I am strongly against contracting our email to outside vendors that will mine the data and which clearly violates UC Policy (changing the policy to allow this would not be my idea of a fix- it is the correct policy as currently drafted).
I need to be able to access my e-mail when off-line so I can work on it, compose replies, etc. for sending later. Currently whenever I login I turn on Eudora on my laptop and download everything. Then I can access it any time for work. I commonly have to work in locations where connections are not possible.

Whatever is done, please ensure that faculty have the option to receive email on their own computers (eg I have a linux machine running "alpine") and are not forced to use some private software. That would be inappropriate.
good spam filters and all the other stuff you asked earlier about storage space
My wife, who is also a professor here, switched to gmail and constantly finds her account blocked because it's full. I have stayed with the UCD system and been glad I didn't change. Also, I take SmartSite to be an example of farming something that was working well here to a vendor, and it has been a disaster in my experience. I have no faith at all in outside vendors or in IT people's enthusiasm for outside vendors. I want things to work locally, and I want to be able to get my hands on local people responsible for those things when they don't work.
If it ain't broke, don't fix it!
we just need to be able to access it from where ever we are on the globe, so please keep that in mind
Tech support when in need of trouble shooting; so far U.C.Davis staff has been very helpful the few times I have requested assistance.
Aren't the concerns stated about going to an outside vendor relevant to our current in-house systems?
If it isn't broke, don't fix it. Are campus email services broke?
The flexibility of the service to receive, aggregate, and manage non-email electronic messages.
Make sure the new email system is compatible with Euduo, Mac Mail, Thunderbird, etc.
Keep e-mail as it is - housed at UCD - DO NOT, I repeat NOT, go to google or something similar for faculty e-mail!!! I would go back to paper letters and memos. You have already taken away our phones - insecure e-mail would be the nail in the coffin and lead to massive breakdowns in communication. I just want to do my job - and do it well and securely. Please don't make it any harder!!
search e-mails being able to tag sufficient storage easy to use
Keep email simple and allow Email to be forwarded to second site hosts such as yahoo mail or google's gmail. Save the university budget and keep the Email system simple. There are plenty of free options for most of the suggested features described in this survey.
Storage capacity and accessibility by multiple devices. Also privacy issues are a concern.
The campus system is very slow. There is no excuse for maintaining an expensive and obsolete system. Get rid of it and go to Google.
I find google's clumping of conversations difficult to navigate when I am searching for past e-mails. I much prefer Entourage's separation into subject, sender and date so I can choose my own method of searching backwards. Syncing with mobile devices is a must feature. I am frustrated that there is no IT support for iphones syncing with computer services.
Increase number and size of attachments
Current storage limits are medieval. I waste way too much of my time trying to "manage" my email (i.e., fit it into the absolutely inadequate storage provided by the University). This is only exacerbated by the idiot administrators on campus who are unaware that sending out thousands of copies of multi-megabyte posters for their bake sales is wasteful. There appears to be no attempt to educate people about mail usage -- only an attempt to limit storage. LAME.
Mostly, the email program just needs to be more user friendly. All of the features mentioned would be nice, but I'd be happy if I could customize my inbox! Seriously, Geckomail is the worst email I've ever used at any university. I'm a little shocked that UCD has such bad technology.
Find a way to make Google's DavisMail service filter messages ID'd as spam by UCD's system - these messages currently get through. Also, find a way to make the DavisMail service work in the Gmail app on Android phones.
Email should work, w/o long 'send' delays or w/o 'locking up' the local email program. RIGht now, campus email is terrible. Email should allow us to control forwarding and allow 'sent email' folders to be on our local machine, to avoid storage issues. None of this is the case. When we had email in our dept (ECE), it was much better than what we have now. And, when we send complaints about email not working correctly, we are ignored. Best solution - move email back to the depts or colleges and eliminate the campus email staff, which is not helpful and not doing a good job.
no, just want to emphasize that we need one email system campus-wide
Most of this survey appears to be about capabilities above and beyond e-mail. We have access to many of those services now and it's unclear to me why UC should invest in services that are already available.
I need to be able to access email over the internet from any computer.
A program site that easy to login to and able to perform email. The rest is for other programs, apps.
Interoperability and access between affiliated account applications for both students and faculty--i.e. student ucd/gmail accounts function as a separate domain from both faculty ucd accounts and faculty gmail accounts. This makes it more difficult for faculty and students to share google-docs, google websites, etc. than for faculty-to-faculty or student-to-student collaboration.
I find that Doodle is fine for scheduling meetings and SmartSite is fine for my teaching/project sites. Thus I don't need those tasks to be combined with email.
I actually read most email in my Gmail forward. But I love having this address because so many logins are tied to it. Wish the junk detector were a bit more accurate--I frequently find nonjunk there.
I work in the CA&ES dean's office. We use Microsoft Outlook for all e-mail and scheduling. It is accessible when I am traveling and works well with my iPhone. My assistant can access it to schedule appointments for me. I have no desire to switch to another system, as this works so well for me.
Geckomail is problematic. Not enough storage space, not enough usability in program, program lost 18 months of my saved emails, tech support not helpful, slow server response at times.

