November 9, 2001

Assembly Member Elaine Alquist, Chair
Assembly Committee on Higher Education
1020 “N” Street, Room 152
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Ms. Alquist:

The California State Employees Association/CSU Division and the California Faculty Association would like to call your attention to an important issue pertaining to the CSU’s Common Management System (CMS) project. This project is a statewide computer system that is currently being implemented which claims to streamline computer information for the CSU’s Financial, Human Resources, and Student Administrative systems.

The cost for this project has been estimated between $450 and $1 billion dollars, depending on the source. Because this is such a massive and expensive procurement for CSU and the State of California in general, our organizations have been very interested in its status and progress. Unfortunately, it has been virtually impossible to ascertain any substantive and reliable information or background material relative to the project. Our members have found many discrepancies between the CSU’s explanations and what our members who work in the field on these computer systems report to us.

Because of these discrepancies, outlined in our enclosed report, we ask that you submit a request for a state-conducted audit to the Joint Audit Committee to provide an accounting of the expenditures for this project.

Our position regarding this request is based on the following factors.

1. No apparent accountability
2. Cost overruns
3. Downturn in the economy
4. Funding jobs in Utah when unemployment is dramatically increasing in California
5. Protecting class offerings as CSU enrollment increases
6. Increased security concerns
In summary, while both CSEA and CFA support the need of the CSU to upgrade its computer systems to better serve students, faculty, and staff, we strongly believe that it is in the best interest of the legislature and the taxpayers to be informed as to how much is being appropriated for such a project so that the state’s limited funds are being spent as appropriately as possible.

Sincerely yours,

MaryAnn Bailey-Breed and Teven C. Laxer
Senior Labor Relations Representatives

cc: Paul Mitchell, Committee Consultant
Jackie McClain, CSU Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
Karen Yelverton Zamarripa, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Governmental Affairs
CSEA/CSU Division Council
CSEA/CSU Staff
CSU Labor Council
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A. **Background**

1. In April 2001, CSEA distributed a document entitled, *Common Management System/PeopleSoft - Information and Concerns*. In this document, CSEA expressed several concerns regarding the cost of CMS and PeopleSoft, poor experiences with PeopleSoft software from around the country, the lack of any cost-benefit analysis, the lack of any legislative/public scrutiny, the potential impact of CMS/PeopleSoft on CSU jobs represented by CSEA, and taking tax dollars out of California by using a data center run by UNISYS in Utah. In addition, CSEA outlined an alternative to the PeopleSoft system.

2. The CSU issued a response to our statement on or about August 20, 2001, but CSEA didn’t receive a copy of it until September 10, 2001.

3. This document is CSEA’s response to the CSU’s August 2001 document. We have used the same headers that the CSU used, and we have numbered each statement or question.

4. CSEA is not opposed to a consolidated data center(s) and common software systems. But, in light of the tight fiscal situation in the state, we think the legislature should be fully aware of how the CSU is spending its money. CSEA firmly believes that the CSU should have utilized a state-wide task force comprised of all affected constituencies and should have been committed to utilizing CSU employees, rather than going to out-of-state vendors.

5. California State Employee Association (CSEA), Local 1000, SEIU, AFL-CIO, represents employees on 23 CSU campuses from Humboldt to San Diego. CSEA represents approximately 15,000 employees in four bargaining units: Bargaining Unit 2 (Health Care Support), Bargaining Unit 5 (Operations and Maintenance), Bargaining Unit 7 (Administrative Support) and Bargaining Unit 9 (Technical Support). Our membership encompasses a wide range of job classifications on every campus including, but not limited to, administrative support coordinators and analysts/specialists, computer programmers, equipment technicians, and information technology (IT) consultants. Each of these classes could potentially be affected by the CMS project, both in the amount of the employee workload and the elimination of currently assigned duties due to outsourcing.

6. The CSU boasts that the Statewide Academic Senate and the California State Students Association (CSSA) have provided "advice and counsel to the Executive Vice Chancellor on all aspects of CMS," yet CSEA has not had any representation on the CMS Project Advisory Committee.
B. Cost of CMS

In September, 1999, CSU Assistant Vice Chancellor for Information Technology, David Ernst was quoted as saying that the CMS system would cost approximately $350 million. At the March 20, 2001, meeting of the CSU Board of Trustees, Ernst reported that the total cost of the CMS project could range between $800 million and $1 billion. In August 2001, the CSU stated that the $1 billion figure was actually in reference to the total cost of all IT services in the CSU over a period of 5 to 7 years. The CSU also states that they are reporting annually to the legislature on IT projects, including the CMS. CSEA contends that there is a lack of clarity about the costs of these projects and we have never seen copies of any reports to the Legislature on CMS or IT.

