
Applications Steering Committee

Discussion Notes

April 26, 2007 3:00 – 4:30 CSS 302

Present: John Urbanick, Pat Klarecki, Sandra Davison-Wilson, Richard Cochran, Rick Christner, Karen Thompson, Deb Yost, Craig Westman, Denise Grinnell, Jennifer Thede (minutes), Melanie Rice

Absent: Dan Burcham

Guest: Adam Wetherell, HR

Handouts: Agenda, Previous Minutes, Employee Self-Service, People Admin information

New Business

1. Review Previous Minutes of Mar. 20

Karen said she wasn't sure about the amount of money left for the Banner servers, but she will confirm just as the minutes noted. Next month Karen will come with a Banner wrap-up and address some of the budget issues. Minutes were approved.

2. People Admin – Adam Wetherell

- A. Presentation – Adam shared the benefits and efficiencies of converting to PeopleAdmin which will change the hiring process (not the policies). Adam said most state universities in Michigan are using it and it would present Ferris as up-to-date with technology
- B. Cost – There is a one-time start-up cost of \$6000, one-time training cost of \$1500, and an annual fee of around \$23000.
- C. Timeline – Implementation timeline is about 4-5 months with a small implementation team.
- D. Banner Interface – There is an ePAF module that interfaces with Banner, but it has not been put into production yet. Sandy said this is a module already paid for in Banner and it would eliminate filling out the web PAF. There is a Banner interface with PeopleAdmin that has been released by SunGard but is not in production at any institution yet. Adam is not recommending Ferris purchase this interface yet. Richard expressed concern with how many resources it would take to make ePAF work.
- E. Comments – Richard said that if an application will integrate with Banner, it should not be necessary for ASC to weigh in; it's not the forum for making all electronic expenditures. He did say there is a concern that if a new software affects Banner in any way, then ASC would need to be involved.
- F. Approval – John recommended and the group supported moving PeopleAdmin forward

3. Student Team Progress Report – Craig Westman

- A. Reporting –
 - a. Working with Pat and Acad. Affairs to develop a list of report needs
 - b. Lora Caputo is back to help with data migration into tables we can write reports against for Acad. Affairs
 - c. The prioritized list from Acad. Affairs has helped a great deal. Pat said they are pleased that Kathy got the grade report done
 - d. Met with FSUGR; they have reports needs as well. Sandy said the reports are useful
 - e. 12+ reports have been created



Applications Steering Committee

- B. ODS – is loaded and running for students! Craig thanked Tech Svcs for their help
- C. Data Security – Pat said the issue of data access and security needs to be addressed/rethought
 - a. Needs to be more dynamic with the different roles that get added for people.
 - b. More access would provide more tools and empower employees
 - c. Richard said there is a difference between viewing access and manipulating data.
 - d. Craig echoed what Pat said; Pat added that many people don't know what options are available. Pat envisions data "experts" that can give rights as they talk to end-users
 - e. John said Data Security team is the place to have the discussion
 - f. Could security be tied into PeopleAdmin?

4. Employee Self Service Enhancement – Denise Grinnell

- A. Proposal is to put name and last 4 digits of the pay stub on self-service; this would have to be done if Ferris wanted to eliminate printed stubs
 - a. Are there any legal requirements on the pay stub; would last 4 digits be adequate?
- B. Payroll is testing the availability of making W4's available online; Denise will check on if this is going to happen and the number of exemptions. New hires will still need to sign paper W4. Denise will talk to HR team about how to announce this.

5. Sungard HE Information Access Strategic Assessment

- A. John handed out the Sungard assessment which was a consulting service paid for before ODS implementation
- B. John highlighted the results from meeting with the user groups
 - a. P. 17 Section on training; users want to run their own reports, but they are also expressing concern about having to run own reports and balancing current job duties
 - b. P. 24 Maturity of finance is greater. Denise said we are level 2 for reporting. Good goal would be for level 3 within a year; Dr. Cochran said that reengineer expectations of employees; requires participation from HR. – job audits, etc. – what are entry level expectations now? What is the forum for these decisions? Can provide structured training.
 - c. P. 36+ - all the different teams that were interviewed and what they felt the processes or reports needed to be done in Banner.

6. Unit Action Plans and Priorities

- A. John said he would try to complete the monetary piece of the IS&T UAP's and have the document prepared and prioritized for the next meeting.
- B. ASC should put the group's priorities on the UAP list to make a unified approach to IT/Banner-related requests

Adjournment @ 4:45

Banner Live!



Applications Steering Committee

-Submitted by Jennifer Thede