<p>Campus needs to maintain professionalism in the public eye by maintaining its own email services. Our system needs to encourage individuals to take charge of their email by downloading to remove burden on the university network and place messages on personal hard drives (via macmail, thunderbird, eudora, etc). Need to be able to send and receive large documents for purposes of professional communication, ranging from receipt of student work to dissemination of publications and sharing of data. As a faculty member I strongly oppose any outsourcing of email. We need only look to the example of e-journals that have created a dependence and increased costs to Universities exponentially to see that outsourcing is "penny wise and pound foolish" as the old saying goes. Simply put, it is shortsighted.</p>
<p>Difficult answering some questions as I download email from Geckomail to a personal email account on computer and mobile devices and am very happy with that aspect.</p>
<p>I do mostly my own stuff on my linux box (my own web site, calendars, email filtering...) so I might not be the best test subject on these issues, in short I do not really care, I'll do my own stuff whichever way UCD decide to goes, just hope the transition is fast and painless...</p>
<p>Many faculty I work with forward their Geckomail to Gmail. The number one reason for unhappiness with geckomail seems to be the size of the inbox. Searchability is also a major pro of Gmail, it allows all parts of an email to be searched using a keyword.</p>
<p>Security of data on mobile devices. Ability to send and receive encrypted messages and documents. Offsite backup (esp. for departmental systems). Ability of departmental-level communications technology to integrate with the campus system. Didn't know how to answer the radio button, but I don't object to e-mail data being used to algorithmically generate targeted advertizing (e.g., Gmail), but would immediately drop a service that permitted human inspection (e.g., by law enforcement, commercial directory services, or even researchers, without robust protections such release by opt-in only and a refusal to make releases to government without a court order.)</p>
<p>UC Davis webmail has been impossible for me to use- it's not searchable, it's method of alphabetizing is completely illogical and incomprehensible, and the quotas are way too low. I would be thrilled to be able to use the google app rather than the ucd webmail.</p>
<p>GMail is about as good as it gets; Microsoft is bloatware.</p>
<p>This is a poorly designed survey. The reason I use departmental mail, having all campus mail forwarded to it, is because it has vastly outperformed the campus since at least the early 1990s. Many of the features that I clicked as "Very Important", I can also already do. Your survey could be construed as support for writing a new email program or creating a lot of calendar features that someone said were important, disregarding (for instance) how many of them a Mac already does. I strongly, strongly recommend that you don't try to force a one-size-fits-all solution on everyone. Anyone running their own UNIX machines, for instance, already has email; it's not like people set up their own in-house systems solely for email. But it works, it comes along with having computers, and all the campus needs to do for many of us is make sure mail-forwarding works. If you think people can't schedule meetings or reserve conference rooms on their own, don't write your own software and try to embed it into a mail program---we don't need another Gradebook, and we don't need bloated software. One program for one task is a much better approach---keep it simple!</p>
