



## Meeting Minutes

<b>Meeting Title:</b>	BG@100 Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Meeting
<b>Date:</b>	November 26, 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	*	Melissa Hudson-Nowak
*	Linda Dobb	*	Chris Cox
*	Ron Lancaster	*	Ed Whipple
*	Gaylyn Finn	*	Cindy Fuller
*	Bill Gerwin	*	Ginny Pinkelman
#	Sheri Stoll	*	John Konecny
*	Al Gonzalez	*	Leslie Wilbourn
*	Brian Rellinger		
#	Shirley Baugher		

### Opening Statements

**Brian** called the meeting to order at 11:05 AM.

### Minutes

The minutes from the October 22 meeting were approved and can be posted to the web pending changes.

### PeopleSoft Project Status Update

**Bill** stated the last ESC meeting for this year will be held December 10<sup>th</sup>. The plan is to have the Scope document for the December 10<sup>th</sup> ESC meeting for review. After the first of the year **Bill** expects an Action Item regarding the University Admissions System Strategy for PeopleSoft and for degree audit. **Bill** also expects an Information Item regarding the use of accounts receivable within FMS to handle non-student accounts receivable.

**Ron** asked about Admissions and if there is something similar from the Graduate College. **Bill** will speak with Eric Zahnle after Admissions.

**Leslie** distributed an ESC Status Report document that she and Mel developed. The document is color coded to identify levels of concern, milestones, alerts, etc. Two areas that are outlined on the report relate to Fit Gap and Scope definition. Milestone dates were given and those dates were established prior to Leslie joining the group; the dates were pushed back and negotiated. The dates now overlap and revisions were made to meet the December 10<sup>th</sup> deadline. **Leslie** stated there are session notes that remain outstanding although Fit Gap is completed. **Leslie** stressed to the project group prior to Thanksgiving that deadlines needs to be met and that session notes need to be completed. **Leslie** stated Phyllis was able to update an executive

summary and anticipates more session notes should be close to 90-95% complete. Identified fits; identified gaps but what is left is gap resolution.

**Ron** asked about the Financial Responsibility agreement alternatives; what are the best practices? What are our options and how can we implement this policy. **Mel** asked Bill if this could be added to the agenda for the December 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. **Chris** stated modeling might bring new opportunities to manage this form. **Ron** stated it is difficult to explain the form to international students. **Gaylyn** stated Miami, Wright State, OU and UT all have electronic ePromise documents; but unsure of the signature frequency required.

**Chris** stated the frequency of the signature was discussed with General Council and it was decided the form would be signed each year. **Ron** asked what the implications are if the student does not sign the form. **Mel** stated the objectives are not well understood. Before the process is fixed we need to understand the objective and work to develop an efficient way to achieve it. Where did the original mandate come from? There should be guidelines around the mandate. **Gaylyn** stated the original mandate came through General Council from the Attorney General; however, Gaylyn is unsure about the guidelines. **Linda** stated the document should be signed once and an exception for those under 18.

**Mel** asked Ron to provide an update about the Master Data Committee. **Ron** stated it is functioning effectively with wide consultation. Decisions were made from the advice of the consultants regarding name formats, types, address formats etc. There is a challenge with attaching a phone number with an address due to increased usage of cell phones. There is a potential to eliminate the shadow system that is taking care of the directory. The process is slow but trying to be all inclusive with choices.

**Al** asked about the academic structure setup and what are the implications if there are future changes? How difficult is it and what communication would have to occur? **Bill** and **Chris** will put together a timeline and at some point will need to establish a time when no changes are permitted. Changes at the college level and plans could cause problems. **Linda** asked **Chris** to meet with Shirley to discuss and **Chris** will set up a meeting. **Mel** is concerned about making decisions and the ability to be flexible when the system is live. **Chris** stated the academic structure is flexible; it is a matter of timing. **Chris** is concerned with the implementation and once testing begins it will throw off the process. **Bill** stated any customization would throw off the flexibility.

**Brian** adjourned the meeting at 11:37 a.m.

<b>Next Meeting Date:</b>	December 10, 2007
<b>Next Meeting Location:</b>	McFall Chart Room
<b>Minutes Prepared by:</b>	Ginny Pinkelman