



Meeting Minutes

Meeting Title:	BG@100 Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Meeting
Date:	February 12, 2007
Time:	11:00 AM ET
Location:	McFall Chart Room

Invitees/Attendees (* in attendance, # absent, + substitute, = by conference call)

Names			
*	Bruce Petryshak	*	Phyllis Short
*	Linda Dobb	*	John G Gleason
*	Chris Dalton	*	Melissa Hudson-Nowak
*	Ron Lancaster	*	Mark Gromko
*	Gaylyn Finn	*	Chris Cox
*	Bill Gerwin	*	Ginny Pinkelman
*	Toby Singer	*	Ed Whipple
*	Cindy Fuller		

Opening Statements

Bruce called the meeting to order at 11:00 AM.

Bruce stated cutover went very well. Staff committed much effort and work hours towards cutover.

The ESC meeting on February 26 will be an abbreviated meeting. **Mel** stated Jacque Hahn will attend in her absence and distribute an updated FMS document.

Bruce briefly went over the budget pieces for Finance. There are 3 pieces; hardware, software and people. The people portion is broken down between outside hires and inside staff.

The HR budget for consultants was \$2.317 million and spent \$2.485 million for consultants. Internal staff was budgeted at \$850,000 and spent \$681,000. The HR side was under budget by \$9,400 on the people side.

For all hardware/software pieces together the Finance side had budgeted \$3.029 million and \$2.089 million was spent. \$2.45 million was budgeted for the internal implementation team and \$1.48 million was spent. The Finance side was under budget by \$1.88 million. **Bruce** noted there were not a lot of changes to the system for this side of the project. **Mel** asked if the budget is now or through the end and **Bruce** stated this is now

Bruce stated the total budget for Student labor is \$11.37 million, \$6.3 million for consultants and a little over \$5 million for internal staff. This number is higher as the student side is a more complicated portion of the project. The total budget for hardware/software maintenance was \$18.9 million and we have consumed so far \$9.9 million. Anticipated expenses throughout the project will probably consume the remainder of the \$9.9 million. There is about \$300-400,000 built in as contingencies. Hardware maintenance was budgeted at \$413,000 and spent \$55.9 thousand already and with the remaining expenses will spend about \$19.00 more than

anticipated. The software one time charge was budgeted at \$7.8 million and spent \$5.9 million. There is an anticipated expenditure of \$39,000 more than we had budgeted. The project is budgeted at \$38.967 million; the sum of the amount paid thus far is \$16.82 million and have a remaining pool of money of \$22.14 million to take the project forward. **Bruce** noted changes thus far have been modest and the budget is in good shape. Bruce noted an increase with student is anticipated and it will probably absorb the savings thus far.

Mel stated there is an open list of HR items and assume Finance will also have open items. **Mel** asked if there is a way to review these items with a separate pool of money; prioritize etc. **Bruce** recommended at earlier meetings the ESC group in some fashion will not go away. HR has a new series of projects and would like this group to remain active with those future items. Bruce stated the budget as it was set did not incorporate second phases. The budget will define the scope of the student piece. **Mel** suggested the group discuss the budget right way to handle the money that remains. **Bruce** stated the move into student will consume any savings. **Ron** stated Fit Gap would be far along before discussing the budget. **Bruce** stated HR is moving forward and taking on Benefits and Administration and unsure about Grants Management.

Bruce stated the IT budget is being evaluated. Anticipate software pieces of \$4.4 million annually.

Mel asked if there is enough hardware to make the system robust. **Bruce** stated the hardware environment has been architected and it does have enough capacity to run sufficiently and there is fault- tolerant redundancy built in. The hardware platform is very solid.

Gaylyn stated it is taking about 30 seconds longer to process a document. **Bill** asked if this is budget checking; as budget checking takes some time. Bill stated it depends on what process is running. Budget checking takes some time; it is checking the money in the budget, the encumbered money and any outstanding requisitions. Budget checking in general is longer.

Bill stated databases are running well and were upgraded prior to Finance. If there are issues with response time Bill needs to be aware of this and would like to those know who is experiencing problems. Bill needs to know of situations with higher than expected delays.

Bruce stated PeopleSoft experts for the Student Phase are more difficult to find and may pay more of a premium. A project manager may consume an extra \$60-80 per hour. Candidates for this position are in the process of being reviewed.

Linda stated it is important to reiterate our commitment to move forward with the student implementation; what did we borrow for the PeopleSoft Project? **Chris D** stated \$38 million was identified one way or the other. **Bruce** stated the amount is covered in multiple ways. **Linda** expressed concerned with the financial components. Linda would like to review the pros/cons with the group. **Chris D** estimated \$27 million was borrowed. **Linda** stated the system is 2/3 built and managing through various interfaces to keep the system running. Linda stated one disadvantage is that the current student system is not available 24/7. **Bruce** stated it is also the last major system on the mainframe and requires the mainframe to run. **Chris C** stated the current mainframe system would need to be significantly modified for degree codes and course functionality. **Ron** stated it is important that the new student system run in real time. **Gaylyn** noted that accounts receivable does not age and committed to accomplishing this with the new system.

