

## Meeting Minutes

<b>Meeting Title:</b>	BG@100 Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Meeting
<b>Date:</b>	June 11, 2007
<b>Time:</b>	11:00 AM ET
<b>Location:</b>	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
*	Sheri Stoll	*	Jen Milligan
#	Toby Singer	*	Teresa McLove
*	Cindy Fuller	*	Michelle Simmons
*	Art Herbert	*	Suzanne Fahrer

### Opening Statements

**Bruce** called the meeting to order at 11:00 AM. Bruce welcomed Sheri Stoll, Chief Financial Officer and Vice President Finance and Administration. Bruce announced the departure of Toby Singer, Executive Director of Information Technology Services.

### Minutes

The minutes from the May 14 meeting were approved pending changes.

### PeopleSoft Project Status Update

**Art** announced that David Ehrlich, Admissions consultant began June 4<sup>th</sup>. Kristen Baldelli, Student Financial consultant began today. The Student Records consultant, Steve Hamrock will begin June 18<sup>th</sup>. The contract is being reviewed for the Financial Aid consultant.

Fit Gap kick-off is scheduled for Tuesday, June 19 at 9:30 in 113 Olscamp. The beginning of Fit Gap begins Monday, June 25 for Admissions.

### Action/Information Items

**Bruce** recommended for Action Item voting that participant's state the Alternative # to which they are voting for better documentation in the minutes.

**Bill** presented FMS-A011a, Continuing Education Daily Cash Deposits from Non-Credit Courses, (Amended and Resubmitted). This item relates to the interface for payments between CEE and the Finance system. Previously this action item received a vote of Alternative #3. It is being resubmitted with addendum information. **Bill** asked Teresa to provide an overview regarding the problem with Alternative #3 verses Alternative #2.

**Teresa** distributed a spreadsheet regarding Alternative #3. Currently the Bursar Office receives manual sheets, re-keys the information and then forwards it to a spreadsheet that is loaded into

FMS. Alternative #3 involves much re-keying of information and can cause keying errors due to volume. Alternative #2 is the preferred method. Information would be exported from the Peopleware system which would include payment amount and DCC. This information would be manipulated into a spreadsheet for the FMS interface. Alternative #2 would involve less manual work, reduce the likelihood of errors and offer a cleaner look for credit card and bank numbers.

**Bill** asked Teresa to clarify the previous interface in AFIN. **Teresa** stated before Peopleware there was FoxPro; which is a homegrown system and everything was manual. Peopleware tracks classes, hours, upfront event planning and sends the individual class amounts to a specific DCC. Prior to FMS a paper receipt was generated and sent to the Bursar Office and a receipt was then sent back to CEE with budget information and verified. Now receipts are keyed into the Peopleware system and then keyed in for a second time at the Bursar Office. **Mel** asked if there is a way to get the Peopleware output set up to be sent so the data is exported from Peopleware to avoid re-keying. **Teresa** stated this is being reviewed, but not sure it would meet the requirements of FMS. The Peopleware output needs to match as close as possible. **Mel** asked if someone has strategically looked at all interfaces. **Bruce** stated an analyst for interfaces could attend the next meeting. **Mel** stated CEE processes both incoming money for credit and non-credit classes. It might be possible the new POS system for the BG1 process may take care of automating some of this information. **Mel** asked if CEE should be accepting monies for credit classes when there is a Bursar Office.

**Teresa** stated CEE previously did not have an interface; it was a paper interface and not perceived as broken. An auto interface was not written. The point of sale terminal discussions just began. **Teresa** stated there is another interface from another system for billing. **Bruce** stated the reason the action item has been amended and resubmitted is not so much the volume, but the amount of manual work being done on Alternative #3. The action item resurfaced because of the labor issue not the volume.

**Ron** asked if it could be delayed a couple weeks until there is more information on the point of sale. **Mel** is not sure. **Ron** asked if the action item could be approved contingent on a better solution. **Teresa** agreed, but unsure there is an interface on the point of sale terminal project. **Mel** stated if the receivables are not being interfaced into the FMS system there would be a disconnection of the process. **Bill** stated there are two groups; the affiliated and non-affiliated university people who do not have a BG1 Card. **Bill** reviewed all interfaces in the FMS system. CEE did not have an automated interface and was not picked up until late March or April. **Bill** stated this would have been an interface created in the old system; however, timing was a factor. Roll call vote for Action Item FMS-A011a:

Bruce Petryshak	Alternative #2
Linda Dobb	Absent
Sheri Stoll	Abstained
Mel Hudson-Nowak	Alternative #2
Ed Whipple	Alternative #2
Ron Lancaster	Alternative #2
Gaylyn Finn	Alternative #2
Chris Cox	Alternative #2
Mark Gromko	Alternative #2

