

Chief Technology Officers Meeting Notes
May 28, 2004

Present: Jeff Cox, GBC; Don Moxley, WNCC; Al Valbuena, CCSN; Brian Chongtai, NSC; Lori Temple, UNLV; Steve Zink, UNR; Buster Neel, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration; Ed Anderson, SCS; Ginger Holladay-Houston, SCS; Becky Seibert, SCS.

1. UCCSN Budget Process – Vice Chancellor Buster Neel

Buster described the UCCSN budget process and schedule, and he distributed an excerpt from the 2005-07 budget proposal to be presented to the regents at the June meeting. He explained the difference between the Adjusted Base/Maintenance/Growth Budget, which is based on predicted increases and caseload growth, and the Enhancement Budget, which represents new initiatives. The Enhancement Budget has a lower chance of receiving funding than does the Base/Maintenance Budget. The enhancement priorities have been set but may be changed by the regents. The regents will discuss the budget at the June meeting and vote on it at the August meeting. It will be finalized and sent to the Governor in the fall. The Governor usually releases the proposed state budget in the late fall. Buster is unable to predict how the UCCSN request will be received or what the state budget constraints will be.

Several questions were asked about how the CTOs can best support the technology requests. Buster said that they can make sure their presidents understand the technology requests; however their presidents probably do understand and have had considerable discussion already with the Chancellor's Office and regents. When asked about how the regents set priorities, Buster answered that many factors enter in, and politics plays a role. For example, health care priorities have a high political profile both within the UCCSN and within the state. Al Valbuena expressed an interest in working on a decision support system that would coordinate requests and demonstrate their benefits.

Buster was asked about his impressions of the UCCSN on returning after an absence of a number of years. He said the System appears to have matured and is facing serious growth and funding issues.

2. The Future of UCCSN Administrative Applications – Ginger Holladay-Houston, Assistant Director for Applications

Ginger reported on recent meetings of the Human Resources Directors and the Advantage Steering Committee. Her notes are included below.

Human Resource System

A few months ago the Human Resources Directors expressed their dissatisfaction with the Integral Human Resources System and requested that SCS facilitate a project to assess their needs for a Human Resources/Payroll System. SCS has

contracted with IBM to do the assessment and the project is underway. The objectives of the project are:

- Define the necessary requirements for an HR / Payroll system
- Examine the current system's capabilities
- Determine the gaps between the current Integral system and the defined requirements
- Develop an HR/Payroll system direction for the future

Throughout the assessment, integration issues with the other two UCCSN administrative systems (Financial and Student Information systems) as well as any campus applications will be assessed and documented. Ultimately, the Human Resource Directors would like to purchase a Human Resource Management System that better fits their needs.

Financial System

On May 24, 2004 SCS presented some issues and options to the Advantage 3 Steering Committee. The main issue presented by SCS centers on the hardware needed to run the new Advantage 3 application. Our current hardware is inadequate and an upgrade will be needed. The extent of the upgrade is not clear at this time. Based on this information, SCS recommended that the Advantage 3 implementation be delayed for a year. SCS also pointed out that this delay would give the UCCSN the opportunity to investigate the market.

The Financial community added another issue to the discussion. Many of the users are not pleased with the Advantage 3 product. They have requested that we facilitate a project similar to the HR/Payroll assessment. SCS has agreed to this. Most probably we will expand the scope of the current assessment to include the financial functions.

It was suggested by both groups that an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system that integrates all three major administrative systems would be ideal.

Student Information System

SCS plans to discuss the status of the Student Information System with the campus people that are responsible for the functions within SIS (Admissions, Student Records, Student Accounts and Financial Aid). This discussion will take place in a few weeks.

Becky Seibert mentioned that the HR assessment group wanted to be sure the CTOs are included in the process and that SCS plays a role in ensuring integration between functional areas and between applications. The HR group said they would need to include campus functional experts from areas outside of HR in the assessment process. The CTOs emphasized their need to be a part of the process to ensure integration and coordination among their campus customers. Ginger said she planned to forward to them the assessment plan outlined by the consultants.

There was general discussion about future planning and funding for applications. Steve Zink shared some of his insights in consulting with other institutions on application integration. Al told the group about the CCSN proposal from IBM for the Student Monitoring System Validation Study.

3. Future CTO Meetings – Becky Seibert

Becky asked the group how often CTO meetings should be scheduled. Responses varied from every month to every two months with “face to face” meetings scheduled several times a year.