### NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION Project Proposal - Summary Sheet FY 2008 Deficit Budget Requests

Project #	Agency	Project Title
51-01	University of Nebraska	Student Information System

#### **SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of the proposal is posted at: http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/2008\_deficit/51-01.pdf.]

The University of Nebraska currently operates separate student information systems for each of our four campuses. A vendor developed student information product, the SunGard SCT SIS PLUS system, is utilized by our UNL, UNO, and UNK campuses. UNMC operates an in-house developed student information system. These SIS systems are running on a variety of database management products, operating platforms, and hardware environments.

The SCT SIS PLUS system was developed in the 1970s and is based on dated design principles and technologies (e.g. terminal access and batch processing) that are becoming technologically obsolete. The SIS PLUS vendor announced 5 years ago they would continue to provide basic system maintenance to comply with federal and other higher education regulatory requirements but would not implement any significant PLUS system enhancements in the future. SCT is no longer actively marketing the PLUS system and the PLUS client base has declined from a peak of approximately 450 schools in 2000 to less than 70 and this number continues to decline. Indications are that SCT will likely terminate maintenance for PLUS in the 2009 – 2010 timeframe.

Additionally, PLUS provides limited support in a number of areas that are becoming increasingly important in the higher education arena – e.g. prospecting and recruiting, 24x7 availability, the ability to offer and administer courses that are not term-based, web-based access to data and services, workflow support, reporting capability, decision-support, and flexibility in registration and billing. These functionality "gaps" are addressed either through the purchase of additional function specific software products that must be integrated with PLUS, a costly process, or through inhouse developed applications. Enhancements to PLUS developed in-house often require complex interfaces due to the lack of technical integration in the PLUS system. It is becoming more and more expensive to implement and maintain these "external" applications to provide functionality the base PLUS system does not offer.

As we face increasing competitive pressure to provide any time any place access to information and enhanced services we are finding it more and more difficult, and in some cases virtually impossible, to implement new desirable features and functionality due to the PLUS system architecture and technical limitations.

If the University of Nebraska is to remain competitive in the future we must implement new student information systems which allow us to be more innovative, responsive, and effective in meeting these challenges.

### FUNDING SUMMARY

	······											
	**ADDITIONAL NOTES PROVIDED IN PROPOSAL**	F١	Request for (2008-09 (Year 1)		Request for '2009-10 (Year 2)	F١	(2010-11 (Year 3)	F١	(Y2011-12 (Year 4)	Future		Total
1. Personnel Costs		s	981,100.00	s	992,533.00	s	1,004,309.00	s	416,438.00		S	3,394,380.00
2. Contractual Services												
2.1 Design											s	-
2.2 Programming											s	-
2.3 Project Management											s	-
2.4 Other		s	7,692,850.00	s	382,950.00	s	170,200.00				\$	8,246,000.00
3. Supplies and Materials		s	1,500.00	s	1,500.00						\$	3,000.00
<ol><li>Telecommunications</li></ol>		s	39,600.00	s	14,400.00						\$	54,000.00
5. Training		s	100,000.00	s	100,000.00	s	100,000.00	s	20,000.00		\$	320,000.00
6. Travel											\$	-
7. Other Operating Costs		\$	2,819,518.00	s	353,428.00	s	353,428.00	s	353,427.00		\$	3,879,801.00
8. Capital Expenditures												
8.1 Hardware		\$	1,763,466.00	s	218,758.00	s	240,634.00	s	264,697.00		\$	2,487,555.00
8.2 Software		s	8,300,847.00	s	1,549,243.00	s	1,626,983.00	s	1,709,449.00		\$	13,186,522.00
8.3 Network		\$	36,000.00	s	36,000.00	s	36,000.00	s	36,000.00		\$	144,000.00
8.4 Other											\$	-
TOTAL COSTS	s -	\$	21,734,881.00	s	3,648,812.00	s	3,531,554.00	s	2,800,011.00	s -	\$	31,715,258.00
General Funds											s	-
Cash Funds											\$	-
Federal Funds											\$	-
Revolving Funds											\$	-
Other Funds											s	-
TOTAL FUNDS	S -	s	-	s	-	s	-	s	-	s -	\$	-

# PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	14	14	14.0	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	25	24	24	24.3	25
5: Technical Impact	15	19	14	16.0	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	10	8	9.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	9	9	9	9.0	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	20	19	19	19.3	20
			TOTAL	92	100

