



Meeting Minutes

Meeting Title:	BG@100 Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Meeting
Date:	April 23, 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	*	Melissa Hudson-Nowak
*	Chris Dalton	*	Mark Gromko
*	Ron Lancaster	#	Chris Cox
*	Gaylyn Finn	*	Ed Whipple
*	Bill Gerwin	*	Ginny Pinkelman
*	Toby Singer		
*	Cindy Fuller		
*	Art Herbert		

Opening Statements

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

The agenda order was changed to accommodate for Information Item MOR-0001, Moratorium Exception Request Procedures.

Bruce announced that David Hayes has been hired as a Security Analyst; which brings the core security group to five.

Information Item

Bill presented Information Item MOR-0001, Moratorium Exception Request Procedures. This document outlines the procedures for Action/Information items that are exceptions to the Moratorium.

Once it is determined that a department has an exception to the Moratorium rule, the department that identifies the exception is responsible to write up the document as an Action/Information Item. If the exception is a regulatory release, mandate, or application bug fix, the exception request will be presented as an Information Item. If the exception is an enhancement, customization or other than the previous mentioned items it would be presented as an Action Item.

The department will electronically submit the document to John Konecny and John will assist with adding information regarding IT specific information and hours required. John will maintain a Moratorium Tracking Spreadsheet of all items submitted for tracking. John will then forward items to Bill. Bill will review, assign numbers and place it on the Executive Steering Committee Agenda. Bill will notify the department that the item has been placed on the ESC

agenda. The department that submitted the item will provide the name of an individual that will present the item at the ESC meeting. The individual will attend, present and explain the item at the ESC meeting. Once the Action/Information Item has been acted upon by ESC; the document will be published to the BG@100 web site. John Konecny will be notified, update the Moratorium Tracking Spreadsheet and if the item is approved it will be assigned to someone in IT for work and the department that submitted the item will be notified. If the item is not approved, the department will be notified as well.

Mel asked if John would also maintain a log of submissions that did not make it to the ESC. **Bill** will add this as item 3a. to the Moratorium Exception Procedures. **Mel** noted a brief explanation as to why the item did not go forward should be added.

Gaylyn asked about items that are in process; will they be finished. **Bill** stated if this is in regards to the Bursar items; John is working with Cindy K on an information item for the next meeting. The items are not in progress; but have been identified as potential problems for Cindy K. The items are in a limbo state at the moment. ITS is not currently working on those items. **Bill** believes they are truly bug fixes and possibly submitted as an information item.

Minutes

The minutes from the March 26 meeting were approved and can be posted to the web.

Linda noted some complaints have been received from Continuing Education regarding Action Item FMS-A011 that was approved. **Bruce** asked if Continuing Education would re-describe the problem as the document submitted did not reflect it would be much more work. **Linda** stated it appears a process was de-automated that should be automated. **Bill** previously suggested to Continuing Education to re-describe the problem and **Bill** will bring it back to the ESC. **Linda** will follow-up with **Bill** Balzer.

PeopleSoft Project Status Update

Bill stated 2 FMS Overview sessions have been in held in the last couple weeks. The presentations went well and a number of people are commenting that the system is getting better for them. There are some people that are upset with the new processes and procedures. **Bill** noted these are not system problems, but rather perceived as system problems. There is a small group of people that feel we should go back to AFIN.

Mel noted that **Jacque** attended one of the overview sessions and commented that the session went very well; however, a few people were able to sidetrack the discussion. **Mel** recommended in the future noting concerns will be heard, but to move forward and stay on topic.

Bill asked for assistance with approaching faculty regarding procedures for the new system. A few clerical groups expressed concern regarding the need for faculty to be aware of the new policies and procedures. **Linda** suggested to create an FMS Q&A pamphlet for faculty. **Bruce** suggested calling the document, the new financial processes for the system. **Linda** prefers, what does the new system mean for you? **Bruce** noted it is a procedural change. **Linda** heavily suggested pamphlet be created and **Bruce** agreed.

Ed asked if in the future remote access will be available and **Bruce** stated yes in the future; however, at the moment security is an issue.

Linda noted since faculty will be gone, timing will be an issue.

Bill stated one of the issues from the overview meetings is the new procedures; and the amount of time involved to complete work. There is a middle group that indicated they are finding the system to be useful.

The second area involves vendor invoices coming in and going to central scanning. **Bill** is unsure how to handle this, but hopefully it will resolve itself as people realize they can see the invoices through document imaging.

