

Testimony to Senate Education - The Uniform Chart of Accounts and Shared School District Data Management System

Given By:

Daniel M. French, Ed. D., Secretary of Education

The implementation of the Uniform Chart of Accounts (UCOA) and the Shared School District Data Management System (SSDDMS) are complex projects that are being implemented simultaneously with Act 46 mergers, significant changes to our special education system (Act 173), and the introduction of other major statewide data systems including a new grants management system, and the state's first longitudinal data system.

Last week the Committee heard testimony from Alena Berube, Special Education Finance Manager, on a status update on the implementation of the SSDDMS. As stated in her testimony, we support a delay in the implementation of the SSDDMS for districts merging under the State Board of Education's Final Report and Order. Such a delay would spread the number of SUs going live over two years more evenly, which would make implementation easier for both the AOE and for the participating districts.

Any consideration of delay should include an assessment of the system's capacity to implement the initiative. Below is an assessment of the system's capacity in terms of district, AOE, and vendor capacity.

District Capacity

VASBO Past-President Brenda Fleming raised important concerns about district capacity to do this work in her testimony last week. I agree with her assessment and offer my own observations on district capacity to implement the SSDDMS:

1. VASBO estimates approximately 1/3 of Vermont school district are currently using outdated software applications for accounting and HR functions. It is difficult to transition these districts to a modern software platform. For them, this is an entirely new experience.
2. Like the outdated software issue, there is a concern about unique business rules and financial control systems at the local level. Implementing a new system based on accounting best practices will create challenges for many districts since they will be required to abandon their old rules and practices in favor of new ones. A delay will give the AOE additional time to publish an updated accounting handbook which will assist in this area.
3. Many districts already have integrated accounting and HR systems. It would have been helpful to the process to have had some of these districts in the first-round implementation of the SSDDMS since their experience could have helped inform the implementation for districts.

AOE Capacity

The AOE does not have a dedicated staff person to serve as the point of contact for districts in this work. A new position from another AOE division has been allocated to the support the SSDDMS and will be filled soon. Also, AOE CFO Emily Byrne recently resigned. Ms. Byrne

played an important role in the roll out of the SSDDMS. A delay would allow us to build out better support capacity at the AOE including filling the direct support position and the CFO position.

Vendor Capacity

The vendor, PowerSchool, has increased its resources for the implementation of the SSDDMS to include onsite trainings in Vermont. PowerSchool has been a good partner in the implementation to date and has expressed a willingness to adapt the support and implementation approach based on the needs of our districts.

There have been concerns expressed about the quality of the software even though the software is well established in the industry and used in other states.

Here is a summary of the vendor selection process as described in *Executive Summary: Findings and Recommendations Shared School District Data Management System (SSDDMS)* published by the AOE in February 2018:

- **Authoring the RFP:** AOE collaborated with an independent contractor (Berry Dunn), the Vermont Association of School Business Officials (VASBO), and the Agency of Digital services (ADS) to identify and document the functional business requirements and non-functional technical requirements to be included in the SSDDMS request for proposal (RFP). The final RFP published reflects feedback from both local and state stakeholders, from those with business and/or technical expertise. The RFP was posted on September 13, 2017.
- **Evaluate Vendor Proposals:** Proposals were scored on a number of items as they relate to the following categories: (1) bidder profile (experience, financial strength, and references), (2) ability to meet the State’s functional and non-functional system requirements, (3) implementation services with Project Management and technical execution, (4) maintenance and support services, and (5) pricing. **Initially, we withheld any information related to pricing from the evaluation committee so that the quality of each vendor’s proposal could be initially evaluated without bias regarding price. Pricing was only revealed after proposal scoring was submitted.** There were 4 total proposals received. Three proposals were scored by the review team. One proposal, did not meet minimum requirements of the State’s procurement policies, administered by BGS, and as such, was not evaluated. The proposal evaluation period occurred between October 26, 2017 and November 21, 2017.
- **On-Site Demonstrations:** All three vendors were invited to provide on-site demonstrations to show how the proposed solution met specific requirements outlined in a demonstration script provided to the vendors ahead of time. A scoring template aligned with the demo script was used by the review team to assess how well the software met the focal requirements. The first round of demos occurred during three separate sessions over the course of two days (November 16 and 17, 2017). The review team met subsequent to these demos on November 21, 2017 to debrief and discuss the on-site demonstrations and what questions still required clarification, if any. Because the review committee felt that the time allotted for the first presentations on-site was not enough, a second virtual web conference demonstration was requested. A script was

sent out to all vendors for the second demonstration. This second round of demonstrations occurred on December 18, 2017 and December 19, 2017.

- **Findings:** The scoring reflects overwhelming support for the top vendor. The second and third (last) place vendors are close in score and vary in ranking (2nd or 3rd) depending on the inclusion/exclusion of outlier scores. Of all the proposals, the highest scoring vendor produced a bid that was most in line with the requirements outlined in the RFP. **Not only does the winning proposal fit the needs of the SUs/SDs in terms of daily functionality and system requirements, but it also proposes to meet the State's requirements for succinct management of the UCOA and more streamlined state reporting tools.** Furthermore, this solution is the only solution that reflects the proper balance between system standardization across SUs/SDs with built in flexibility where variance between SUs/SDs is needed. The other two vendors' proposals fall short in these critical areas. While one is highly standardized, and would make the central management of the UCOA simpler, the vendor is unable to provide a solution with the flexibility needed for variance across SUs/SDs. The other vendor provides the flexibility needed across SUs/SDs, but is unable to provide a convincing solution for the central management of the UCOA.

Functionality alone could not win this RFP. The other criteria for selection is that the cost to implement and sustain the preferred solution must enable the State to save money through economies of scale, in particular through the transition of SUs/SD's from 60+ disparate solutions to the unified solution. These criteria underpins the state's commitment to reduce the burden to tax payers for costs that are purely administrative. In comparison, this highest scored bid was significantly less expensive than the second-place vendor (more than two-times less expensive), but a bit more expensive than the last place vendor. In summary, we feel that the most highly scored vendor clearly satisfies our goal of meeting the mandated UCOA objectives while balancing the value of the solution to end-users with the affordability and cost savings to Vermont tax payers.

Additional Business Manager Contacts

The Committee asked for additional business manager contacts:

- Laurie Garland 802-365-9510
- Kathy Barron 802-857-7043
- Rick Pembroke 802-885-8391
- Cheryl Scarzello 802-265-4905 x2005