1. Is the $400 million dollar Technology Infrastructure Initiative (TII)\(^1\) part of the $1 billion price tag?

2. Is there a line-item for TII in the CSU budget?

3. What is each campus paying annually towards CMS/PeopleSoft?

4. What is the total projected cost for each campus for the entire CMS project?

5. What are the annual costs and the projected total costs for the CSU system?

6. What is each campus paying for programs that are being run simultaneously?

7. Some campuses, like San Diego State University (SDSU), have chosen to develop their own software for Finance, Procurement, and Human Resources modules. SDSU has entered into a partnership with Oracle, known as Project LEAP, for this purpose.\(^2\) What is the annual and projected total cost of Project LEAP at the SDSU campus?

8. Are there other campuses like SDSU which are developing their own software modules? If so, what are the annual and projected total costs of their programs?

9. How much money do auxiliary organizations, including the Associated Students, have to contribute towards the implementation of CMS and how much money has been taken out of student activity accounts for CMS?

10. What portion of the $10.1 million requested by the CSU for student services goes towards supporting CMS/PeopleSoft?

11. How much has been spent on consultant-modified changes for each of the Human Resources and Finance modules, systemwide and by campus?

---

\(^1\) The Technology Infrastructure Initiative was previously known as the Technology Infrastructure Master Plan (TIMP).

\(^2\) LEAP stands for Learning Enabled Administrative Processes.
12. What is the cost to the state for on-going support and development of CMS?

13. What is the annual cost and the projected total cost of the outsourced data center in Salt Lake City, Utah?

14. How many employees at each campus are involved with the CMS/PeopleSoft project? What are their job classifications and assignments?

15. How many Management Personnel Plan (MPP) employees have been hired by the CSU to perform CMS/PeopleSoft work? What is the cost, by campus?

16. What is number and the cost of the consultants who have worked on the CMS project?

17. What is the cost to backfill work assignment vacancies created by the loss of technical people assigned to the CMS project?

18. How many “consultants” are ex-CSU employees, who have resigned from the state, only to continue working on the CMS project and how does their salary compare to their previous CSU salary?

19. How much overtime has resulted from the CMS project?

In conclusion, even if CMS project costs remain constant, the available budget resources most likely will not. Therefore, the overall budget percentage dedicated to CMS will rise drastically, siphoning off much-needed resources necessary to support the academic mission of the institution.

C. Accountability

1. CSEA stated that no return on investment (ROI) or cost effectiveness studies have ever been conducted by the CSU on the CMS project. The CSU failed to address this key issue in its response letter. This is one of the most significant questions about the CMS project and one that any auditor would surely want to address: Why was no ROI or cost-effectiveness analysis conducted?

2. CSEA also asked whether and how the CMS Initiative would result in increased enrollment, and whether and how it would decrease costs. The CSU did not address these questions.

3. In order to comply with the Information Practices Act and the Public Records Act, how does the CSU intend to log and report access to electronic files stored in Utah?

---

Because the CSU is contractually obligated to remain within two versions of the current PeopleSoft software release, we don’t regain campus positions when the CMS project goes into production. Instead, campus staff members assigned to the CMS project must immediately begin development work on the next release of PeopleSoft.
4. Have PeopleSoft and UNISYS or any subcontractors filed affirmative action policies, in compliance with the Vietnam Era Readjustment Act of 1974 and the 2001 settlement agreement between the CSU and the US Department of Labor?

In conclusion, by entrusting the CSU to self-report the total budget expenditures for CMS, it is all too easy to shift certain costs to other non-budgeted areas outside the CMS umbrella, giving the appearance that the CMS project is on target and within the budget. In this way, the real costs are almost impossible to measure.

D. History of Failed Projects in California

1. A June 2001 audit conducted by the California State Auditor found that California is failing in its promise to fix an oversight system that helps plan and construct state computer systems, costing taxpayers $2 billion per year. The Department of Information Technology (DOIT), created five years ago in the wake of two bungled computer projects, is not providing adequate guidance and oversight, the report found. The two failed projects were very costly: the Department of Motor Vehicles spent $51 million and the Department of Social Services $111 million on failed computer projects.