The third area is insufficient funds. More complaints will be heard as we approach May and June; what will the Business Office do? **Gaylyn** stated it involves moving the recognition process to a different set of people. **Gaylyn** noted some questions to be asked; do we not pay an invoice, call the department for a transfer or wait until June 27th and process a lot of invoices and allow the department to carry negative balances into the new fiscal year. **Mel** asked if buyers are told no before they purchase instead of after and **Gaylyn** stated yes. **Bruce** stated the PCard should not be used as a way to circumvent the process. **Mel** stated the budget administrator should know who within their area has the PCard and to monitor its use. **Gaylyn** stated most PCard purchases are small items. **Gaylyn** asked if the PCard transaction limit of \$1500.00 should be reduced to a smaller amount; will this change the use of the PCard. **Linda** suggested reviewing areas that are near the red. **Mel** suggested this should be a discussion for operating groups.

Linda stated policies should be discussed campus wide in regards to invitations and mailings that are sent to faculty/staff home addresses.

Bill stated another item has to do with the handling of reports. **Bill** believes the concern is more systematic and he is in the process of reviewing solutions. **Bill** stated the threshold for retention might be increased to 6 months. The current threshold is 75 days.

Gaylyn asked about the status of the data warehouse and **Bruce** stated it is in the process of being loaded for HR. **Bruce** recommended reviewing DCC's; there maybe a better way to use 1 DCC with sub codes.

Bill stated the final item deals with presenting the new system in a positive manner. **Bill** stated that negativity creates more problems. The primary back offices need to present the system in a positive manner. The negativity creates additional hardship for end users and the project. **Chris D** noted that it is important to relay success stories and offices presenting the system negatively need to be addressed. **Linda** stated it is important for the Business Office to remain positive. If the Business Office needs more help, then look into getting additional help. However, it is important to remain positive.

Bruce stated some individuals were sent to the Business Office for assistance; how is this working. **Bill** sent Deb Clink to the Business Office and spent about 5 days working on invoices and answered telephone questions on requisitions. The bigger issue is if the Business Office does not know the answer, that's okay, but it is important to leverage their resources. The Business Office needs to reach out to Maureen for assistance but this is not occurring. **Linda** stated it is important for key people to maintain a positive attitude

Bruce asked if Action Item MOR-A001 is time sensitive and **Bill** stated no. **Mark** stated the document is time sensitive.

Bill presented Action Item MOR-A001, “W” Grade on Student Records. When a student withdraws early in the semester the withdrawn class is eliminated from the student’s record, which creates concern in terms of student auditing, financial aid and subsidy from the state. **Bill** stated Chris C would like the group to look at the following alternatives:

Alternative #1

- Do nothing

Alternative #2

- Reconfigure current SIS/SAM systems to allow withdraw to be maintained on the system long term, due date August 2007

Alternative #3

- Implement Alternative #2 for the Fall 2008 catalog year with PeopleSoft

Bill is unsure if the costs for Alternative #3 will be the same as Alternative #2 due to PeopleSoft. **Mel** agreed there is a risk involved without the data; however, how long have we not had the data available to substantiate this? **Ron** stated in 1992 FA pushed very hard for this and it was agreed to by various areas; however, the Bursar Office indicated it would not work due to the processing refunds. **Mark** stated this situation is different, it is “W’s” at the end of the semester. **Ron** indicated the document states after the census date; up to the census date is not a problem. **Ron** stated refunds are scheduled after the 2nd week. **Mark** asked how this is handled and **Ron** stated the “W” is taken off the transcript, the TSUM record is updated and the Bursar Office schedules the refund.

Mel would like to meet with Chris C to discuss; is there a way to extract data, daily reporting etc. **Mark** stated it is not just data. A year and a half was spent changing the withdraw policy with various committees. This represents implementation of a hard won policy debate. Many groups have agreed to implement changes for withdraw on the basis of not being able to represent a “W” as a continuing grade on the student record. If this is taken away, all policy discussions over the last year and a half would be undermined. **Bruce** stated it is a timing issue. **Ron** clarified no one is stating to take it away, but maybe defer until PeopleSoft.

Mark stated policy changes were contingent on the understanding a grade of “W” would persist on the student’s record. If for reasons of FMS implementation we can not continue the grade, then all agreements break down and start over. **Ron** stated it would just be deferred, not effective today, but could be fall 2009. **Mark**, what is the advantage of keeping us exposed to the risk. **Ron** stated the risk has been there since 1992; the gain is the \$280,000 costs and keeping the project on schedule. **Bill** is unsure if John Konecny was aware of the Bursar piece when he specked this out. **Gaylyn** expressed concern with the costs. **Bruce** will review and defer to the next meeting, the \$280,000 or more modification or policy change could be built into the new system. **Mark** stated it will not be cost free to build it into the new system. **Bruce** stated no, but there is work already being done and it could be part of the process.

Bill stated the MOR-0002 Action Item needs to be acted on soon. **Bill** will move forward and place it back on the agenda along with the Moratorium for next meeting.

Bruce adjourned the meeting at 1:05 pm.

Next Meeting Date:	May 14, 2007
Next Meeting Location:	McFall Chart Room
Minutes Prepared by:	Ginny Pinkelman