Applications Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes – 12/19/07

Present: Dan Burcham, Rick Christner, Richard Cochran, Denise Grinnell, Jennifer Thede, Kristen Salomonson, Karen Thompson, John Urbanick, Deb Yost

Absent: Don Flickinger, Melanie Rice, Sandra Davison-Wilson

Handouts
- Student Worker Access in Banner fact sheet draft

<u>New Business</u>
1. Updates
   - Banner Upgrade - Denise
     - o Upgrade went well with three issues but they were solved in the same day; the issues will be added into the test plans. The process had enough planning and communication that it was not too stressful. John suggested that key individual names be collected for a pat-on-the-back or other appreciation award.
   - Report on Faculty Senate Meeting
     - o Denise and Dan Burcham met with eBoard on registration issues. Concerns were about first night of registration open for honors students because a step was missed that caused the students not to be able to register for 5 hours past the start time. A group will be formed by Dan to discuss registration options that are best for everyone in the future (such as what time registration starts). Communication is the key.

2. Unit Action Planning
   - Training Team - Karen
     - o Karen shared the training team UAP for a training coordinator to specifically organize IT training for the university. The recommendation is to request a 1 year internship as part of the overall internship request for A&F. See UAP for details.
     - o The training team tried to meet the demands for Banner training; functional areas held some trainings and town-hall meetings. Looking at methods, they can be online, the web, videos. Want a centralized training service to Banner and other IT issues; a lot of training can be done though FerrisConnect. This would allow employees to take courses from their desk and once training is completed they would have increased access. Richard said in Deans' Council was looking at CT help in colleges and issues on productivity in general. The deans seemed eager to look at the big picture of improving employees abilities. He said that it would be helpful to show that we have ramped up the qualifications of employees in general.
     - o John talked about the ITAP students and Karen said there is internal training to ITAP employees being delivered via FerrisConnect. These students go out to do trainings and they can work with this. John said HR has so much compacted in to New Employee Orientation that there isn't more room for IT training. Richard said that until there is a baseline expectation of employee training it will be hard to assess success of training. There are expectations and certain tasks that need to be done, but the instruction varies so much and it is hard to say with confidence that training is yielding the desired results.

Applications Steering Committee

- Denise observed that HR is a focal point for this but they are mainly concerned with new employee orientation. The training team may need to lead broader training concepts. Richard said that evaluating employees is part of HR, but Rick said the department needs to determine if their skills fit. Rick said that finance training was offered this week and those who attend training are often reluctant. This training is driven by people in Finance and having a coordinator would be a big step.

- Information Technology Services UAP recommendations - John
  - FerrisConnect upgrade to disk space and nodes. Over 4500 students are using it, and we are using over half of what disk space is available.
  - Ferris.edu environment into a cluster environment for failover
  - Ebill and Intellicheck are moving to a pure web environment instead of a client on machines....need to move off of computer installed clients
  - Workflow...need hardware, training, and staff to support
  - Student email project – technical group has looked into it and outsourcing seems to be the best choice but it is still being investigated. Need to talk to students, student government, and alumni office about this.
  - Finance team would like to purchase implemented marketplace to be PCI compliant in the acceptance of credit cards
  - Xtender team would like to purchase additional licenses
  - WebFOCUS team would like to purchase additional licenses

3. Current Projects
   - Student Email Project
   - Ferris Connect
   - MyFSU
   - Xtender Implementation

4. Software License - Kristen

   With more people asking for access to modules and more expectations that people use it in their job, it is hard to make sure there is enough licensing. How will they get financed? It is expensive.
   - Xtender – 45 concurrent licenses currently
     - We have more than 45 users, but a survey is being conducted to help identify who should be moved to non-license report users to bring us back to compliance.
     - Approx. 2K per user + maintenance and we need about another 40-45 licenses (depending on survey) to be in proper compliance
       - CORRECTION – Cost is only $250 per user!
     - We don't know how many people will be using this if they go through SSB. There are people who may need to use Xtender when advising students
   - WebFOCUS – 200 licenses currently with about 250 users (not concurrent)
     - A survey has been created to find out what people are doing with their licensing
     - John asked about the features in WebFOCUS and if a license is needed vs. viewing and Kristen and Denise said they are moving people to the library and see where we stand before buying additional licenses.

o A group of 100 licenses cost about $43,000 plus annual maintenance
o John asked if we should be looking at other solutions other than WebFOCUS. The past purchase of WebFOCUS was made in relation to mainframe, not Banner, and it carried over. Denise said it is easy to train programmers on WebFOCUS and Karen said it is a supported Banner product. We could use Crystal Reports, Cognos, Argos, or something else. Denise said that a limited number of schools use WebFOCUS, probably because of the cost. Karen said Banner is increasing their reporting abilities.
o Rick said that we should support more licenses than fewer and we need to provide the tools to make it successful. Karen said the way we do business with Xtender still has to change.

5. **Data Security - Kristen**
- More requests for access to Xtender; more thought needs to be given than just allowing people to get access since there are cost ramifications for more users
- Students are more restricted in INB than in SSB and there are requests for Xtender access. In Xtender you can see the SS# and that can be turned off. There are offices that rely heavily on student employees who need higher access to do their jobs.
    o Dan said it has been made clear that in the Deans' offices that the students need higher access and workflow would stop without student help and this is a real issue that needs to be addressed. Dan said there needs to be a significant UAP from ASC and John said we need to frame the request and analyze how jobs are getting done with student help. Kristen said we need more clarity from the top on what the approach should be so we can address security adequately. Dan said maybe it can't be a decentralized process and it should be done in a similar way since it would have some advantages in terms of clarifying several systems.
    o John referred to the FERPA document online and that really only refers to releasing information versus inputting or processing information.
    o Richard inquired about other universities and how they address this and Kristen thought most schools were restrictive like this. Rick wondered if FT staff handled all student records, could it work? Karen said students are employees and it might not be what FERPA wants but they are valid employees.
    o Does this go to Pres. Council? John said we should take time and look at other universities and get help from Gen Council. John suggested a conference call with other schools.
    o Dan is concerned that we can't get the resources quickly enough to fix issues if they arise, but we have a couple of months.
    o John wondered if we can lockdown access to certain locations (at work)

6. **FACT Meeting Issues**
- The group did not have time to discuss this topic - tabled

7. **Spring Semester Meeting Schedule**
- Next meeting is Jan. 21. February through June meetings will be last Tues. of the month as usual