2. The state audit focused on four nearly completed state projects, begun from 1993 to 1998, and found that none has been completed on time or within budget. Cost overruns for the four projects ranged from $4 million to $28 million, and completion dates were delayed between nine months and nearly five years for a wide variety of reasons. The four projects were an electronic toll-collection system for the California Department of Transportation and multimillion-dollar computer projects for the Employment Development Department, the Franchise Tax Board and the Department of Health Services. In the case of the toll-collection system, for example, the department did not receive timely progress reports that would have documented changes that more than doubled the budget -- from $27.8 million to $56.1 million, the auditors said.

3. "DOIT would have been aware of project slippage as it occurred if it had required monthly reporting of two critical pieces of information: the project's monthly actual costs and revised estimates of total projected costs (and completion dates)," the report said.

4. Auditors claimed the Department of Information Technology has not adequately identified computer-project priorities, reviewed departments' strategic plans, or provided proper information, guidance, standards and oversight. Nor were "special project reports" filed to track cost or time overruns for several projects.

In conclusion, given the history of questionable performance of other technology projects in the State of California, CSEA and CFA are convinced that an audit of the CSU’s technology programs is in the best interests of the public. Has the CSU prepared written reports on both the ongoing costs of CMS and related projects as well as the estimated completion dates? If so, who has received copies of them?
E. Consolidated Data Center

1. Where is the Cost/Benefit Analysis or Return on Investment (ROI) for the Data Center Consolidation Project?

2. Is the cost of the Consolidated Data Center, currently run by UNISYS, included in the total cost of the CMS/PeopleSoft Project?

3. Benchmark specifications, programs, and simulations for benchmark verifications were not in the RFQ or RFP for the Consolidated Data Center. Were they ever created and/or given to the vendors? If not, why not?

4. What was the final cost of the IBM contract?

5. What would the final cost of the IBM data center have been if the contract with IBM had not been cancelled?

6. What will the final cost of the UNISYS data center be?

7. Is there a disaster recovery plan for this data center?

8. Is UNISYS liable for lost productivity and data during unplanned outages?

9. Is there a Business Continuity Plan (BCP)?

10. According to the University of Utah, the chance of a large earthquake in the Wasatch Front region of the state (which includes the site of the UNISYS data center) during the next fifty years is about 1 in 4. Was the potential earthquake hazard(s) in Salt Lake City, in particular at the UNISYS data center site, ever considered? [See Appendix B.]

11. What would happen to the data center if a magnitude 7.5 earthquake occurred along the Wasatch fault, which runs near the site?

12. Given the events of September 11th, is housing all of CSU’s data in only one consolidated data center still such a good idea?

In conclusion, if there were two regional data centers based in California and a natural disaster such as fire, flood, or earthquake struck one center, the system could be brought up by the second regional center. This is what happened when CSU Northridge was devastated by an earthquake in 1994. Other campuses were able to bring up CSUN’s systems.
F. Problems with PeopleSoft

1. If CMS is a centralized product, why is each campus running their own version of the Human Resources (HR) module?

2. In its April 2001 report, CSEA cited numerous problems that universities and other entities have had with PeopleSoft around the country. In CSU’s response, it routinely blamed the users, rather than PeopleSoft itself. PeopleSoft also has stated that most of, if not all, failed implementations were because of inadequately trained customer personnel and/or consultants. PeopleSoft has further stated that they have dealt with the issue by tightening up the requirements for consultants to receive PeopleSoft certification. Our question is: *Are all consultants doing CMS/PeopleSoft implementation work PeopleSoft-certified consultants?*

3. The IT industry is well-known for marketing "vaporware", hoping to be able to find buyers based on a superficial prototype of what may be a good idea but not yet fully developed behind the scenes. The CSU’s own Technology Evaluation Team which reviewed proposals from PeopleSoft, SCT, and Oracle, stated in a report dated October 5, 1997, that the PeopleSoft presentation was not focused to CSU’s guidelines, the presentation examples used by their “experts” did not work, and that the student records module was not practical for production.

4. Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, has elected not to implement the Student Administration module at this time (and possibly not for several years down the road) because they were inadequate to the needs of the campus. A video on the Cal Poly website states that the Student Administration module is "...not mature, ...questionable when compared to current functionality" and that the campus "...recommend to the President that Cal Poly hold off" with its implementation.4

5. Recently, CSEA learned about a suit against PeopleSoft by Connecticut General Life Insurance Company over the aborted installation of their finance system. Connecticut General claimed that it was forced to develop a home-grown application after PeopleSoft failed to deliver customized software that was promised as part of a 1999 contract. The suit also alleges that the projected cost of the project escalated from $5.16 million to $11.7 million. The suit was filed in US District Court in San Francisco.

6. CSEA would also like to see a listing of all incidents, by campus, logged at the CMS help desk. This would enable us to view open/closed/solved issues by campus, and allow us to see which issues were discovered, and how rapidly they were solved.

7. It has been reported that PeopleSoft is hiring programmers in the Philippines. How much programming or data entry is being done overseas? In what countries? What are the wages and benefits of the workers used overseas?

---

4  http://mediaserver.calpoly.edu/mbase/asset/Administration/CMS/Clip4_Modem_RM.rm
G. End-User Complaints

Problems with the implementation of PeopleSoft have been reported on many campuses in various areas, including, but not limited to payroll, financial aid, and fiscal services.

1. Both the San Diego State University Foundation and the Cal Poly San Luis Obispo Foundation are looking at abandoning the PeopleSoft package for HR and Financials because of the high-level of maintenance required to keep it current and functioning.

2. Employees at CSU Northridge who have been assigned PeopleSoft tasks have complained about a lack of training, dramatically increased workload, lack of support, and increased stress. Many say that they no longer having the time to do "their regular jobs" because they are spending so much time on PeopleSoft. They report that they have had difficulty getting responses from the PeopleSoft Help desk email and their phone calls are not being returned. They also report that the personnel information in PeopleSoft is erroneous and causes "panic phone calls for clarification." Thus they do more research and try to correct the problems, but without an understanding of the cause of the errors. The Payroll office tasks now include duplicate input into the PeopleSoft systems as well as the normal State Controllers System (SCO). Employees also report delays in processing payroll and part-time faculty separations. Employees also report that they were assigned to process financial aid checks with no training what so ever. In some cases, employees still have not received any formal training after more than four months.

3. Employees at Humboldt State University report that at the very first meeting they had to discuss PeopleSoft, the audience was informed that PeopleSoft was not going to write a program specifically for the CSU - that, in fact, the CSU was going to adjust its processes to what PeopleSoft calls the "vanilla" version of their program. That means, they say, that the end product will likely be less than Payroll has available now through the State Controller's Office. The new system will be much more labor intensive than the current system (i.e., a payroll document that is keyed onto the current SCO system is three screens long, whereas the PeopleSoft system will require 13 screens to key the same info). This means that "every time we key a document we will have to slog through more than 4 times as many terminal screens to get the job done." Staff have also received reports that student employees (Student Assistants and Work Study employees) under PeopleSoft have to be appointed and separated the same as regular employees. Under our current system, once the student's Spar (W-4 information) is entered into the system, then all that needs to be done each month is to key a batch that includes all hours worked for all students from a specific department. If they work, they get paid; if they don't work, no money. Under the new system, a 13-screen document must be keyed for each student that is hired. If they don't work for a pay period, they must be separated (another 13-screen document), and then re-appointed (yet another 13-screen document) the next time they work. When you consider that Humboldt pays approximately 1200 students per month, this will be an incredible workload increase (and Humboldt is one of the smaller campuses).
H. Keep CSU Work in California

1. In its April 2001 position paper, CSEA raised concerns about job security and promotional opportunities for thousands of professional and technical staff we represent. We stated that the final CSU plan could result in outsourcing all campus administrative support systems, including help desks, e-mail systems, and networks. The technical staff at each CSU campus are already doing work similar in scope and function to that required by the CMS project, and they would like to continue in their current positions, plus be given the opportunity to be trained to support the CMS hardware and software.

2. The CSU responded that “no CSU employee has or will be displaced by CMS.” However, just six months ago, the CSU was very close to laying off nine analyst/programmers in Fresno who performed work that will be taken over by the CMS project. Quick intervention by CSEA averted these layoffs, and preserved the jobs of these employees.

3. CSEA is also concerned about what happens to the technical jobs at the 23 individual campus Data Centers when the CMS project goes live statewide within the next several years. CSU’s assurances are not trusted because of effort such as the one described above.

