STUDENT SUCCESS TECHNOLOGY PLATFORM RFP
GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS

• This will be the only tool approved/implemented with two-way data integration with ctcLink.
• All institutions will likely pay something, regardless of their decision to implement.
• There will be a state-negotiated price; institutions would not engage in pricing negotiations.
• Support needs may vary based on type of implementation.
PURPOSE: PREP FOR TWO QUESTIONS

• How will we fund the state-approved student success technology platform?
• How will we implement the platform?

WHY IT’S IMPORTANT

• We must have these answers in order to create and publish a complete RFP.
• Vendors have to know the landscape to determine cost and capacity.
GENERAL FUNDING OPTIONS

Super Big Picture
EVERYONE IN THE POOL

• We have one lump-sum price, and everyone contributes to that system price;
• Likely based on a complex algorithm that hopefully nobody understands;
• Likely includes headcount as primary variable;
• Likely one bill to SBCTC;
• Every institutions pays substantial portion and retains the right not to implement.
EVERYONE AT THE POOL

- There is a foundation cost, and additional cost based on how many colleges get into the pool;
- All institutions contribute some funds toward a base;
- Institutions implementing pay substantial additional costs, likely based on headcount;
- Need a sense of how many people will be in the pool and everyone retains the right not to implement.
BACKYARD POOL

• Minimal “all in” funds;
• The commitment to vendors is that they will be the sole product with two-way integration;
• Interested schools then work off a common pricing structure, though their engagement is more direct with the vendor, allowing for greater customization;
• Need a sense of how many people will build a pool; and everyone retains the right not to...
IMPLEMENTATION OPTIONS

Super Big Picture
CENTRALIZED

- Single instance of the platform, replicated for each institution;
- Instance is hosted at SBCTC;
- Requires common practice, coding, definitions, and data structures;
- Easiest to manage for two-way integration with ctcLink.
QUASI-CENTRALIZED

• Institutional instances of the platform, though with substantial guidance/requirements from SBCTC
• Thinking this looks most like Canvas;
• May strike a balance depending on flexibility of the platform.
DECENTRALIZED

- Each institution manages its own implementation;
- Most challenging with regard to two-way integration;
- Likely need some level of programming standards from SBCTC, though crosswalks may be possible.
- Most institutional control, though likely the most difficult for consistent ctcLink two-way integration.
UPDATES & TIMELINE

- Original timeline suggested an 18-month process.
- Working to pull that back to roughly 12 months.
- We are not doing further industry research or RFI phase.
- Taskforce has met twice for overview and launching the collection of priorities.
- We have a priority collection tool and a first draft of rating tool. Some commission/council visits.
- Need to have these decisions by end of May WACTC.
WHAT DO YOU NEED TO MAKE THESE DECISIONS?

HOW WOULD YOU LIKE TO MAKE THESE DECISIONS?

YOUR QUESTIONS?