<p>speed of transmitted messages and the reliability of the system</p>
<p>capacity, speed and accessibility.</p>
<p>I can't send email from my iPad using Safari or Firefox, although I can receive it. To send, I seem to need Geckomail, which is less user-friendly. Can this. Be remedied?</p>
<p>sub folders within folders to help sort saved emails search function for finding saved emails quickly</p>
<p>Not really, I am happy with Davis Mail</p>
<p>Definitely get enough space for email storage (Google's default ~7 GB is not nearly enough for me) Command-line access to email files is *appreciated* but not totally required Help migrating email from campus to vendor via IMAP (and preserving flags etc.) is VITAL (I split my email between campus and my department, so be flexible about how that migration would work)</p>
<p>Use of client email apps vs web-based email. I prefer the former. Campus tried to get faculty to use the latter in the gmail beta.</p>
<p>Why change something that is working.</p>
<p>microsoft office does not always load...I get error messages. It is also slow. Geckomail is faster. I want a firewall so that my e-mails are not infinitely accessible. Also, IT is not always helpful. We have excellent IT people in our department that helps me with classes, postings during the weekend.</p>
<p>seems to work fine as is and in these days of fiscal crisis seems counterproductive to try to find ways to send money off campus</p>
<p>Geckomail drove me crazy because of its small inbox and lack of search capabilities. Gmail is WAY better. I also like gmail chat.</p>
<p>As a supervisor and administrator I have HR issues spelled out in detail in email. If my email is not secure I put my employees at risk as well as the university. Privacy and security are my main concerns followed by ease of access.</p>
<p>Confidentiality and who at the email service provider organization would have access to our email communications.</p>
<p>Most important concerns are hacking and technical support</p>
<p>If we were to go with an outside vendor, it is very important that the company culture and the contract with the vendor be such that they will be very responsive to our needs for fixes, improvements, customization, and very high reliability.</p>
<p>I really like DavisMail and would like to be able to continue to use it!</p>
<p>We have an excellent spam filter on our department server that seems to be much better than the campus filter.</p>
<p>Occasionally Safari cannot connect with UCD system</p>
<p>The system must be scalable. The biggest issue we have seen on campus in the last year is related to SMTP. There were periods where sending messages seemed to take a very long time, or did not work at all. However, sometimes the message actually went through. This led to duplicate (or more) sends of a message, to be sure it was received.</p>
<p>Gmail is fantastic, I am so disappointed that we are not allowed to keep it. The pilot with Gmail was so much better than Geckomail that I can't describe. I hope you are able to find an option as good as Gmail and that I don't ever have to switch back to Geckomail!</p>

