

Applications Steering Committee

Discussion Notes

March 20, 2007 3:00 – 4:30 CSS 302

Present: John Urbanick, Dan Burcham, Pat Klarecki, Sandra Davison-Wilson, Richard Cochran, Rick Christner

Absent: Denise Grinnell, Karen Thompson, Craig Westman, and Melanie Rice (all at Summit)

Handouts: Agenda, Banner Baseline Results, Banner Survey Native Results, FFA Survey Questions, FACT Charge, UAP Successes & Efficiencies, and UAP Proposed, letter to students regarding RIAA copyright violations, Banner survey open text

New Business

1. **Review Previous Minutes of Feb. 20**
No additional changes/comments

2. **Banner Surveys**

A. Results

John shared Banner Baseline Survey Results; 300 people replied. The quantitative results for question 1 through 3 showed a favorable feedback on the use of Banner. John also shared the FFA survey that was conducted. The open comments for question 4 was shared and discussed. It was recommended that John the share the comments with each team leader and place the baseline survey on the website.

Pat said the FFA survey results do not reflect what people in AA feel. Pat commended John for asking Michael Ryan for his FFA survey data and conducting the Banner survey.

Sandy recommended that the legend include the number of banner users and numbers instead of percentage

Richard suggested the results be shared with SunGard to see if they have solutions already.

A consultant is going to review our tables.

Applications Steering Committee

3. Academic Team Report

The charge Pat issued was to identify a list of issues that prevent employees from doing their daily jobs or issues that are problems. The second charge was to get a handle on the reports. The list was compiled and priorities will be set at the next meeting.

#1 – Header box on all forms in Banner that would consistently display student information on all screens; John said this was echoed on the Banner survey

#2 – Pcard balances show different balances at the end and beginning of the month – fix this discrepancy

#3 – Room scheduling is cumbersome and time consuming; hinders final exam room scheduling as well

Pat is going to prioritize the items on the reports and as he meets weekly with Denise, Craig, and Student Team, those reports will be adjusted as they are completed or move up in priority. Pat will also provide weekly updates to the deans. There is a desire from the customer viewpoint to be involved with testing to see if it will meet the needs. Pat was supportive of an automated tracking system like eHSARF to track and communicate the status of banner requests.

Pat will invite John Urbanick to the next Academic Team Meeting.

4. Unit Action Planning

A. Banner Successes

John reviewed the draft Information Services unit action plans with the committee. The discussion focused on the Banner project accomplishments and the plans for next year. Most of the discussion focused on next years plans.

B. Banner Proposed

- a. A brief discuss was held on the new support model, survey information and staff feedback to improve services.
- b. Staffing - Requesting three support positions: extend current FT Temporary for at least one year; add another FT temporary to address the number one request on the survey, Reporting. A third FT temporary position is needed to implement WorkFlow. Temporary positions are being requested, but permanent positions would be preferred because there is so much turn-over with temp positions. Pat suggested temp agencies might be a solution, but that has its own issues. Posting the job as “multi-year” would help; John to adjust Banner staffing bullet on UAP to request multi-year funding.

Dan said that there needs to be a discussion at President’s Council about the necessity of positions being permanent – perhaps the ASC committee would recommend certain positions. Reduction in reports would change needs for



Applications Steering Committee

report writing, so need to look at strategically. Could grad assistants help more on campus; pay more or offer tuition credits? Pat enthusiastically supported adding resources. John asked those in support to update their UAP requests to reflect this need.

- c. Upgrade/Replace Banner servers. Current servers are three years old and during peak academic events running at capacity. Jim Cook, Manager of Technical Services, is evaluating whether to upgrade or buy new? There were multiple concerns expressed in the survey about performance and the time it takes to navigate from screen to screen in Banner.

John reported that registration went well, but servers are running at peak. Operational Data Store (ODS) is up and running for Finance and HR, but still having issues with Student module.

SCT is now recommending that ODS be run on its own database server.

- i. The new ODS, WorkFlow and Xtender hardware were included in or will be funded via Banner budget. The server was committed but there may not be enough funds. Karen Thompson will confirm at the next meeting.

- d. Continued Training

John reported that training was the number 2 priority from the Banner survey.

- i. Recognize that there should be sustained training effort for existing and new employees. Information Services will collaborate with the Training Team on training for Banner and other campus-wide applications.

C. Recommendations

John asked the committee for any additional comments and recommendations.

- a. Ask for what is really needed
- b. Richard congratulated IS&T for the wide-range of UAP accomplishments and plans that focus on all university areas

Previous Business

5. Functional Area Coordinating Team (FACT) Charge

A. Language

Denise re-worked the charge and revised the language; the charge was shared with the committee. Richard commented that the new language refers to software that uses “university technology resources” – this is too broad, and what software doesn’t require technology resources? Rick Christner added that applications integrating with Banner and MyFSU are the ones that need oversight by FACT. After discussion, the final language reads: **The applications will include the Banner system and other integrated systems that require university technical resources.**

Applications Steering Committee

B. Committee Members

The FACT committee members were approved of, but there is some concern because Academics does not have a technical resource representing them. The majority of the issues with regards to Banner Student revolve around academic issues, but it doesn't seem like there is enough representation. Pat feels things are on the right track to resolve problems, but at this point Academic Affairs is relying on Student Affairs reps to solve issues. Richard suggested that we might engage someone from AA office.

6. People Admin Software – April's Meeting

–Submitted by Jennifer Thede