

UNIVERSITY of GLASGOW

**Student Lifecycle Project Board**

Minute of Meeting held on **Wednesday 4 June 2008** in the Turnbull Room.

**Present:** Carol Clugston, Robert Fraser, Jan Hulme, Neal Juster, Christine Lowther, Sandy Macdonald, David Newall (Convener), Andrea Nolan, Stuart Reid

**In Attendance:** [REDACTED] Janice McLellan (Clerk)

**Apologies:** Gavin Lee

**1. Minutes of the meeting held on 6 May 2008**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

It was agreed that Professor Paul Hagan and Dr. Arthur Whittaker would be co-opted on to the Project Board for the purposes of the supplier selection process. Professor David Fearn was unable to take part.

**2. Matters Arising**

***Review of Supplier Demonstrations***

It was confirmed that following the Project Board review of each of the supplier's presentations the strengths and weaknesses for each had been documented and issued to the Project Board members on Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2008.

***Key Supplier Dates***

The Senior Management Group (SMG) had been advised of the budget allocation for the implementation phase of the project. It was confirmed that clear provision had been made. Court had been given a general progress update at the meeting held during April 2008. The Convener would request their delegated authority, on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2008, to enable contractual commitments to be made on their behalf.

It was agreed that Neal Juster, Andrea Nolan and David Newall would produce a brief progress update for the next meeting of Senate on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2008.

**Action: DN, NJ & AN**

***Policy Decisions***

It was noted that progress of the items requiring a policy decision would be discussed as a separate agenda item.

***Reference Site Visits***

It was noted that reference site visits would be discussed as a separate agenda item.

***Highlight Report & Risk Log -Functional Experts***

It was noted that the on site workshops, functional demonstrations and open demonstrations had been well attended by the functional experts, the project team and representatives from Faculties and University Services.

***Change Management Strategy***

It was confirmed that the recruitment of a Change Management Team would be progressed as part of the implementation phase.

### *Change Academy Team Update*

Christine Lowther confirmed that potential members of the Change Academy Team had been identified and were now being approached. Paul Hagan, Arthur Whittaker and Gavin Lee had confirmed their membership. Tom Guthrie and another newer adviser were yet to be contacted.

### *Any Other Business - New Risk*

It was confirmed that the risk reflecting the possibility that the University would be unable to select a suitable supplier from this round of discussions had been added to the Risk Log.

### **3. Highlight Report & Risk Log**

It was confirmed that the project remained on track, with the major current activity being the on site workshops, functional demonstrations and open demonstrations with the suppliers. These meetings were well attended by the functional experts, the project team and representatives from Faculties and University Services.

It was noted that due diligence, with the preferred supplier, was planned as part of the procurement phase of the project; however this activity would not take place during the current financial year. As such it was noted that the remaining unallocated budget would need to be carried forward in order for this phase of the project to be properly completed.

The responses to the Invitation to Participate in Dialogue (ITPD) were due to be received by 12 noon on 4<sup>th</sup> June 2008. The relevant sections would then be distributed to the evaluators.

It was noted that a new risk had been raised by the Project Assurance Team:

‘Potential delay to project timescales if a challenge were to be received from an unsuccessful supplier at the ITPD stage of the procurement process.’

It was confirmed that advice had been sought from Tom McAra and from the NCC Group. It was anticipated that all three suppliers would need to be taken through to the final stage in the procurement process and therefore this risk was unlikely to materialise.

The Project Board reviewed the risk relating to the possibility that the University would be unable to select a suitable supplier from this procurement round. It was noted that there would be a level of risk and compromise with each of the solutions. It would be necessary to consider alternative ways of addressing any gaps identified during the evaluation process, such as through business and behaviour change or reducing the scope of this project. An option would be to go back to market again; however it was agreed that the probability of this risk was not high enough at this time to warrant this type of action. The short listed suppliers would probably be the same, perhaps with one other, e.g. Agresso, being added.

It was confirmed that several of the Board Members would be on annual leave when the Invitation to Submit the Final Tender (ITSFT) was due to be issued (9<sup>th</sup> July 2008). A meeting has been arranged with David Newall, Robert Fraser and Neal Juster during week commencing 23<sup>rd</sup> June to agree in principle the format of the ITSFT so as not to delay the issue of this document.

#### 4. Reference Site Visits

The purpose of the reference site visits was to gain a better understanding of the products, the suppliers, the implementation process and the benefits derived. Four visits were undertaken:

- Atos Origin/ Oracle – Fontys University, Eindhoven (Sandy Macdonald, Christine Lowther and Janice McLellan) and the University of Cambridge (Sandy Macdonald, Christine Lowther, Arthur Whittaker and David Newall).
- SunGard – University of Greenwich (Sandy Macdonald, Christine Lowther, Arthur Whittaker and Carol Clugston).
- Tribal – University of Wolverhampton (Sandy Macdonald, Christine Lowther, Arthur Whittaker and David Newall).

