MINUTES
Banner Implementation Team Meeting
Thursday, February 15, 2001
1002 1 Park Place

Present: Keith Campbell, Trey Chiles, Bill Fritz, Dan Hammond, Mike Moore, Dan Niccum, Cherise Peters, John Pratt, Wanda Taylor, Winnie Tsang-Kosma, Tim Woltering, Joann Worthington

Banner Implementation Team meetings will use 1002 1 Park Place Conference Room for meetings. If Team Leaders would like to use the conference room for their focus team meetings, ask Wanda to facilitate with BJ Yeargens. Mike Moore indicated the room as a token ring connection and if needed his computer can be used.

The format of this meeting is open discussions. Informative minutes will be taken and posted on the web. Wanda will email a draft of the minutes to the Banner Team for review before posting to the web.

Bill Fritz indicated he was asked by Provost Ron Henry to take over the leadership of the Banner Implementation Team and project. His goal is to do the best he can to make Banner a success and for the team leaders to succeed. Cherise Peters will be Associate Leader. Both Bill and Cherise will be responsible for the whole direction of the project. They do not want to have their roles divided into technical or functional leaders. Cherise will be given “Banner” questions – there will be no distinction between functional or technical issues and will be working across the breadth of the project. Team Leaders should direct questions or concerns to Cherise. If she has questions, she can bring them to Bill. Cherise will handle decisions when Bill is off campus. If an immediate decision needs to be made and Cherise is not available, Team leaders may go to Bill. The goal is to not bring the same problem or issue to both for resolution, but to keep the project moving forward. Please let Cherise and Bill know if this chain of command is not working. Bill’s and Cherise’s roles are to provide general leadership and to make the university happy with the final product. C&A’s role is to provide assistance to make sure the project is a success.

The Focus Team Leaders need to start owning management of their focus teams. Team members need to develop their own working relationship with SCT vendors and consultants. Getting service needed from SCT Banner so far is going well. SCT has a reputation for not providing customer service to its clients. Cherise asked that Team Leaders take responsibility and be more accountable in developing relationships with the SCT trainers/consultants.

Bill indicated interaction and communication with the University community about Banner is a must. There are concerns, misinformation, and misunderstanding about Banner that need to be addressed. He wants Team Leaders to start developing their political skills and leadership roles on campus. Team Leaders should start talking to people, focusing on their individual contacts, share information and getting input about the University project. Team leaders should hold impromptu and ad hoc meetings. This will require more work on the team leader’s part but they need to meet with their worst critics to discuss concerns. The University must know the Banner Team is listening to the concerns of the community. Bill stated he is available to help provide assistance in getting input from the Deans, Chairs, VP, etc. He will identify key persons to talk to and is willing to go with the team leaders in their discussions. Bill’s goal when Banner is finished, is to have produced focus team leaders that are stronger leaders on campus showing time spent on the Banner project was well used. Teams Leaders need to ask questions and see who they need in order to strengthen their leadership role.

Decisions, such as Degree audit need buy in from the campus to provide political support in possibly fighting the Board of Regents. Team leaders will be faced with making similar decisions over the next year and a half to two years. Taking ownership of project lead management roles will add duties, but make Banner a more successful project. Bill and Cherise will be available to help make decision and get needed resources.

Bill summarized a few of the University’s concerns he was aware of:
Academic community fears Banner will force changes in academic regulations, which they will have no say. Department Chairs, Senate Chairs, and Senate Committees (e.g., Admissions and Standards) want to have a say and want to stay in the loop in the decision making process.

The University Community does not know what’s going on with the project and think the team is not aware of their major concerns.
The Team Leaders will need to manage expectations that Banner can do better or that users will lose some functionality. The University needs to be prepared that Banner may not work perfectly – especially during the first year. Team Leaders need to be realistic about Banner in their communications.

In regards to the Go live dates, Cherise indicated the need to communicate to university decisions about what the Project Team is committed to deliver. The Community wants different things from Banner and the Implementation team must balance and manage expectations as much as possible.

Bill stated the Senate can be very important in helping with decision-making and team leaders should meet with senate chairs. Team leaders need to have one on one conversation with persons and try to get an understanding of their concerns. The Implementation Team will sit down as a group to decide how to handle concerns.

Statware is depended on for all sorts of decision making, there is fear information will not be available in Banner. Some perceptions of issues are based on experience with Spectrum and needs of departments not met as expected. Some are scared the same thing will happen with Banner. Team leaders need to be more realistic of expectations in promoting Banner.

Cherise and Keith will report on their trip to Virginia Tech at the next meeting.

Bill stated the Team leaders had two questions: How? and What? To answer the what, they need proper input from campus and should seek advice and input from other people not on their focus teams. Team leaders should talk to Bill about issues, concerns in communicating with their team members. Bill will talk to the dean’s about the possibility of reassigning team members. Resources should best be used as liaisons.

Another issue/concern is that the time table is unrealistic, too compressed and need to be expanded. Bill offered two solution to this concerns: 1) to extend the deadline another year, and 2) to stick to schedule, do best as can and let the first year serve as testing and feedback to see what the University really needs to provide a better product.

