

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2007-2009

Project #50-01
Page 1 of 5

Project #	Agency	Project Title
50-01	Nebraska State College System	Student Information Administrative System

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: <http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/index.html>]

Nebraska State College System (NSCS) is requesting \$6 million in year one of the 07-09 biennium and an additional \$4 million in year two of the same biennium for the purpose of purchasing student information administrative software system (referred to in this document as an enterprise resource planning (ERP) solution) and necessary supporting hardware. The existing student information system was purchased and implemented in 1987 and is now dated, lacking necessary function to provide appropriate administrative support to students, faculty, and provide accountability reporting. Year one dollars will provide for planning and vendor selection, software and hardware purchase, training, and initial migration to a modern system. Year two will continue with training and implementation efforts.

The request will allow the Nebraska State College System to maintain its essential administration system. New software and hardware will provide online functions necessary to meeting the needs of students, faculty, and administration. Among the components considered are: recruiting, admissions, registration, student accounts, financial aid, housing, grade reports, transcripts student access to records, faculty advising, class scheduling room assignments, departmental budgeting and accounting, key control, parking, alumni functions, document imaging, and electronic transcript exchange.

FUNDING SUMMARY

(revise dates as necessary for your request.)

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2007-08 (Year 1)	Request for FY2008-09 (Year 2)	FY2009-10 (Year 3)	FY2010-011 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs							\$ -
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							\$ -
2.2 Programming							\$ -
2.3 Project Management							\$ -
2.4 Other							\$ -
3. Supplies and Materials							\$ -
4. Telecommunications							\$ -
5. Training							\$ -
6. Travel							\$ -
7. Other Operating Costs							\$ -
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware							\$ -
8.2 Software							\$ -
8.3 Network							\$ -
8.4 Other							\$ -
TOTAL COSTS	\$ -	\$ 6,000,000.00	\$ 4,000,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000,000.00
General Funds (SBF)		\$ 6,000,000.00	\$ 4,000,000.00				\$ 10,000,000.00
Cash Funds							\$ -
Federal Funds							\$ -
Revolving Funds							\$ -
Other Funds							\$ -
	\$ -	\$ 6,000,000.00	\$ 4,000,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000,000.00

Note: Request is based on information gathered from informal presentations provided to each campus. Detail will be available after completion of the Request for Proposal process.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	13	12	12.3	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	24	24	22	23.3	25
5: Technical Impact	15	18	13	15.3	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	7	6	6.3	10
7: Risk Assessment	7	6	6	6.3	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	0	13	11	8.0	20
TOTAL				72	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Given the advances in technology over the last 20 years it is clear that the SCS needs to update to provide modern services and comply with reporting demands. The stated goals are clear and appropriate objectives for an organization that finds itself with a nearly 20 year old system - The goals are clearly defined and identify the systems required of today's ERP system if we are to provide the Nebraska State College System the tools necessary to succeed in the information age we must compete. The concept is "right on" in regard to better serving students and making the tasks of faculty and staff less onerous. - There was a complete list of the areas of affected core business functions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The measurement method as outlined is whether or not SCS can successfully migrate their existing data and bring the new system on line. While that is certainly a "bottom line" measure it falls far short of a process to evaluate the implementation of a very complex system and substantial undertaking. - Outcomes and performance measures seem a bit nebulous. Our experience in implementing a new ERP system is that the individuals in charge of each subsystem (Student Information, Financial Aid, etc.) will identify specific areas they want to see improvements in performance and/or reporting of data. - The measurement and assessment methods are not described but will be described in the RFP?
4: Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The primary justification is to minimize the risk associated with maintaining a system that is where increasingly there is a lack of human resources capable of doing the necessary work and industry support is quickly fading. It is clear that migrating to a new system is critical. - One benefit that stands out is the potential a move to a system utilized by over 1,000 peer or similar institutions would provide. The NSCS will benefit from the knowledge base which most peer institutions readily share, especially as you implement a new system. <p>Other solutions were not specifically offered in item 5 but the implication is that doing nothing is no longer an option and that the current system has run its course. Other integrated solutions will become evident as qualified providers respond to the RFP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Much depends on the needs assessment, selection process and subsequent gap analysis. It is beyond the scope of the proposal to outline this in any detail; however, more information on the RFP process is needed to fully assess this project. - No particular mandate is listed. Many details belonging in this proposal are described as "...will be defined in the RFP".