## **REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals,	- Specific and measurable outcomes	- The only notable weakness is the lack of
Objectives, and	articulated. Impact of the additional services	inward-facing assessment methods. That is,
Projected	scoped to include both administrative and	those methods listed are mostly outcome or
Outcomes	student users of the system. Clear tie to	"outward-facing." Beyond before/after
	existing plans to reduce application	surveys of the users additional assessment
	complexity and application rationalization	data might be gathered from users to align
	process.	business processes with the functions of the
	- The strength that stood out the most was	new software.
	the benefit the new system would provide	- Concurrence with the weaknesses
	the students. I've spent the last 4 days at	indicated in the 2006 Review.
	the League for Innovation Conference on	
	Technology and theme mentioned over and	
	over was that students are demanding	
	changes in the way they receive information	
	and interact with their professors. A 24/7	
	web-based system is clearly the mandate for	
	the future. The goals are clear and the	
	benefits many!	
	- Concurrence with the strengths indicated in	
	the 2006 Review.	
4: Project	- Clear and tangible benefits were listed	- The relationship of the proposed SIS to
Justification /	along with solid rationale for migrating to a	compliance is not spelled out but may be
Business Case	new SIS. The implications for remaining on	beyond the scope of this summary.
	the current system were clearly articulated.	- Concurrence with the weaknesses
	- The challenge of maintaining an aging	indicated in the 2006 Review.
	legacy system that the vendor does not	
	improve or enhance with new innovations in	
	technology is unacceptable. The benefits of	
	providing services that today's students	
	expect, providing uniform services	
	throughout the University system, and	
	benefiting through the economies of scale	
	seem on the mark and achievable with this	
	proposal.	
	- Concurrence with the strengths indicated in	
	the 2006 Review.	
5: Technical Impact	- Clear indication that the new system will be	- It was difficult to evaluate the technical
	based upon current software code, RDBMS	impact with the limited information relative to
	and hardware architecture.	hardware, software and system architecture.
	- The challenge of providing better	In fairness to the proposer this is a reflection
	accessibility without compromising security	of the status of the project.
	accessionity without compromising security	

### NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION Project Proposal - Summary Sheet FY 2008 Deficit Budget Requests

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	are properly addressed. The improvements	- Concurrence with the weaknesses
	and new technical elements have been	indicated in the 2006 Review.
	identified.	
	- Concurrence with the strengths indicated in	
	the 2006 Review.	
6: Preliminary Plan	<ul> <li>Clear plan to engage users and technical</li> </ul>	- Until a system is selected the specific new
for Implementation	staff at many levels. Clear and reasonable	skills can't be fully articulated, however,
	milestones along with an overall timeline that	additional information would have been
	is appropriate.	helpful.
	<ul> <li>The time necessary to plan the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Concurrence with the weaknesses</li> </ul>
	implementation seems reasonable and	indicated in the 2006 Review.
	points to the necessity of making a decision	
	for a new SIS system. The plan is thorough	
	and reasonable. Pleased to see that	
	additional staffing has been addressed and	
	planned for. Implementation means for a	
	period of time the University would be	
	supporting two systems until the full	
	implementation has been completed.	
	- Concurrence with the strengths indicated in	
	the 2006 Review.	
7: Risk	<ul> <li>Clearly articulated technical barriers and</li> </ul>	- No specific "human" or "process" barriers
Assessment	remediation strategies. Clear indication of	were listed. Given that this will include 2nd-
	previous success migrating complex	order change recognition of "human"
	computing environments.	barriers at the outset is an important
	<ul> <li>The University will benefit from the</li> </ul>	consideration.
	knowledge peer institutions have gained and	- None
	share through their implementations. Our	
	college experienced this with its recent	
	implementation of a new SIS system. Data	
	mapping and migration from the old system	
	to the new are huge tasks and the University	
	has properly gauged the scope of the work	
	and has planned accordingly.	
	- Concurrence with the strengths indicated in	
Q. Financial	the 2006 Review.	
8: Financial Analysis and	- Hardware, software and personnel costs	- It is not clear what RDBMS will be used so
Budget	are clearly indicated including 5-year TCO.	there is no method to understand the costs
Budgot	- The budget reflects costs that seem high	associated with the licensing.
	but the cost of delay add up as well. It	<ul> <li>Concurrence with the weaknesses indicated in the 2006 Review.</li> </ul>
	would seem that acquiring a new SIS	indicated in the 2006 Review.
	system is not a question of if but when. The spreadsheet showing the four year costs are	
	well done. The comment regarding the use	
	of some of the student fees to support the	
	project seem reasonable as the students are	
	the main beneficiary.	
	- Concurrence with the strengths indicated in	
	the 2006 Review.	

Staff Note: The University indicates that, "This is a re-submission of the original (51-01) request submitted to the NITC in Aug 2006, in response to the New or Additional State Funding Requests for Information Technology Projects FY2007-2009 Biennium. The only significant change to this submission is in the budget portion of the original request. All other sections of the request are unchanged."

Below are links to the project review documents from last year for this project:

2006 Project Proposal Form - <u>http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/ppf/51-01.pdf</u> Summary Sheet with Reviewer Scores and Comments - <u>http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/ss/51-01\_s.pdf</u>

### TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist				Technical Panel Comment		
rechnical Faher Checklist	Yes	No	UNK			
1. The project is technically feasible.						
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.						
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.						

### EDUCATION COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The Education Council recommends the project be designated as a Tier 1 Priority (mission critical for the agency) because of discontinuation of support of the existing student information system.
- The Education Council adds the following remarks:
  - To commend the University of Nebraska staff on their efforts to operate as an integrated system of four campuses.
  - To require the University of Nebraska to more clearly delineate "Other" as part of the budget (\$8.246million).
  - To the extent possible, both the State College System and the University of Nebraska must synchronize their RFP processes and co-evaluate vendors.
  - To require an analysis of cost-savings and an analysis of 'effect on students' for two pathways:
    - Centralization and cooperative hosting of Projects 50-01 and 51-01
    - Adoption of a single vendor for Projects 50-01 and 51-01
  - To require a unified look at adopting the same vendor by both the State College System and the University of Nebraska; and if not the same result, to provide a justification for divergence.

### NITC COMMENTS