

Chief Technology Officers Meeting – December 8  
Video 9:00 am – 12:00 am

UNLV Classroom Building Complex C 326  
WNCC Nevada State Library Lower Level Classroom E  
GBC Berg Hall Conference Room  
Reno System Administration Conference Room  
IBM, Atlanta, GA

Present: Brian Chongtai, NSC; Jeff Cox, GBC; Don Moxley, WNCC; Lori Temple, UNLV; Al Valbuena, CCSN; Steve Zink, UNR; Oscar Lewis, Sally Phares, Roberta Roth, Becky Seibert, John Tully, SCS; Kathy Hicks, Diana Sweetwood, IBM Business Consulting Services.

1. SCS Reports – Conversion of Employee ID, Web Contracts, DARwin

Oscar Lewis reported that SCS has nearly completed a project to replace social security numbers with new employee ID's as the primary UCCSN employee identifiers. The employee ID will be nine digits, will reside in the "employee ID" field, and will be unique throughout UCCSN. The new ID's will be put into production during the weekend of March 12 and 13. All SCS administrative systems will be unavailable for that weekend. Customer Services is developing explanatory documentation for employees and a web site will be up soon with information about the change. The SCS Human Resources programming group has been working with the Human Resources Advisory Council (HR Directors) and with the HRS User Group.

Oscar also reported on the implementation of web-based contract processing. The project grew out of a request for campuses to be able to distribute contract processing throughout their organizations. Testing has been underway for some time, and web contract processing will be available in a production mode on Friday, December 10. The Chancellor's Office has set a July 1, 2005 deadline for all contracts to be generated electronically. Printing is currently handled in the same way as "green screen" printing; however SCS is working to simplify printing with the web interface. Campus IT organizations can obtain RACF ID's from their campus Human Resources offices to do some testing of their own in preparation for helping campus users with printing issues. SCS is training the HR directors, who will in turn train campus users.

Roberta Roth reported that the project to convert from the DARS degree audit system to DARwin was completed in October. Miami University, the developer of DARS, is now supporting their new product, DARwin. DARwin is being used directly by student advisors on some UCCSN campuses. SCS has requested a few customizations from Miami University. A future release will add the capability for students to access DARwin directly themselves. There are some performance issues being addressed by SCS with Miami U. There are plans to increase capacity. Steve Zink asked whether rule changes had been put on hold during the migration and what their status currently is. Roberta will get an answer to the CTO's.

Roberta reported no news about the Advantage system other than that AMS will continue to support Advantage 2 for the foreseeable future. Lori asked how the transition was going for UNLV to begin using the SCS financial data warehouse. Roberta said training needs to continue.

## 2. Status of Campus Shadow Systems Inventory

Becky Seibert referred to the email Susan Bunyan sent to the CTO's on December 7. It contains a list of proposed data items to be collected about campus shadow systems. Sally Phares said that each institution had been contacted and some meetings have already started. Each representative present reported that he/she intends to be involved in this process and will provide information to the CTO's via SCS. UNR already has an inventory, and SCS should contact Jim McKinney about it. There was some discussion about the level of system to be included. Lori Temple is including systems that either cut across various UNLV departments or functions or interact with UCCSN databases. Lori reminded the group that this inventory request stems partly from a desire to share systems or techniques between institutions if feasible. Becky suggested that SCS should assist with developing a common reporting format that satisfies all the institutions.

## 3. SCS Project Management Briefings

Sally alerted the CTO's that SCS would be requesting an opportunity to visit each campus so that Linda Kennedy, the Manager of the SCS Project Office, could brief them on SCS's plans for project management and to solicit input on how the office might function best for campus needs. Steve mentioned the concern that SCS project priorities be set with input from campus personnel who are familiar with overall campus goals. Roberta and Becky responded that changing the governance process with respect to project priorities is an important goal for SCS as well. Lori expressed the hope that the governance process be changed quickly to make the best use of resources during the pre-integrated information system period.

## 4. CTO Spring Schedule

Becky asked how often the group would like to meet during the spring of 2005. It was agreed that once a month is a good goal. Becky will send out a tentative schedule.

## 5. PeopleSoft Visit to SCS

Becky referred the group to Roberta's December 7 email regarding the PeopleSoft visit to SCS on December 14. The visit was originally arranged to give SCS staff some background on potential ERP vendors. SAP has already visited. SCT is tentatively scheduled to visit on January 21. The CTO's are invited to attend the Reno meeting if they wish. This is not meant to replace the vendor visits and demos which will undoubtedly be set up by the Technology Task Force. (NOTE: This meeting was subsequently postponed due to Oracle's acquisition of PeopleSoft.)

## 6. Recommendations for Task Force Agenda

Becky suggested that the group consider topics they would like to see addressed by the Technology Task Force and forward suggestions to Regent Seastrand. She proposed several: What does campus readiness mean and what role should the Task Force play in that? What does integration really mean to each campus? Does it mandate a single ERP vendor? How and when will financing options be addressed? How should the Task Force deal with the issue of cost? There was much discussion about the fear that capping the cost would mean the failure of the project. Already determined for the agenda are a vendor analysis from Steve Zink and a presentation on implementation/integration options by Al Valbuena.

## 7. HR Assessment Meeting with Kathy Hicks and Diana Sweetwood, IBM Business Consulting Services (10:30 am)

Kathy gave a brief summary of the workshops held with HR and other functional representatives. There have been sixteen functional workshops, a visit to Elko and a technical workshop. Workshops were held for personnel administration, position control, student employee and graduate assistant management, and payroll administration. Overall, the workshops were very well attended. There was good representation from all of the institutions and the input proved to be right on topic based on workshops IBM has held with other higher education clients. IBM still anticipates that they will be ready to make a formal presentation of their findings in early 2005.

She then attempted to answer the questions posed to her in an email from Roberta and during the meeting by Lori and other CTO's. The primary concerns were related to points of integration between HR and the other functional areas. The CTO's cited the need to integrate with Vista and email. Kathy said that all of the issues raised by the CTO's had also been raised in the workshops. A question was posed about the requirements imposed by R1 research institutions. Kathy responded that DRI had provided extensive information about research HR requirements.

The next step for the workshop participants will be to rate the requirements with the following four criteria: 1 = Critical Importance, cannot complete business process without this functionality; 2 = Important, process can be completed, but work-arounds may compromise benefits or metrics; 3 = Nice to Have, This is really cool, but I can live without it for the initial roll-out; 4 = Not needed we don't need this functionality in the foreseeable future. She said that to date the institutions do not differ significantly in rating the requirements.

The CTO's stressed their desire for a vanilla implementation, and Kathy said she had heard similar comments in the workshops. John Tully mentioned that all of the potential vendors depend on third party solutions for ad hoc reporting and that Business Objects seems to be very popular. Becky asked about how the results of this effort can be used in evaluating and selecting a vendor. Kathy expects that the requirements document will be

helpful in preparing demo scripts for the vendors and went on to describe the deliverables requested by the Human Resources Advisory Council. They are: 1) a case for change, 2) ranked requirements, and 3) market alternatives and cost estimates for HR solutions based on the HRAC's guidelines to look only at ERP solutions.

#### 8. Additional Items

Steve Zink alerted the group that policies and procedures with respect to Student Technology Fees are being reviewed, and advised that CTO's might want to make sure their guidelines are published.