



Meeting Minutes

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Meeting Title: | BG@100 Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Meeting |
| Date: | January 14, 2008 |
| Time: | 10:00 AM ET |
| Location: | Bowen-Thompson Student Union 207 |

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 | + Camille Consolvo |
| * Shirley Baugher | * Jie Su |
| * Phyllis Short | * Jason Gross |
| * Mike Failor | * Eric Zahnle |
| * Beth Ann Rife | * Sue Lau |
| * Sue Tomor | * Laura Waggoner |
| * Carol Hague | * Rich Kasch |
| * Deb Clink | * Kate Whitmore |
| * Jerry Ameling | * Tina Coulter |
| # Cecilia Castellano | |

Opening Statements

Bruce called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM.

Bruce indicated an action item will be sent to the ESC group this Friday for review.

Bruce, Shirley, Linda and Sheri met earlier in the week to discuss expectations.

Sheri briefly reviewed her expectations for the Functional and Team Leads present at today's meeting. Sheri's expectations are to keep modifications at a minimal. It is also critical for everyone to analyze what we are doing in the course of our work; do we have to keep doing it this way, is it critical, if it is important, is there a different way to get the same result. It is important to question ourselves in this process. There are current challenges within FMS that will require policy and procedure changes. It is important to keep an open mind, challenge ourselves and ask questions.

Shirley stated that PeopleSoft will perform as well as we design it. Shirley's expectations are to be reflective about practices, policies and the way we do our work. It is important to slow down, be reflective with our work and what we are designing and to be visionary. There is a high expectation for service for departments from multiple areas.

Shirley stated the consultants are very important and to hire those who are familiar with higher education. Consultants are able to step back and understand the business and products. Shirley stated there should be a set of people who have a broader understanding of the system and agenda goals.

Tina Coulter asked how the team can accomplish everything when they are under a short time frame. **Shirley** stated that it is important be vocal when more time is required. Shirley would rather stretch the timeline out and have it done correctly. The timeline should not be set due to budget implications. The timeline should be set to accurately do the work and then allocate the dollars. The budget should not drive the timeline. **Mel** stated the budget and timeline work in proportion. **Shirley** stated that money should not drive the timeline.

Bruce stated some items will be phased in. The self-service model for HR was not in the first phase, but will be phased in. The original timeline was 6 years. There are budget implications. If the team has compelling reasons that the timeline can not be achieved, the group will discuss it. This is a non-trivial decision that has a significant financial impact.

Laura Waggoner stated not all of the consultants are on board and have had bumps along the way with personnel. Registration and Records has had a consultant for a couple weeks and still trying to get her caught up with Fit-Gap. It is slowing the team down not having all of the developers and programmers in place.

Shirley asked if Human Resources are missing, can you meet the timeline goal. **Laura** stated they are waiting on a consultant for the Bursar Office. **Bill** stated 3 consultants left the project. The Registration and Records consultant began January 7th. A replacement for Student Financials is near completion. A technical consultant will leave in two weeks and this position will be replaced. There are 5 open positions for Application Developers and 6 are on the project right now.

Shirley asked if HR is missing, can you meet the timeline goal. **Bill** stated at this point in the project for Application Developers it will get difficult soon and become more important in the next month. **Eric Zahnle** expressed concern about the timeline. **Mel** stated there are modules in July 2008 and concerned that modeling is still underway.

Phyllis is not sure the team has a handle of the go live pieces for Student. **Shirley** stated Admissions should know what they need and to look at the management tools they need to be in place to meet the goals. Phyllis stated it has not been determined what is needed for go live and what can be deferred.

Carol asked when the Data Warehouse will be live. **Bruce** stated the Data Warehouse is starting in the next couple of weeks with the HR piece then the financial portion. It will not be available for Student day one. Bruce stated it is important for Admissions to have discussions about the reports that are required. The idea is to use it for the decision and planning process and some reporting. **Bruce** stated the current SIS will be here for at least a year if not more after go live of Student. **Carol** asked if the Data Warehouse will be ready to pull the information in within a year. **Bruce** stated it will probably be 2-3years before it totally goes away and will have to be reviewed. Bruce noted everything does not have to happen day 1 and can be phased in.

Eric Zahnle asked what the ESC expects of the team. **Bruce** stated the original expectation was not to install every module and the goal was to eliminate the current mainframe environment that

does not support what the university needs to do. What are the core necessary pieces that need to be in place to eliminate the old environment is the question? Once the old environment is eliminated it will release some funding. PeopleSoft will not have everything you want or need Day 1. The expectation is to reflect on what we currently have and objectively look at the tasks at hand. The primary focus is to use what is delivered and how this can be carried out. Can the functionality be replicated in PeopleSoft? **Shirley** noted PeopleSoft can handle anything and would rather have it work in PeopleSoft than run separate side by side systems. Explore what modules can be purchased to make it work. **Bruce** stated customizing everything would involve a lot of money over time; need to decide what needs to be customized and evaluate the value proposition.

Tina Coulter asked about the expectations for customer service. At what point is there minimal self service. For example, if PeopleSoft offers a cut and dry Financial Aid award letter at what point do we say it should be customized? **Sheri** stated this relates to expectations. If Financial Aid is making a decision of this nature in isolation, then we are in trouble. The team should collectively discuss. **Shirley** stated service has to be a high priority; both external and internal. There is nothing more important than the perception of BGSU. **Bruce** stated that the team needs to look at these issues holistically. The team may need to shift resources from one area to another in order to meet a greater need.

Chris is concerned with the participation from colleges and departments. A number of meetings across campus have been held with little participation. Although colleges and departments were invited to Fit-Gap sessions, there was not a lot of participation. **Shirley** recommended getting on the agendas for chair and council meetings; use existing times they are already meeting.

Financial Responsibility Agreement

Sheri stated historically the Financial Responsibility Agreement has been in paper form. The question is how to handle this agreement in PeopleSoft. Is it possible when the student registers for classes that the student agrees to the Financial Agreement electronically in order to continue with registration? **Chris** indicated that a student under 18 is not permitted to sign the form. **Sheri** asked why not risk it? **Sheri** stated the student under 18 should be permitted to register. Most incoming students are 18. The risk is potentially just one semester.

Bruce indicated to verify this with General Council and bring this back as an information item at the next ESC meeting.

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Next Meeting Date: | January 29, 2008 |
| Next Meeting Location: | Bowen-Thompson Student Union Mylander Room 207 |
| Minutes Prepared by: | Ginny Pinkelman |