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Solid business case and justification is evident. 	
5: Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Due to where NSCS is at in the process it is very difficult to assess this proposal based on anything other than the stated objectives. Thus, no real assessment of the technology (hardware/software) can be done. - The timing of migrating "now" rather than later seems reliable advice. A migration to a newer platform would move the NSCS to a technological position many other colleges have already made. Our experience would be that the desire for web access to applications drives many of our business interactions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The basis of the RFP appears to be sound and moving away from the existing legacy system is critical. - Would have liked more information reliability, scalability and security. The promise seems to be that it will be there. Addressing some of the improvements over the existing platform would have been helpful. - The project proposal needs more technical detail and explanation. Again, it said that these requirements will be defined by the RFP.
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Obtaining appropriate, credible, representation from all groups will be difficult yet critical to obtaining widespread acceptance in a state known for fierce localism. In light of that some mention of the process that will be used to attract these representatives would have been helpful. - I agree that many of the fine points of the implementation process will be refined after system vendor has been selected. The make up of the team from the different offices and systems looks fine. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no way at this point to determine the adequacy of the process that will unfold based on the information provided. - I would have liked to have seen more stated about the climate of acceptance amongst the stakeholders. Do they see the need for the change? Will they be champions of a major implementation? Has the leadership of the NSCS prepared the stakeholders for work that is ahead of them? Placing appropriate training and consulting days into the implementation will be critical to the success of the project. - Overall timeline/milestones lacks specific and detail.
7: Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The document outlined the need for widespread representation and this is made clear in the recognition that widespread user acceptance is critical. - Funding is always a challenge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integration at this level is very complicated and user buy-in is critical. There is no clear evidence that those who will spend the most time interacting with this system will have much in the way of input. Focus groups that work through existing processes that will be changed should be convened in front of deployment. In essence, one of the major risks is change management and very little is discussed in this proposal that addresses how it will be handled. - There are many barriers and risk to an implementation and should be anticipated in the project plan/proposal. - Risk assessment section definitely needs more detail.
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Total dollars for each budget year are identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In one sense it is premature to assess a budget because all of that is to be determined within the context of the RFP. Nevertheless, appropriations totaling 6 million dollars are being requested. Providing a price tag of that magnitude with no substantive rationale suggests that either work has been done and the details weren't provided or, worse, that this number represents a "ballpark" figure that could actually turn out to be much lower than what is needed.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		- The detail I would expect was lacking. It tells me the planners do not have a clear concept of where the costs of the project will accrue. A listing of major components and projected costs of the project would have been helpful. I realize the project is in the initial planning stage and the variables are many. - The financial analysis is so incomplete it is hard to gauge whether the \$10,000,000 is adequate or inadequate.

TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS

Technical Panel Checklist				Technical Panel Comment
	Yes	No	UNK	
1. The project is technically feasible.	✓			
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.			✓	Unknown until the agency completes the RFP process.
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.			✓	Unknown until the agency completes the RFP process.

- The Technical Panel concurs with the Education Council recommendation that encourages collaboration and partnership between the University of Nebraska's and State College System's SIS projects.

EDUCATION COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The Education Council recommends this project be categorized as a highly recommended project.
- Both SIS projects are of equal importance for their sectors due to the discontinuation of support of the existing systems.
- The Education Council encourages collaboration and partnership between the University of Nebraska's and the State College System's Student Information System projects in the procurement, implementation, and training and other areas that provide efficiency and cost effectiveness.
- The concerns about the financial analysis and budget of the State College System project, by one reviewer, can be attributed to the uncertainties associated with the purchase and implementation of a robust, contemporary collegiate information system.
- The Education Council disregarded the technical review scores due to the apparent inconsistencies in scoring.

NITC COMMENTS

- Tier 1 (Highly Recommended. Mission critical project for the agency and/or the state.)
- Regarding Projects 50-01, State College System-Student Information Administrative System, and the collaboration with Project 51-01, UN-Student Information System, Commissioner Peterson moved:
 - To leave the project in Tier 1.

- That the NITC strongly recommends that the University of Nebraska and the State College System collaborate on these projects in the areas of data element definitions, data warehouse design, data sharing, networking, hardware, and implementation.
 - That the systems should be interoperable.
 - That the University of Nebraska and the State College System work closely with the Technical Panel and provide periodic project reports to the NITC.
- Commissioner Hedquist seconded. Motion passed.