ISTeCC Meeting
March 13, 2013

Meeting Summary

Attendees:

Bruce Alexander	IT Services
Katherine Ball	IT Services
Burt Bargerstock	University Outreach and Engagement
Michelle Carlson	IT Services
Firmin Charlot	Student Services
Michael Connelly	Social Science Dean
Tom Davis	IT Services
Mike Dawisha	Residential & Hospitality Services
Barb Dawson	Health Information Technology
Steve Devine	IT Services
Dush Fernando	IT Services
Cynthia Ghering	IT Services
Thomas Luccock	Internal Audit
Estelle McGroarty	Research & Graduate Studies
Annette McLane	IT Services
Mark Notman	Osteopathic Medicine Dean
Gail Nutter	Education
John Resotko	College of Law
Don Ries	IT Services
Nicole Rovig	Registrar
Matt Stehouwer	Natural Science
Jennifer Sweet	College of Natural Science
Scott Thomas	IT Services
Terry Viau	Associate Dean for Support Services
Jim Willson	College of Business

Katherine Ball chaired the meeting.

<u>**Student Information Systems**</u>

Nicole Rovig presented on the Student Information Systems (SIS) planning process. Review of lead administrative units (Office of Admissions, Controller, Financial Aid, Registrar) and organizational effectiveness. Very mature workflow system. Review of cross-unit initiatives (graduate school, preadmission enrollments, etc).

Review of planning charge:

- high-level review of current systems
- market study of what is available
- initial high-level report with recommendation for future steps. Very centralized perspective at this time.

Milestone activities

- scripted interviews with stakeholders and executives
- questionnaire for 14 higher ed systems that implemented a new SIS within the last 5 years
- conducted site visits to U of Arizona, Texas Tech, U of Washington. Received site visit materials from Iowa but didn't visit
- draft of scope (high-level) to identify functional areas; diagrams and database to capture data flow.

Market trends: 90% of higher ed has a vended solution. Two primary vendors (Banner, PeopleSoft). Penn State, U of Penn and Harvard started their selection process and should have decisions within next couple weeks.

Recommendations from Gartner:

1. Develop strategy
2. Fund an IT modernization program
3. Focus on retiring older systems.

Recommendations from Moran:

1. define scope
2. reengineer business process
3. don't customize
4. get stakeholder buy-in

Review of current MSU SIS landscape: no consistent investment in core; lack of unified structure; more than 125 apps have been developed around core; pockets of greatness; changes to SIS take exceptionally long. Bottom line: we haven't been able to maintain functionality – still doing batch processing, etc.

Review of SIS Scope diagram. Comparison of data flow from 1992 and today – complexity has increased. Very reliant on replication software. Review of what the future diagram might look like with a new solution.

Business drivers: Ability to operate and support SIS beyond 2017 is in question (Financial Aid program, SAM, will be unsupported after 2017). Fee assessment has substantial limitations; degree navigator will be unsupported in 2014; core SIS support staff are retiring in 5 years; hiring staff to learn antiquated programming language and hiring and retaining staff within unique system environment are very large challenges.

Institutional risks increasing: mainframe systems at end of life cycle; great risk to fragile systems (financial aid, student accounts); SAM support; fragility of patched system; quality of service (day-old data); high-impact business process reengineering not feasible with current SIS; data integrity issues are rampant.

Review of stakeholder interview key concepts. Site visits to Washington (Kuali Student – choosing to modernize their mainframe while investing in Kuali Student); Arizona (PeopleSoft); and Texas Tech (Banner). Review of common themes.

Differences summary: vended products can be implemented immediately and have mature feature set; Kuali Student is a long-term investment (5 years from now there "might" be something). Currently, time is being spent fixing a mainframe instead of building innovate systems that can move the University forward (i.e. ran out of section numbers due to character limitation in fields – time involved to fix).

Review of provisioning options chart.

Final recommendation: implement a vended solution. Product selection and implementation would take 3 years. Data resource management and organizational effectiveness have to be addressed regardless of solution.

All recommendations were submitted to Provost's office at end of November. Focus at this time is to position MSU for a successful implementation. Working on increasing business analyst skill set within current staff.

> Review of initiatives currently occurring

- Operations
- project prioritization
- process analysis and reengineering
- retiring/replacing outdated systems
- comprehensive course prerequisite/restriction review
- gathering/updating/maintaining SIS related documentation.

John Resotko asked about room scheduling software. Vendor demos have occurred (January). Work group compiling info and product recommendation report. Hopefully will have product selected in next few weeks.

Barb Dawson – has there been a review of the compensation structure for IT staff given its competitive nature? Not from a SIS standpoint. The reality of salary structures is understood and it is also understood that they will need to change. This might be a good conversation between HR and IT Services.

Tom Luccock asked the general cost of vended solution, range? Taking into account the data component, the costs range from $60-$70 million.