The visits were summarised as follows:

- All universities were positive about the product they were using and their current relationship with their supplier.
- All three suppliers had good user networks, which enable sharing of ideas. These networks are both in the UK and the United States for SunGard and Oracle.
- With the exception of Cambridge, who implemented in 2005, the other universities had implemented ten years ago. Their reasons for implementing were different from Glasgow.
- The universities had not yet fully exploited the available functionality of the solutions. This was recognised as a huge opportunity for Glasgow to stretch whichever solution was chosen.
- Student Information System Projects must be seen as long term projects to gain maximum benefit from the products and therefore must be resourced appropriately.
- Implementation of all three products would require considerable effort on the part of the university, e.g. for initial set up of rules for assessment modules.
- In general the reference site visits reinforced the strengths and weaknesses identified by the Project Board during the 6<sup>th</sup> May presentations.
- The quality of implementation team would be essential to the success of the project.
- Wolverhampton had some concerns that the SITS staff were being spread too thinly, particularly with the Edinburgh project underway.
- Cambridge believed that Oracle is committed to the UK market and other markets outside of the US. They have no experience of working with Atos Origin having implemented with Ciber. They have recently gone through a tendering process for support for the current upgrade at the end of which they selected CY2.
- Fontys had used various consultants, including Atos, during the ten years they have been using the product.
- Greenwich confirmed that they believe as there is a UK member on the SunGard Board their voice is now being heard.

It was noted that should Atos Origin/Oracle be the University's preferred supplier it was likely that two contracts would be required. One contract would be with Oracle for the product and the licence and the other with Atos for the implementation services.

## 5. **Policy Decisions**

The policy decisions document has been updated to reflect the Board's discussions. It was agreed that those staff who have been asked to progress the items should provide regular updates to the Project Board. The Project Board would review progress again in the autumn.

### *Ref 4: Room booking and timetabling*

It was agreed that initially all rooms should be held on one system. The Project Convener and Christine Lowther would meet with Jim McConnell and Cula Murphy, Estates & Buildings (E&B) to discuss this item.

**Action: DN & CRL**

### *Ref. 6: Enrolment*

The assumption was that there would be online student enrolment across the whole curriculum. The Project Convener and Christine Lowther would progress this with Noreen Burrows.

**Action: DN & CRL**

### *Ref. 8: Automation of offers*

It was agreed that Jan Hulme would discuss automation of offers with RAPS to fully understand the requirement.

**Action: JH**

### *Ref 9 and 10: Direct Applications*

It was agreed that Christine Lowther should discuss recoding all direct applications, regardless of the outcome, with Sharne Procter in the first instance.

**Action: CRL**

### *Ref. 11: Management of 1 +3 Degrees*

It was agreed that the Project Convener and Christine Lowther should meet with Jane Townson to establish a clearer business rule for processing 1+ 3 PGR Degrees.

**Action: DN & CRL**

### *Ref 12: Debt Management*

It was agreed that Robert Fraser and Christine Lowther would discuss the method to be used to chase student debts and the system which should be used to process debt management.

**Action: RF & CRL**

### *Ref 15: Management of Alumni Information*

It was agreed that this item required an operational decision rather than a policy decision. Christine Lowther would progress this item with Cathy Bell and James Coleman. If Raisers Edge was to be used as a wider CRM model, it would be necessary to involve David Newall in discussions.

**Action: CRL**

It was confirmed that Business Intelligence Data Warehousing would be a separate consideration and would be required to start within the next few months, moving slightly behind the Student Lifecycle Project.

## 6. **ITPD Evaluation – Briefing**

The responses to the ITPD were due to be received by 12 noon on 4<sup>th</sup> June 2008. The relevant sections would then be distributed to the various evaluation teams

including the Project Board. It was confirmed that the model for evaluation was relatively standard, with functionality being 20% of the overall score.

It was agreed that the Project Board would complete their scoring by the 12<sup>th</sup> June 2008, following the supplier presentations on 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> June. At the evaluation meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> June there would be presentations on the Functional and Technical evaluations to inform the discussions.

**7. ITSFT – Outline of contents**

The ITPD evaluation was not the last step in the process. The ITSFT would be issued on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2008. This document would pull all the tenders into line and define how we would complete the procurement phase. On receipt of the ITSFT responses (23<sup>rd</sup> July 2008), a further evaluation exercise would take place to enable the Project Board to select the preferred supplier.

Following this decision due diligence would be carried out with the preferred supplier. This would involve more work than normal pre-contract however this exercise would help mitigate the risk on any gaps identified. It was agreed that David Newall and Sandy Macdonald should discuss which lawyers were to be used, ensuring that they have the experience required for this type of contract.

**Action: DN & SM**

**8. Project Assurance Team**

It was agreed that this item should be postponed to the next meeting.

**Action: JM**

**9. Any Other Business**

The Convener thanked the Project Team Members for their work to date.

**10. Freedom of Information**

Freedom of information was not discussed at the meeting.

*Clerk's note:* Under the exemption of being contrary to the University's confidential interests, that information relating to the implementation budget should be treated as exempt until further notice.

**11. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting was due to be held on Monday 7<sup>th</sup> July 2008. As several Board Members would be on annual leave at that time the meeting would be rearranged.

**Action: JM**