Ease of access when logging-on off campus.
Security is VERY important - we routinely send emails about students and if breached would violate federal law.
Definitely need to find an off-site option better than geckomail.
We already have all the options discussed in this survey and many of us already have multiple email addresses to take advantage of it. We need to retain our ucdavis.edu domain under our control because we cannot trust the corporate world with our information and communication.
In my eyes Geckomail is outdated and is only useful for temporarily scanning the newest messages. Replacing it with something similar to Gmail would be very helpful.
I'm already using gmail since I cannot otherwise manage the amount of mail. If there's a campus mail systems that gives me all the goodies of gmail, I'd be happy to try. Alternatively having gmail host campus mail might be a good compromise, provide Google provides some guarantees for the service ... and storage space!
Outsource outsource outsource! If individual faculty are concerned about email privacy, let them pay for it from their research support. For the rest of us, free email services are fine. All my experience with UCD IT products is that they are vastly inferior to commercial products. There is no reason for us to duplicate what is already being done better.
I am very satisfied with what we currently have and I have noticed a lot of improvement in the system over the years.
Leave things alone! Why are you wasting time, and indirectly money, in this era of budget crisis?
speed, reliability, no down time, large attachment and storage limits
speed of access and compatibility with a variety of browsers and computers,
We've got to get more storage. I've never had such limited space as we have with Geckomail.
In the medium or long run, email is a dying format. It is spam-ridden, insecure, and inefficient. So any planning for email infrastructure needs to keep in mind that pushing alternative technologies would be a better use of resources, as it would amortize further into the future.
You did not ask any questions about how easy it is to sort and catalog emails. This is a very important feature for me, as I have to save correspondence with students and have frequently had to go back and find it. G-mail has an incredibly advanced search program as well as a cataloging program which saves me incredible amounts of time when trying to search through thousands of emails to find what I am looking for. I'd like to again reiterate the extreme importance of a large inbox size (at least 5 gig) because I have to keep old emails from students as part of good record keeping, and then on top of that, try to do all my research work, and the ability to send and receive large email attachments.
No Microsoft and No Google. Lets keep our data to ourselves in a way we can manage it. We will violate funding agency policy, and probably also state law, by outsourcing!
Better spam filters, ability to send/receive large files.
If with an outside vendor, no advertising
The most important thing to me about any email or calendaring system is that they are standards based such that they can be accessed and used EQUALLY among various client systems (windows, mac, linux, smartphone) and easily merged/managed relative to other sources of calendar information (home, work, etc). This "email survey" is a bit odd in that it asks about a lot more than email. The questions about calendaring and collaboration spaces are very interesting, but I think best considered outside of the email question.
Effective spam filtering. Current system erratic and makes many mistakes.
I am concerned that currently we do not offer the same functions that are offered by outside services, such as Google - particularly large storage size for e-mail and the ability to send large attachments.
I like using Outlook for email and Google calendar for scheduling. It would be nice for a system to provide flexibility in working across platforms.
I feel that a vendor-based approach is the way to go. I've used G-mail (forwarded from my .ucdavis.edu account successfully since it was in beta. The university will never have the resources of a google to develop and innovate in this area of what is an essential tool for scholarship and communication. Several options to access e-mail should be preserved, and department servers with direct unix mail clients need to be an included option since they can be truly customized for specialized scientific needs. One size fits all does not apply here. Completely Centralized operations have rarely worked better than decentralized ones at UC Davis.
Smooth integration with Smartsite email functions. This is the single largest usage for me...contacting my hundreds of students on a regular basis. Also, I roll my campus emails over to my home account; this is very important to me as my campus office is shared, thus not an efficient work environment for writing or answering mail. (I'm a lecturer)
To me its all about ease of use and having access to the same data from wherever I am and whatever device I am using to access e-mail. However, I am concerned about dependence and lack of access if outsourcing occurs and how much more "spam" this would create.
ease of use
Cost should be part of the concern. Departments and other units are paying too much for this. There are security concerns, but these 'home grown' e-mail services often not very secure, in fact, not as secure as commercial site.
Can't think of any at this time.
I have never seriously regretted having my incoming email forwarded to a private address, but I have been irked by the fact that I have to disable the forwarding to send outgoing email from my UCD address. (Some letters of recommendation MUST be sent from an .edu address, e.g.) the same is true to access old archived emails in Geckomail. If the campus continues to have its own system, this quirk should be eliminated.
Reliability and availability of service (no crashes or slowdowns)!
- interoperability with department and personal mail -- our dept uses Zimbra, which is great, and I use gmail personally -- but the calendars don't synch - mobile support is important