**Chris** presented Action Item MOR-A002, Foreign Language Degree Requirements for New Freshman Fall 2007. Last fall Undergraduate Council resurrected a suspended policy regarding the requirement of admitted students to have completed two years of high school foreign language or complete the equivalent at BGSU as part of their degree requirements. The policy was suspended in 2004. At that time there was an interface between the degree audit system and

---

admissions to determine foreign language requirements. When it was suspended in 2004, the College of Arts and Sciences continued to use this as part of their curriculum. The interface has been running for last 3 years and upgraded with the degree audit system. Since the Undergraduate Council has reinstated the policy, it is requested the interface be adjusted to evaluate and make note of admitted students appropriately. **Mel** asked if this process will continue until the Student System is active and **Chris** stated yes and at that time a new solution will be necessary.

Roll call vote for Action Item MOR-A002:

Bruce Petryshak	Alternative #2
Linda Dobb	Absent
Sheri Stoll	Alternative #2
Mel Hudson-Nowak	Alternative #2
Ed Whipple	Alternative #2
Ron Lancaster	Alternative #2
Gaylyn Finn	Alternative #2
Chris Cox	Alternative #2
Mark Gromko	Alternative #2

**Suzanne Fahrner** presented Action Item HCM-A027 (FMS & HCM systems), Management of Federal Work Study (FWS). A task force was developed to solve problems with the work study program regarding balancing allocations sent to departments, grants accounting and student employment. Departments are sent allocation letters informing them of the allocated work study dollars. In the past few years departments have notoriously spent over their FWS dollars. For the past year departments have overspent by \$78,000. This overspending has costs the Financial Aid Office a lot of problems and a great deal of manual update between the three offices. There is no definite way to monitor the departments. Typically the cut-off for departments is two-three weeks after the money has been depleted. The intent is to automate the system and shut the account off within 5% and then auto change the student from work study to regular employment. **Suzanne** distributed a flow chart that outlines the FWS process. A web page was developed last year that lists each department and the allocated dollar amounts. **Suzanne** stated a mandatory training session was implemented last year for departments regarding the process and tools available for FWS.

**Mark** clarified that Alternative #1 is the hours/costs that are currently being spent and **Suzanne** stated yes. If Alternative #2 were implemented would any of that work continue or would all of the costs be eliminated. **Suzanne** stated a limited amount would go away. **Michelle** stated work study has two parts; this addresses the department allocation spending; the other part is when the student exceeds their allocated spending. Either one involves individual manipulation of the student record in FMS. When the department runs out of money the student is changed to 100% funding. If the student earns/or reaches the work study limit, this records needs to be manually changed as well. This action item addresses what occurs when a department runs out of FWS allocations.

**Bruce** asked how much of the \$31,000 involved with Alternative #2 would be eliminated. **Mel** stated this is a reallocation of work and not a single position that would be eliminated. **Jen** stated the hours that were gathered involved what went into manually retroactively changing students back to operating dollars. **Jen** estimates a majority of the \$31,000 would go away if it is cut-off before a department goes over the allocation.

**Gaylyn** asked if we are reaching back in Kronos data to make these determinations or working off HCM. **Jen** stated it is after it has been pulled from Kronos into HCM. **Gaylyn** asked how

---

the department would use up their work study funds. **Michelle** stated the preference would be not to spend all of the money than go over.

**Ron** stated the savings is not clear. The 5% would have to be adjusted either way. **Jen** stated the preference would be to have the department under spend because a majority of the departments are overspending. **Bill** asked if all of the departments on campus overspend FWS dollars what happens. **Suzanne** stated \$81,000 of the allocation from 06-07 had to be carried back to 05-06 because of overspending and cutting back \$50,000 of administrative cost allowance. In essence \$130,000 went back to 05-06 instead of using it in 06-07. **Bill** asked if \$130,000 came from individual departments. **Suzanne** stated it was the overall work study budget.

**Jen** stated \$50,000 was lost last year, by not being able to claim the administrative cost allowance, but gave it up to cover up the actual work study dollars spent.

**Mel** asked for clarification regarding money that remains in a departments FWS allocation. **Jen** stated the money can not carry forward into the next year, unless the department asks for it in a timely manner in the current year.

**Ed** asked why work student money is not packaged in a way that the student receives the money. **Michelle** stated small areas that rely on work study dollars would then be in a position not to have students. Areas that depend on work study as a budget source would be in competition with other departments. It would also effect how work study is packaged and many students who currently receive work study would not be eligible.

**Bruce** asked that Action Item HCM-A027 be amended and resubmitted to better clarify the labor costs involved and the costs to produce a computer training program.

Bruce adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.

<b>Next Meeting Date:</b>	June 25, 2007
<b>Next Meeting Location:</b>	McFall Chart Room
<b>Minutes Prepared by:</b>	Ginny Pinkelman