



CAMPUS MANAGEMENT TEAM RECOMMENDATION

Process: Data Conversion/Migration

Description of Recommendation:

Since 1997, student transcript records have been audited. Initially, two former recording clerks were hired on a temporary basis to audit all transcript records of students enrolled spring 1997. After the initial audit was completed, an ongoing audit of student records has been conducted by Senior Recording Clerks in the Registrar's Office.

We propose to migrate five (5) years of student data to Campus Management. Therefore, any student who was enrolled spring 1997 or later should be migrated to CM. Also, any applicant for a future term (intersession 2003 or later) should be converted to CM. After data is converted and maintained in CM, only those students who do not enroll (do not have a schedule) after one (1) year should be purged from the system.

If Information Technology and SAP can provide a "holding bucket" for student academic history where the information can be easily electronically converted to CM (for the readmission process and the transcript production process), only currently enrolled students (spring 2003) and applicants for future terms (intersession 2003 or later) should be converted to CM.

In addition to current on-line records in the Student Information System, there are many historical records that need to be converted or migrated to SAP. The creation and purpose of these records is documented below.

Upon the completion of each term, historical tapes are produced to satisfy the reporting needs of the university, in particular federal and state government agencies, the IHL, and others. Since this process began in 1979 and continues to exist today, the University has accumulated a tremendous amount of historical data. The data from which these historical tapes are created, and the COBOL programs that must be executed to create them, reside on the mainframe. As part of the proposal, the Campus Management team has researched the course of action that would be required to convert the historical tapes from the mainframe to an alternative storage device from which reports can continue to be

generated. This course of action also requires the design, development, and implementation of an ongoing method to extract and store the necessary historical data from Campus Management upon the completion of each term. Once the migration to Campus Management is complete, there will be a need to generate reports from historical data converted from the legacy system, new historical data extracted from Campus Management, and in some cases a combination of data from both the converted legacy system data and Campus Management historical data. For example, to support the Federal IPEDS Graduation Rate Survey known as GRS01, the university must be able to read, combine, and analyze 6 to 10 years of information. There are also programs, run by the department of Institutional Research, which read this same data to create a 10 year retention analysis report. Finally, a research team was put together for the purpose of analyzing the reporting needs of the university. Their findings revealed 20 programs run on historical data to meet the external mandated reporting needs of the university and 95 programs run on the historical data to meet institutional mandated reporting needs.

Before a strategy to convert the historical tapes from the mainframe to an alternative storage device can be recommended, a number of factors concerning the historical tapes had to be researched and identified. The team began by consulting the appropriate individuals to identify the categories of tapes "GIDs" that are absolutely necessary to convert. Upon completion of this process, each GID was examined to determine its number of generations, layout, and total number of bytes. Of the more than 100 historical GIDs reviewed, the Campus Management team identified 26 that must be converted to an alternative storage device. These 26 different GIDs amount to 7,421,774,432 bytes or 7.4 gigabytes of data. Detailed documents describing the record layout, record length, and calculation of total bytes for each GID are attached.

Underlying Opportunities:

With student transcript data maintained in CM, we should be able to produce a transcript from the system. The online transcript project has been anticipated for many years.

The Campus Management team has already determined, along with the recommendation of SAP consultants, that not all active data should be converted from the legacy system to SAP due to performance issues. Once the criteria for selecting student records to be converted to SAP are established, the issue concerning how to store the remaining student records in the legacy system will have to be addressed. The Campus Management team recommends storing the remaining student records in the Legacy system and the historical data in two separate databases. Storing these two separate groups of data in separate storage devices presents an opportunity to design a historical database with a structure that is based on the current reporting needs of the university, thus facilitating the continuous extraction and storage of historical data each term.

The remaining student data will be stored in a database that will be used to house purged (or archived) data from SAP. This database will mainly be utilized to restore records in SAP whereupon a student, who has previously been purged from the active SAP system, reapplies to the university.

Pros Supporting the Recommendation:

Converting five (5) years of student data to CM will be beneficial to several student services offices including Registrar, Admissions, Graduate School, Law School, academic departments, and deans' offices.

*An audit has already been performed on students who were enrolled since spring 1997; therefore, data are considered accurate.

*Data will be readily accessible for viewing by academic and administrative offices without having to come to the Registrar's Office or requesting that the transcript be sent.

*Most students who will be accessed by academic and administrative offices would have been enrolled at some point since 1997. If the data were to be re-entered manually, an audit would have to be performed. Another records audit would duplicate work and is very costly, labor intensive, and time consuming.

Cons Against the Recommendation:

The size of hardware and storage space must be considered.

Issues, Concerns, or Currently Unresolved Aspects of the Recommendation:

An outstanding issue is transcript production for students who are not in CM (or the holding bucket) or students who apply for readmission. Imaging records is a possible solution to this issue. If a student requests a transcript or applies for readmission, the imaged record would be printed from the CD and manually entered or preferably electronically transferred from the imaging system into CM. After the record had been entered in CM and audited, the record would be deleted from the CD. Timing of this process would be critical.

The holding bucket itself is an unresolved issue. Exactly how the holding bucket will function has not been clearly articulated.

The process of loading applications that are in process is unresolved. Currently, we are required to store a notification in order to use workflow for the admissions process.

Date Submitted: July 2002

Submitted by:

Charlotte Fant and Larry Ridgeway