Sharing of all forms of data between designated groups in all forms including video.
better and easier spam protection
Email and cloud-based document storage space are the most important features to me and security from hacking is my biggest concern. I currently use personal Gmail for work and pay for additional Google storage to host the 10GB of email that I have.
Permanent storage of emails messages that I could access. Sometimes I need an email from 4 years ago, and when my computer crashed, I lost those emails. A backup we can access would be nice.
I receive correspondence in Japanese. When I download it to my computer I can read it, but when I'm traveling and reading my e-mail on the geckomail website, the messages get scrambled. My wife's university switched to g-mail and that website does not scramble messages in Japanese. For that reason alone, I would prefer a shift to g-mail, despite worries about concerns about security.
Training of persons using the changed systems for optimizing the features of the new email system. Particularly faculty, staff, and students.
Don't do anything to disrupt the service we already have.
cost to university and feasibility
Yes, you should do what UC Berkeley does. Provide a no-frills single campus wide system (probably best run by an outside company). Scheduling etc. is important but there is little point to organize that by campus; and certainly not worth our money as we can do it with gmail and skype, doodle and what not. Hopefully these services will integrate more in the future; but it would be a waste of effort to have our own.
We need Google-quality spam filtering
Keep things flexible enough so that those of us who don't want to use web-based email don't have to. Don't force us into a box where we all have to use the same software or do things the same way.
I have lost too many emails from East Asia (Japan and China), most likely through the spam filters of UCD email system. Please stop filtering against double-byte codes or whatever features that may be relevant.
Faculty use a variety of email clients and one probably should be cautious about trying to force people to converge in this particular arena. I myself do not use the campus-based email (I use our department's email service and have mail forwarded to my desktop machine) because I prefer to use a text-based UI (eg, alpine) instead of a GUI, where one has to mouse around all the time. Also, I want to be able to compose emails with a proper text editor of my choice (emacs or vi). I do sometimes find it necessary to use have a web based UI when I travel; to that end, I fork a copy of incoming emails to a commercial web-based client. I don't use gmail or the campus' mail even for this , because the former (and I assume the latter), at least when I last checked, doesn't let you spoof the 'From:' field in your outgoing message; I want all emails to look like they come from a single email address, even if this isn't really true.
I use an account at the math department's email server. I wanted to forward email from my campus-wide ucdavis.edu email address to my department email, but this was not allowed because this was a university email address. I eventually managed to achieve the same effect by forward the email to a gmail address and set up forwarding to my department email from the gmail address, but I feel that this is a stupid and unnecessary hack. I would appreciate if this could be fixed in the future, i.e., that forwarding would be enabled from the campus-wide email directly to department email.
Foreign language handling.
The affix supports other language except English
Not everyone is on campus. I am permanently based in Salinas. We need access from anywhere
We simply need better spam filter.
faculty and students share data, we need to be on top of the curve when it comes to size of attachments. I currently have to use yousendit.com for my 100mb with to open a dropbox.com account and share a folder with them.
this needs to happen fast. i already use gmail and rarely use campus services. i think ucd email might be too late or inconsistent for many of us.
better support for multilingual emails, so that campus email filters don't tag them as junk
The file size capability of my faculty Googlemail prototype is very much appreciated. Geckomail was a joke. Storage capacity is an overriding factor for me. Given the widespread use of gmail, I see no reason to deny its use to the faculty.
I have a guest appointment at LBNL and they switched to Google Apps about a year ago and their service is very good. I also have a MobileMe personal account and a Google business account. UC Davis mail is the least reliable of all these services. I do not use it for anything critical. The single fact that I can receive a large email and then my email stops working is a dealbreaker.
Something a lot better than SmartSite, which is not intuitive, clunky, and unattractive.
Email is generally considered a permanent record--certainly for official UCD business. Are the long term storage and retrieval options being considered?
searchable email database is very important. Ability for large files to be managed very important
The email service should be easily accessible even with very slow internet connection while traveling.
Compatibility with standard IMAP and SMTP protocols over SSL, reliability, customizable filters, and spam blocking. Gmail would be an excellent solution.
I think maintaining email accounts, even for students after graduation, is an important and low-cost feature. It also makes it easier to contact alumni for surveys and so on. But I suspect most people are like me and use gmail or some other provider and only need to have things forwarded.
Cost
Drop middle initial for email addresses. Dependability and not features is key.