There was discussion about the pros and cons of changing the time line. The reality about Banner is it does not roll out perfectly and has to be made unique to the university. There would be additional cost to put off a year including additional training. Cherise suggested the “team” might understand the product better but it would not be a good idea to put off implementation for an additional year. As people learn to use and learn more about Banner, we will find out proposed changes and needs might be handled with clips-ons or will require modifications. Other Banner schools have discovered they are trapped by lots of modifications and recommend sticking to baseline as much as possible.

Mike Moore indicated some come concerns regarding the need for information will be handled with the Data warehouse.

In answer to Keith’s question about talking to other schools about how they handled particular concerns, Dr. Fritz cautioned that while talking to other schools would be useful, the solutions might be different for Georgia State because of how resources are allocated.

Mike pointed out that based on information in the flyer regarding the fact that OASIS and Orator were going away and that many departments rely on the transactional system and the Banner team is not at that point in training, we need to move articulation far in advance of the transactional systems. Also, Georgia State does not want to make the same mistake the system made in not having enrollment reports available for six months.

Concerns are raised because the tools to change/allocate resources to maximize hours are going away. The State of Georgia is unique in that 100% funding for universities is based on credit hours. Also, a shortage of classroom space demands maximizing enrollment and a high level of space utilization.

The basic need for the Banner team is to realize what is driving the concerns across campus. Which is why the team leaders need to sit down and get information to understand what the concerns are, and begin discussions about what Banner will do that will help or hurt.
John cautioned the team to be careful about having the same conversations a year from now, with reduced resources.

Cherise advised the team not to get in a reactionary role. Difficult issues will come up every day and the Team Leaders just need to let the community know that they are aware and hear their concerns and balance between what the university wants and what can be done in Banner.

Dr. Fritz stated he raised the issue to the Team to let them know the timeline was an issue, but felt we did not have the data to make a decision at this point. He also states the Team leader’s interaction with the community would vary depending on the needs of the Focus Team. If more resources are needed, Team Leaders need to come to Bill. He did not feel it was unrealistic to ask for more money in order to stick to deadlines.

Keith stated that the way the charters were written that money was secondary and that quality is primary goal. He argued that it would be better to stick to the current timeline and produce a higher quality product. It was agreed that several basic ground rules might need to be changed and some assumption will need to be readdressed.

Bill stated he is here to help and will use his political contacts as resources to make sure the project happens and team leaders should do the same things where appropriate.

Cherise believed the timeline should be based on key dependencies and the team leaders should not run from the dates. It just needs to be communicated to and understood by the University what can be committed to be delivered.

Tim suggested having a special meeting called to specifically talk about the timeline. John stated that a previous meeting on the timeline was good and he has made changes to the timeline document.

Mike gave a brief report on the Reporting Focus Team. He had a productive meeting with the chairs regarding enrollment modeling. He wanted to encourage the team to talk about a Report system strategy. He reported the Provost is entertaining a budget for Decision Support. The decision support group is beginning work on several reporting issues: Spectrum, Banner Development and Alumni, and management information for Research and Sponsored Programs.

Mike recommended looking at reporting tools for decision support and banner called Discovery, an end user reporting tool from Oracle. He suggested the Team leaders call Daryl Holloman, Student Advocate as a contact for getting a student voice in the project.

John asked the Team to look at choices to update the timeline and to let him know if there are corrections or concerns. He reported Project plans groups have met at least three times and the next step is to get SCT’s involvement. March 1 is still the target date for completion of selected Project Plans.

Keith updated the team on the status of the Infrastructure Focus Teams. Acquisition strategy has reached a decision to not acquire additional servers now as early phases of Banner do not need a larger server and both Sun and HP were getting ready to role out new servers and Georgia State did not want to serve as guinea pigs for the newer technology. The infrastructure is moving toward HP products because of issue of Sun’s service. EMG made the decision to get rid of the IVR by Spring 2002. But after talking to Steve Ratterree, it was decided to wait until Banner goes on line.

Winnie stated her training project plans overlay on the Focus Teams project plans. Please give Winnie feedback on the information she sent out regarding her training plans. She will meet with Cherise to discuss her training document. Dan N. suggested the team leaders provide Winnie with their critical issues.

Bill suggested the team leaders begin meeting with Bill and Cherise monthly to talk about critical issues. Wanda will schedule a meeting with Cherise and Winnie on training.

Dan gave an update on the Catalog/Scheduling Team. This team just went through training. Sandra Beaulac’s trip report gave a good review. Dan reported his other teams had not met. He indicated that going through the training uncovered a lot of issues such as how each module affected the others.
It was decided to have a couple of Focus Team reports each meeting. Joann, Dan N, Tim and Trey Chiles will report at future meetings. Tim stated he would not be here next week but wanted to let the team know his team did not like CAPP, did not like DARS and will be building a case with the Board of Regents to allow Georgia State to purchase Degree Works.