



Meeting Minutes

Meeting Title:	BG@100 Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Meeting
Date:	December 10, 2007
Time:	11:00 AM ET
Location:	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

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

The Scope document is not complete, but the material presented today will begin preliminary discussion. Modeling will begin soon.

Bruce noted that 2 out of 3 PI training sessions have been completed for Grants. Invitations were sent to over 100 individuals but only a total of 10 attended. **Bruce** stated it is important to get more people involved in these sessions. **Bruce** noted that 3 sessions were offered. **Shirley** asked to research why people were not attending. **Sheri** stated it is probably a bigger issue than the system.

Bruce stated VPN is ready and working through policy and implementation. It is functional and ready to go but working on the policy before releasing it to the public. **Ron** asked if there is a timetable for this policy and **Bruce** expects January. **Bill** stated the security group is working on the policy.

Minutes

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

PeopleSoft Project Status Update Preliminary Scope Document

Bruce stated one focus of the Scope document is the strategy and implementation with Admissions and/or Graduate College. The idea is to gain an understanding of the Scope of the entire project before these discussions begin. Scope will not be 100% complete until March.

Bill presented the preliminary Scope document. Information was pulled from Fit-Gap and this begins the framework around the project. The final Scope document will layout the details within and outside of Scope. **Bill** expects information and action items for the ESC as we go through Scope in January, February and March. Items such as degree audit, admissions systems, undergraduate admissions, etc.

Page 4 describes the campus solutions Scope. It is mentioned that Scope cannot be completed until the team is through some of the major modeling items in January and February. The document references categorizing items; it really refers to mandated items such as State, Federal or University regulation. The next 3 months will focus on mandated items.

Pages 5-7 refer to the different business process Scopes. **Bill** is waiting on a strategy document from the Graduate College, there is work to be completed with RMS from Residence Life and it was determined that non-credit Continuing Education will be pushed out of Scope for now.

Page 8 displays a grid of various fits and gaps for each area.

Sheri asked how the cost recovery calculation was scored. **Sheri** is concerned there could be issues that are out of Scope. **Bill** stated testing for grants was complete. **Sheri** asked if it was labeled out of Scope and **Bill** stated no. **Bill** is positive this was tested. **Bill** stated there was an issue with pulling costs together.

Shirley asked how it was determined Continuing Education would be out of Scope. **Bill** stated thus far the conversations have occurred between Chris and Bill Balzer. **Chris** stated based on the Fit-Gap analysis and what Continuing Education currently uses, we were not sure we could provide a solid business face for them to continue in PeopleSoft. **Sheri** asked if they would lose functionality during this period and **Chris** stated no. Continuing Education is comfortable enough with the system to continue using it until revisiting it in 2011. **Shirley** asked if there are agenda notes and **Bruce** stated yes Fit-Gap notes. **Bruce** asked **Bill** who would have made the decisions about consolidated billing? **Bill** stated when it went through modeling it would have been Trish Jenkins, Jen Mulligan, Maureen Ireland and Tom Kornacki. When they had an issue it would have gone through Jen and Tom. **Bill** needs to go back and review the documentation. **Bruce** stated as the project moves forward it is important for the functional leads to meet with the back offices. **Bill** stated the functional leads are meeting monthly with the back offices.

Bill stated modeling is internal but will always pull in the back office at the end of each module. **Bill** stated it is important to have the back office included to provide input. **Sheri** asked if the functional and team leaders could attend the next ESC meeting and **Bruce** stated yes. **Bill** asked if at the next meeting the functional and technical leads should attend and the group stated yes. **Bruce** added the next several meetings as well.

Ed asked if the go live is summer of 2009. **Bill** is working on the overall timeline and discussions are underway. It is important to get through some of the major modeling and bring more detailed information to the ESC group. **Bruce** noted the timeline will also be evaluated based on the Financial Aid cycle. **Ed** asked if there could be a draft of the timeline. **Bill** will have a draft in January. **Ed** asked about the status of the RMS contract and **Bruce** stated there was an issue with maintenance but the paperwork will be processed.

Al asked how overtime will be handled in order to complete modeling. **Chris** is not sure it will involve significant overtime but expects some overtime in January and February. **Chris** is

working with Leslie to iron out the expectations of the back office participation. A schedule will be created for modeling and this will determine who will attend modeling sessions. **Chris** will put together a request for overtime and send to the respective vice president's for approval. **Al** asked if a process could be laid out. **Chris** does not have enough information at this point.

Ed asked if Student Employment is part of the Financial Aid work and **Bill** stated they were part of Fit-Gap. **Chris** stated it will be discussed.

Sheri referred to page 6 of the document and the Undergraduate Admissions System; what is being proposed. **Bill** stated there will be an action item presented to ESC on how to integrate the Admissions system with PeopleSoft. The document is stating as we move through modeling the strategy will be determined. **Bill** stated Admissions has an extensive system and it will be critical to review how PeopleSoft does business and how that system can be integrated. **Sheri** asked if it is being proposed to convert the data and **Bill** stated not at this moment. It is important to go through more modeling and determine what data is there. As an example, **Bill** stated enrollment in SIS goes back to the late 1980's; some data is from the 1960's. It is difficult to say yes at this point until the team is able to analyze the data. More modeling is necessary to determine what data is critical to move.

Sheri asked what feedback **Bill** needs from the ESC. **Bill** stated the intent is to provide an opportunity to understand the size of this before getting any further through Fit-Gap. It is important to recognize and analyze the gaps. **Bill** stated there are many reports in the old system, and analysis will need to be completed on how this data will be retrieved. **Bill** stated the final Scope document in March will itemize what is within Scope and outside of Scope. **Bruce** noted it will be important to have all of the functional leads attend that meeting. **Bill** stated it will be important at that time to identify if an item has been designated outside of Scope and should be inside of Scope as it would affect implementation.

Sheri asked if there are fits and/or gaps that should be addressed within specific areas between now and March. **Bill** stated anything that surrounds making a decision around policy or changing high-level items should be reviewed now.

Bill stated the document will also focus on larger action items. As an example, **Bill** stated a decision will need to be made on whether to continue with the Darwin product or interface with the PeopleSoft system; each path presents work. PeopleSoft will involve much manual effort; the Darwin path will involve large interfaces. The Scope document is important because any decision will involve resources.

Shirley asked what are the consequences of staying with Darwin? What have other institutions done? **Bruce** stated this will be part of the discussion. If we stayed with Darwin, there would be a time limit.

Bill asked if the Functional and Technical leads should be invited to the next ESC meeting to discuss the Scope document and **Bruce** stated they could be invited to the next several meetings.

Ron asked if the Scope document presented in March will have a timetable and **Bill** stated yes. **Bruce** stated there will be discussions regarding possible implications around the timeline and how that will be handled.

Bruce adjourned the meeting at 12:05PM.

Next Meeting Date:	January 14, 2008
Next Meeting Location:	Bowen-Thompson Student Union Room 207
Minutes Prepared by:	Ginny Pinkelman