We need to maintain the current email address and maintain our identity.
Loss of data, see recent Google Mail problems
this survey is poorly designed... the last question forced me to take a choice that does not reflect my beliefs
Social responsibility of the company. Please don't go with Microsoft!
Part of a medical unit on campus have spend lot of time/effort educating our student patients to not use regular email to communitate with their health care providers. Maintaining separate secure messaging system inside our electronic medical record is critical for HIPPA compliance.
Too many spams came in to my mailbox daily.
Ability to "guess" the rest of e mail addresses after typing he first 2 letters. Details on the size and nature of attachments (including virus risks and spam)
cost, we should be using a free service
I wasn't sure how to answer many of the quesitons related to calander and other features. I have a palm and use that for my calendar, I use doodle to schedule meetings, etc. I don't see the need to have all these kinds of features in one place, if that is what you are getting at.
I switched to gmail 4 years ago and am very happy with it, so all my replies should be categorized accordingly. I do not think that UCD needs to provide an email service, at all.
Please note that Voice Over IP is not a luxury, but a necessity, for those us whose office phones were taken away as part of the budget cutting. As tenure-line faculty, I need to be available via phone, for example to confirm that I have recommended a student for a graduate program, or to handle logistics for national-level conferences. Thank you!
allow searches for prior e-mails from particular people. Offer choices once we start to type in an address.
I use MyUCDavis email (when I don't use my department email), and that has several flaws: you cannot search in emails, the storage space is extremely limited--one big attachment in an email can put me over quota.
I think it's a terrible idea for everyone to have calendar access to schedule meetings-- our time is so tightly scheduled as it is, and I would really rather not have to slot in 15 minutes for lunch so that a meeting isn't put in that time period.
Need enough storage space so e-mail can be left on server for access by multiple devices. Need more and better help and training information for users to decide how to store and access their e-mail.
The current system works very well for me and I *absolutely* do not want to switch to an external vendor whose main interest is making money off me and sell my information elsewhere. There have been already a few incidents about people loosing their entire mailboxes with no chance of recovery whatsoever.
This is a rigged survey. Qs 9 and 10 are designed to scare responders away from perfectly good and safe systems to encourage preservation of the truly atrocious system we have. It is the worst kind of "push" survey based on strawman arguments. I'm appalled that our campus is supporting this. I have been using gmail for years. It is so fare superior to the garbage ucdavis mail system that it pains me to have to continue to use our email simply to have a professionally valid address. I continually have email from colleagues flagged as spam, which means that I'm informed as late as a week afterward and I have to go through the utterly ancient and atrocious geckomail interface to find the mail. I cannot object too strongly to this phony and rigged survey clearly designed to protect the status quo.
Larger inbox (5GB or more) Larger attachments should be possible
The current implementation of ucdavis mail is pretty rudimentary. The search functions are poor. It is hard to delete and organize messages, particularly if usin an outside mailtool like Thunderbird.