4. Furthermore, CSEA has recently learned that CIBER, Inc. has been chosen to provide PeopleSoft Consulting Services with Project Management, Functional Support Services, Technical Support Services and Supplemental Support Services. Apparently, the services of CIBER, Inc. are already being used on the campuses of CSU Fresno, CSU San Bernardino, CSU Los Angeles, and the Chancellor’s Office. CSEA contends that this is work that should be performed by CSU employees represented by CSEA.

5. In their response, CSU claims that CSEA and CSU have agreed on a training program for IT professionals. This is not true. CSEA and CSU are parties to a IT Labor Management Committee, facilitated by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Services (“FMCS”). So far the committee has issued an interim report dealing with training and professional development and salaries and benefits. Unfortunately, the CSU has rejected each and every one of the recommendations made by the joint committee and doesn’t seem interested in even talking about these important issues. Their statement that CSEA’s concerns are “either misinformed or disingenuous” is itself misleading and patently false.

6. The potential erosion of the bargaining unit due to outsourcing has a chilling effect on IT employees within the CSU. IT employees thrive on keeping current with new technologies so that they can do the best job possible serving the needs of the campuses and students. What is wrong with the concept of a IT career within the CSU that serves the needs of California students and taxpayers?

7. What portion of the cost of retraining will be included in the costs of the CMS/PeopleSoft project or the Data Center Consolidation project?
8. In their response, the CSU claims that its campuses couldn’t handle a system-wide data center, yet the campuses were never actually consulted.

9. The CSU asserts that "some of the individual tasks performed at a consolidated data center do fall within existing CSU job classifications. However, the CSU has neither the experience nor the capacity at any of its campuses or the Chancellor's Office to run a system wide data center..." Besides being a horrific insult, this statement is a patent falsehood! There are or have been at least four system-wide data centers housed at San Luis Obispo, Sonoma, Los Angeles and the Chancellor's Office. The Chancellor’s Office ran a centralized cyber system for instructional purposes. Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, runs a systemwide business database. CSU Los Angeles runs a systemwide social sciences database. Sonoma State University ran a systemwide US Census database.

10. CSEA believes that there is little cost benefit to the state economy of having taxpayers dollars pay for a data center in Utah, especially when the economy is in a downturn.

In conclusion, the Data Center should be in California and operated by the CSU with CSU employees. CSEA is also concerned about the security of information with an outside contractor and no oversight. One must remember that the some of the data stored will be for student and employee information. This information should be secured and controlled by a state agency and not a third party contractor.

A CSU-run data center in California could also serve the Community College and K-12 community. The age of standardized testing, enrollment patterns, matriculation agreements, and educational quality is upon us. This all requires data tracking and storage. The CSU is the endpoint for a majority of California students. What if the CSU cooperated with other public education agencies to facilitate data storage and acquisition to maintain and improve public education overall?

I. Alternatives to the CMS/PeopleSoft system

1. Currently, each of the 23 CSU campuses has the autonomy to purchase, plan and implement their own software system to handle student registration, accounting, financial aid, housing and human resources (HR).

2. Integration of software specifically designed to meet the needs of the CSU as mandated by the legislature, and the many Chancellor's Office-mandated reporting requirements, is far easier to accomplish than is an attempt to force each campus to change its practices to match the dictates of commercial systems such as PeopleSoft.

3. It has already been documented that the generic version of PeopleSoft's software will require extensive modifications, which will most surely lead to cost overruns, delayed implementation and potential failure. This is due to the continual need to modify data collection and reporting as mandated by the State Legislature and the Chancellor's Office.

4. An efficient administrative software system process could be the acquisition of common software maintained by the campus staff. This has proven to be the most workable solution. Changes to the system mandated by the Legislature and the Chancellor's Office...
can be managed through campus consortiums organized centrally. Specifications for changes would be drawn up by campus user groups and software would be created and tested, and then released in a matter of weeks, at no cost to the taxpayers through common distribution libraries. Campus staff would be able to add local modifications as necessary to match their unique campus environment.