John asked if the University would be willing to work with vendors from a marketing standpoint to increase any discount they might offer (partnership for discounts)? Nicole has not been part of any of those type of conversations. **Bruce Alexander** stated that it's always worth bringing forward as a discussion point. In the past, the University has not been comfortable with an institutional endorsement of a product. Higher level policy decision.

Question on the balance of vended solution use. Majority uses PeopleSoft. Purdue and Northwestern use Banner. Feedback from those in the process of making a decision say they'd be happy with either one. Not many implementations in the last 5 years (most were before that).

Barb asked why the long time frame for implementation? Modules coming on line. "Fully" implemented in three years, using a phased implementation.

MSU IT Conference

Katherine Ball presented on the IT Conference. Review of objectives and what's been done outside of the IT Conference to foster these objectives. Review of keynotes for this year's session (Dan Lohrmann, Chief Security Office SOM; Bill Yock, Assoc. Vice Provost, U of Washington). Bill's focus is the proper use of data within an institution and how you enable that. Review of submitted topics currently received. **John** said that it seemed clear that what hard-core techs want is hard-core tech stuff. Can we look at previous years and know the ratio between hard-core tech/higher-level stuff? **Katherine** said that yes, the ratio has shifted towards leadership/professional development. **Tom Davis** questioned if it's possible to present something in-depth within the scope we have. **Jim Willson** said it's possible to begin to learn about the new technology, maybe not learn it in-depth. **John** asked if we could look at descriptions when they are communicated and maybe refine them to provide greater detail. **Burt Bargerstock** (lead for Web Dev CAFÉ.) Their membership is varied and they go back and forth on their presentations: high tech and less tech.

Attendance is down. Why are we doing it? Do we try something different? **Katherine** asked what the group thought of doing the conference more like Faculty Seminars, holding sessions over two days. **Burt** asked about the delivery medium, captured and available after the fact? Staff count is down, but that makes the current staff less able to attend something like this. Think about the channels of communication and delivery. **Katherine** indicated that in the past, many speakers said they weren't comfortable with being recorded, but that may have changed. **Firmin Charlot** mentioned that lack of time is significant, how are changes within IT Services itself playing out with the ability to market their products, etc? Maybe we're overthinking it and not looking at the true cause of the drop. **Tom Davis** asked for suggested topics and then recruit for speakers.

- **Matt Stehouwer** mentioned that a panel of virtual desktop presentations would be helpful. Hosting solutions, what's going on in the environment, etc.
- **John** asked about putting the format question (two half-days versus whole day) on exit surveys?
- **Barb** said lifecycle, methodologies, etc would be interesting. Best practices. Is there a need for a project management discussion? Operational best practices (ITIL) in a technical structure? Combine leadership topics with technical topics.
- **Annette McLane** suggested a talk on lecture capture – she can get us list from Academic Tech group meeting.

Katherine asked if we can't get high-tech presentations on-campus, will the community be prepared to pay more if we have to bring in outside vendors/presenters that will have a cost? **Gale Nutter** didn't think it was necessary to bring in outside – we have a lot of on-campus talent. Katherine requested that

everyone email her with any suggestions with names, presentations, etc. **Matt** also suggested marketing the conference to Deans and Chairs to send their people.

Update on Office 365

Cynthia Ghering presented. Progress has been made on two of the three bumps in the road that had come up – Microsoft is taking our concerns very seriously. Reworked their cloud architecture for spam/anti-virus routing. We are asking to have it reworked into the higher ed contract. They are willing to broaden their definition of affiliate, but still a few difficulties. Quest (AD role software) has been bought out by Dell and we will have to renegotiate all the pricing, but progress is being made. Outages reported in the forums that the team has been monitoring have turned out to be test or development sites, which has eased some fears. Working on risk mitigation on moving to cloud. Hoping to present to Satish Udpa, new Executive VP, as soon as feasible. Still making progress. **Tom Davis** said that there has been discussion about moving students first instead of faculty and staff. **Cynthia** mentioned that the costs to maintain mail.msu.edu are becoming significant. More info at IT Exchange on Thursday, March 14th from 3:30-5:00 in the Union Parlors.

Learning Management Systems

Annette McLane gave an update on Desire2Learn (D2L) and ANGEL. ANGEL going away May 2015. Encourage faculty to attend D2L classes – there are plenty available, including Faculty Seminars (May 7th and 8th). Upgrading QA system for D2L with 10.1. Scoring Office app being rewritten. Integrating after its pilot phase. Will be having meetings with Registrars office to how best to get info out of D2L and into Registrar's system for grades. Buying a vended solution for the SIS will integrate well with D2L. Encouraged everyone to think about long-term planning for class moves and don't wait for the last minute. Some programs are already trying to move all classes this summer. **Cynthia** asked about ANGEL groups - will groups be able to move? **Annette** said you can convert your ANGEL groups into D2L groups. Archives will be working with Instructional Systems to transfer records.