INFORMATION & EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY
3820 CHILES ROAD
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95618
TELEPHONE: (530) 752-4998
FAX: (530) 754-6550

November 16, 2010

Felix Wu, Computer Science, CIT representative, and Campus Email Committee Chair
Jamie Butler, School of Law, College technology leads liaison
Paul Gepts, Plant Sciences, CIT representative
Francois Gygi, Senate CIT Chair
Rick Grosberg, Evolution and Ecology, At-Large Academic Senate Representative
Joe Kiskis, Physics, At-Large Academic Senate Representative
Tracy Lade, Physics, ADMAN representative
Morna Mellor, Director, Data Center and Client Services
Carl Whithaus, University Writing Program, Gmail Advisory Committee Chair
Gabe Youtsey, Project Manager, IET

Re: Establishment of UC Davis Email Committee

Dear Colleagues:

We write to request your service on an *ad hoc* committee to recommend a strategy for central campus email services for UC Davis faculty, staff and students.

Background

During the 2009-2010 academic year, our campus started exploring options for enhancing the features and capabilities of email service for faculty and staff. Four major efforts took place, each leading to a set of complementary findings and recommendations.

- The Gmail Pilot Advisory Committee, led by Professor Carl Whithaus, evaluated what was learned from the Gmail pilot conducted in the spring and outlined recommendations to address concerns with outsourcing faculty and staff email.
- The Unified Email and Calendaring Strategy Workgroup chaired by Morna Mellor (IET) evaluated four alternatives to meet campus needs for a unified email and calendaring service. In addition to assessing lower-cost alternatives for administrative users (e.g., Microsoft Exchange), the group studied options to improve coordination of communication tools between faculty and students, and ways of reducing or eliminating duplication of campus email services.
- The third committee, the UC Email Workgroup led by Mike Minear, CIO at the UC Davis Health System, was established in Fall 2009 to assess current email use across the UC system and formulate suggestions for improvement. In carrying out their charge, the UC group researched and identified email strategies and sourcing opportunities for all UC campuses.
- Finally, in late April, the Vice Provost-IET, and the Chairs of the Academic Senate Committee for Information Technology and the Campus Council for Information Technology, issued a joint

statement announcing the decision to discontinue consideration of outsourcing options for faculty and staff email. The communication cited concerns related to the UC Electronic Communications Policy and Google's privacy practices.

The reports and recommendations issued by the three committees, along with the official statements received from campus constituency groups and the report from Academic Senate Committee on Information Technology, were reviewed by the Campus Council for Information Technology in early June 2010. The CCFIT report provides a synopsis of each study and recommendations to inform the work of this committee (See the reports at <http://ccfit.ucdavis.edu>.)

Committee charge

Building on these recent developments, this committee is being established jointly by Information and Educational Technology and the Academic Senate to chart a strategy for central campus email services. The committee's discussions will be informed by the reports from the Academic Senate Committee on Information Technology and the three groups who studied email alternatives this past year. Each of these perspectives will be critical to defining a functional, reliable and secure email system for UC Davis that is operated by the University of California. The committee's report will be submitted to Campus CIO Pete Siegel and Academic Senate Chair Bob Powell, and it will be shared with key campus IT groups including the Academic Senate Council for Information Technology (CIT), the Campus Council for Information Technology (CCFIT) and the newly-formed Blue Ribbon Committee on Information Technology Excellence.

Specific elements of the charge to this committee include:

1. *Develop specific guidelines to define essential characteristics of the next generation central campus email service.* This analysis should include a definition of functional, technical and privacy requirements for campus email, as well as consideration of development and hosting options, costs, and level of service to be provided.
2. *Develop a list of critical concerns regarding the University of California Electronic Communications Policy.* During the deliberations regarding outsourcing electronic services for the campus it became apparent that there is significant disagreement on how to interpret statements that the University "does not examine or disclose electronic communications records without the holder's consent" and that "in no case shall electronic communications that contain personally identifiable information about individuals be sold or distributed to third parties without the explicit permission of the individual." There are likely to be other issues as well. The Committee should specifically consider how the policy meshes with the current environment in which faculty, staff and students often use off campus email services with their campus emails addresses. The Committee should make recommendations to the Vice Provost and the Academic Senate Chair, which can then be forwarded to the appropriate policy bodies in the UC.
3. *Evaluate alternatives that can meet the needs of a new campus email service, summarize findings, and formulate a recommendation for campus consideration.* Although the elements of the committee's charge are critical in defining a central campus email service, they should not be viewed as limiting the depth or breadth of the committee's deliberations. Given the current budget circumstance, however, we request that the committee carefully consider ways to ensure prudent management of scarce campus resources and consult broadly to ensure all relevant perspectives can be brought to bear.

We respectfully request that you submit your recommendations to us no later than March 15, 2011. You may also be invited to share your initial findings and draft recommendations in early January 2011 with the Chancellor's Blue Ribbon Committee on Information Technology Excellence.

Thank you in advance for your willingness to serve in this capacity. We appreciate that this effort will require some of your valuable time but we hope you will agree that it is for an important campus goal. Staff will be in touch shortly to schedule the first meeting of this committee. You need not respond to this letter unless you are unable to serve.

Sincerely,

Peter M. Siegel
CIO and Vice Provost
Information & Educational Technology

Robert L. Powell
Professor, Chemical Engineering & Material Science
And Chair, Academic Senate