Linda asked who is attending the Alliance Conference. **Phyllis** stated 2 team members; Eric Zahnle and Tina Coulter; also Chris Cox and Gary Swegan.

Ron asked if we have an exclusive contract with Ciber for consultants and **Bruce** stated no. Cedar Crestone, Oxford International and SunGard have submitted consultant resumes.

Minutes

The minutes from the January 22 and 29 meetings were approved pending changes.

PeopleSoft Project Status Update

John G provided the group with a few statistics for the first week of go live:

- 382 users logged onto the system to transact business
- Input 381 requisitions; 231 of those requisitions were approved via workflow
- 523 purchase orders were processed; some were PO's that were closed in AFIN and brought over to FMS

Mel asked if the remaining 150 were under \$1500. **John** needs to clarify, this group could be under \$1500 or in the process of workflow.

- Total dispatched purchase orders 428
- Total accounts payable vouchers entered 1,467
- Accounts payable issued 138 checks; 138 checks paid 218 vouchers (multiple vouchers were paid to the same vendor on the same check)
- Total general ledger journal (lines) 1842 general ledger journals (this is not necessarily those that were hand entered in the system).
- The Library generated 76 invoices and applied 15 payments

Linda asked how many calls were received and **Bill** stated an average of 25-35 in TSC each day. The Project Office has received about 16 calls per day and closing about 14 per day.

Linda asked if people showed up at the drop-in sessions and **Bill** stated around 6-8 per session.

Bruce asked **Gaylyn** for feedback from the back office. **Gaylyn** stated they were waiting for items to be in the system to process. Trish, Maureen and George are working on blanket purchase orders.

Bruce asked about feedback from central scanning? **Mel** stated they were concerned about a few processes and controls; however, they seemed to be comfortable.

Gaylyn stated the Project Office worked very hard on the interface between HR and FMS. However, when the classified ran last week it failed in FMS. **Bill** stated the new accounting strings did not match up and resulted in errors. **Linda** suggested a Marketing & Communication announcement be sent asking employees to complete a direct deposit form and notifying payroll when changing banks. **Cindy** will work with Marketing & Communication.

Gaylyn noted the number of full-time employees that receive a printed paycheck is very small. The majority that receives printed paychecks are students; about 40%. New employees must be paid by direct deposit.

John G is working on a final copy of the project plan and also working on the annual reports.

Linda asked about classes for reporting. **Bill** stated classes will be offered the last full week of

February each day. **Mel** is working with HR to schedule an excel class; the class will be targeted to Budget Administrators.

Action/Information Items

Bill presented Information Item CSS 0001 – Moratorium on Application Development for Projects Associated with Student Administration. **Bill** would like to amend the document to include any project that a department would like to have reviewed needs to be submitted as an action item and reviewed by the ESC group. **Bill** will amend the Moratorium document and submit it as an action item at the next ESC meeting. Any change that would require project related resources would be submitted to the ESC group.

Mark asked what type of items would be submitted to the ESC group. **Mark** expressed concern regarding the annual cycle of the catalog approval. This cycle affects orientation and registration, marketing and registration and records. This process must adhere to a schedule. Is there a way that the cycle of updates/changes for student can be coordinated with the catalog cycle? The cycle of the catalog approval is a complicated sequence. **Mark** expressed concern regarding any changes during the cycle. **Bruce** asked if there is any flexibility within the cycle of catalogue approval and **Mark** stated some, but very little. **Chris C** stated the process is very compressed. **Ron** stated the moratorium is if ITS needs to modify a program. **Mark** stated it appears there are gray areas (not programming, but creation of tables). **Chris C** stated they could run into problems with academic structure. It would be difficult to develop and test if changes were made close to March 30, 2008.

Bruce stated there are two pieces to keep in mind; the moratorium and it is important to incorporate structural changes into Fit Gap.

Mark also stated another issue that could arise is the xml transmission of transcripts. **Chris C** stated OBOR is in the process of mandating the xml transcripts and does not believe we would have to accomplish this at the moment. **Bruce** asked if this will be staged in and **Chris C** was unsure; waiting on a survey from OBOR. **Chris C** has a conference call scheduled with OBOR later in the week. **Bruce** suggested if it is staged in could it be at the end of the Student process. **Chris C** is not sure. **Mark** suggested it should be clear in the Moratorium where the cut-off is.

Chris C asked who is responsible for writing up the action item and **Bruce** stated the write-up is the responsibility of the requester. The item would be presented to the ESC group and appropriate individuals invited to the meeting.

Bruce adjourned the meeting at 12:10 p.m.

Next Meeting Date:	February 26, 2007
Next Meeting Location:	McFall Chart Room
Minutes Prepared by:	Ginny Pinkelman