5. Alternatives to the PeopleSoft programs currently in place on CSU campuses include:

a. **SIMS (Student Information Management System)** is a system currently in use by four of the largest CSU campuses (San Diego, San Francisco, Northridge, and Fresno). It was originally developed for statewide use, but fell out of favor with top-level management at the Chancellor's Office. The SIMS system, which was developed in-house lends itself to unlimited integration with other systems.

b. **LEAP (Learning Enabled Administrative Processes Project)** is a partnership between San Diego State University (SDSU) and Oracle to integrate new computer applications in finance, procurement, and human resources. Even though SDSU was given a 5 year “exemption” from implementing PeopleSoft, they are not exempted from the mandate that they contribute annually to the PeopleSoft project from their baseline campus budget.

c. **SCT/Banner** is used at CSU Bakersfield, San Marcos, Dominguez Hills, Humboldt, Stanislaus and Pomona for student information, HR, financial reporting, financial aid, and alumni. SCT also makes SIS+ which provides student information software at nine campuses.

6. These diverse software packages do not necessarily communicate well with one another, but integrating software systems at each campus is not a valid reason to replace entire systems. The Chancellor's Office has used this argument for integration repeatedly in an attempt to convince campuses that generic commercial software would suit the needs of the campuses better. Yet integration of systems has never been a high priority at the campuses.

In conclusion, the CSU currently has staff in place at each campus, and the Chancellor’s Office, who have demonstrated a proven ability to plan, develop, implement and manage a wide range of specialized campus-based information systems. By using software developed and maintained by these staff members, student enrollment across the CSU system is at record levels, thus proving that the current systems used today are both flexible and capable of required growth. The transition to the PeopleSoft administrative system could be done more reliably and at much less cost to the taxpayers by using CSU staff, instead of high-priced consultants, to implement a new administrative system. In addition to this, the technical jobs currently being performed by UNISYS at the outsourced data center in Utah would remain within the state of California.
J. Conclusion and Recommendations

The CMS project could have been planned, managed and operated within the CSU system, with CSU employees. This could have resulted in a significant savings to the taxpayers. In order to better serve the students, faculty, and staff of the CSU, CSEA makes the following recommendations:

1. A legislative audit should be conducted in order to seek answers to the questions we pose throughout this document and analyze the responses and data collected.

2. Hold legislative hearings on CMS/PeopleSoft so that the legislature, public, and university community all have an opportunity to review and debate the future use of technology in the CSU.

3. Any future funds for the CMS project should come from specific line-item allocations in the CSU budget that are above the “partnership level” agreed upon by the Governor and the CSU.

4. CSEA also recommends that the CSU establish two or three regional data centers on CSU campuses, rather than contract with UNISYS to run a consolidated center in Utah.

5. The CSU should be required to identify computer-project priorities, review strategic plans, and provide proper information, guidance, standards and oversight. The CSU should also track cost or time overruns.

6. A legislative resolution regarding the CMS project should be introduced seeking a strategic plan to integrate current computer systems with the CMS project. The resolution should include the following:
   a. Provide strong leadership to ensure that the CSU develop the CMS system more effectively.
   b. Provide campuses with a statewide plan outlining the vision and direction of CSU's efforts, which would include the role of the CSU IT employees.
   c. Adopt best practices for best solutions to protect the interests of the state.
   d. Define deadlines by providing contract language to protect the CSU if the vendor does not complete their work on schedule.
   e. Ensure independent oversight to prevent the work from being contracted out.
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APPENDIX B

University of Utah graphic showing hypothetical 7.5 magnitude earthquake along the Wasatch Fault

Maximum normal-faulting earthquake scenario: the 1959 Ms=7.5, Hebgen Lake, Montana, earthquake applied to the north Salt Lake City segment
APPENDIX C

Current Software Systems used by CSU Campuses

According to the April 15, 1997 RFQ 960055 for CMS (Software), Appendix B, these are the systems currently used by CSU campuses:

Student Information System:
SIS+       - 9 campuses (SCT product for IBM MVS)
Banner     - 6 campuses (SCT product for UNIX)
SIMS       - 6 campuses (CSU In-house for IBM MVS)
EDEN-OA    - 1 campus (Digital Equipment Corp.)

Financial Reporting System:
CSU/FRS    - 22 campuses

Human Resources:
HRS        - 2 campuses (SCT product for IBM MVS)
Banner     - 3 campuses (SCT product for UNIX)
SCO        - 1 campus
local software - 10 campuses
none or unknown - 6 campuses

SIMS/R is currently integrated with several other systems:
* A commercially available degree auditing system.
* A system for electronic transmission of transcripts between community colleges.
* Undergraduate and Graduate-level applications for admission via the internet.

Campuses have integrated SIMS with additional systems:
* Financial Aids
* Accounts Receivable/Accounts Payable
* Human Resources
* Library/ID cards
* Student Housing