Banner Implementation Team Meeting
Friday, February 23, 2001
1002 1 Park Place

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

Approval of Minutes
The Minutes of the February 15, 2001 minutes were approved as amended including changes and typos suggested by team members. The approved minutes will be posted on the Banner website.

Announcements – general presentation (Bill & Cherise)
Presentation to chairs, visit with BOR managing expectations
Bill and Cherise have been talking up banner. They met with the Chair’s Council on Wednesday and made a presentation on changes regarding the leadership of the banner project. They will be repeating the presentation to Admissions and Standards and other groups. Bill and Cherise want to send out the message of “realistic expectations”. Things will change when Banner goes live. Bill and Cherise are trying to sell the community on sticking to the current time line or a modified version to allow user input and the first year being viewed as development with user modifications.

Bill and Cherise meet with Barry Fullerton and Tonya Lamb at the Board of Regents and shared their ideas on the leadership of Georgia State’s implementation project. They did not get a clear understanding of Barry’s role. Barry’s office will focus on constructive changes with OIIT and how the system connects with SCT in providing the service they should. Barry’s office consists of functional people handling the products. Both Bill and Cherise detected some tension between Barry’s office and OIIT.

Bill reported their meetings with the BOR served as a preliminary round in promoting Degree Works as the degree audit system for Georgia State instead of CAPP. Both Bill and Cherise felt the initial reception from the BOR was chilly. Bill made a case of Georgia State being a research institution and emphasized how our current PACE provides better information than CAPP. He pointed out how Georgia State will use its degree audit system as tool for managing enrollment. Bill and Cherise will meet with the BOR in late March to make final request for an alternative system other than CAPP.

Tracking of Web Question/Concerns
Questions sent through the website (banner@gsu.edu) will be assigned a number and tracked. Bill and Cherise will assign appropriate questions to the team leaders who will be required to a two-day initial response. The response could be “we received your question”. General questions will be posted on the web page.

Project Time Line Discussion
John distributed a draft of three options for revising the project timeline. Option three eliminated out of sync issues with student target and Financial Aid for Summer 2002. All three options stays within the current timeline. Project teams need to develop their time lines to meet the project timeline.

The first year, Pre-requisite checking will not be turned on in Banner to avoid doing anything that will affect credit hours negatively. Not understanding the consequences, the team does not want to deal with the issue until the final cycle

Joann suggested John include an electronic check payment capability as an option with credit card payments. She is looking at an alternative technology that will allow students to pay without physically being on campus. Joann will send documentation to Keith so that he can research to see how server needs will be affected.

The Registration Focus Team will discuss and determine the terminology for the registration cycles.

John will make changes and send an updated copy of the timeline to everyone.
The issue of communicating to students was raised and included a suggestion for Kiosks to advertise Banner that would invite students to come look at what’s available in Banner, possibly providing a mock registration, and getting more information in the Signal. Bill Fritz will talk to Darryl Holloman, Student Advocate, and Kurt Keppler about getting input from student groups including the SGA.

Trey raised the issue of an institutional ID other than Social Security numbers. Research must be done on whether a query in Banner can be either SSN or another ID number. When Dan H. and his Registration Focus Team meets next week, he will discuss this issue with the SCT Consultant and get clarification on the limitations of Banner. Bill Fritz will investigate the University’s final ruling on using Social Security numbers.

Dan N voiced Tim’s concern, in his absence, regarding moving degree audits to May depending if Dave (Financial Aid) can have the information he needs. Bill asked John to note on the timeline that the dates were subject to change.

The Implementation Team agreed to adopt Option 3 as the only doable option in changing the timeline. This option will be presented to the Steering Team. Bill will use this option to ask for more resources to meet the deadlines. The consensus of the Team is that this group strongly advises against turning on Pre Requisites checking the first year.

Work with SCT on Project Plans
Cherise, John, Bill and appropriate team leaders will be working with SCT next week to develop Project Plans to make the March 1 commitment date. Sandra Beaulac has committed to working Tuesday-Friday with the Banner management group to help identify key dependencies and resources in the hopes of beginning to know where we are in the project. Ground rules will be set at the beginning of each session. Cherise asked John and Emory Cornelius to lead the Planning sessions, as they did not want to waste the consultant’s time.

Mike Moore expressed his concern about Reporting not being included in the planning sessions. Cherise reported the hope was to keep the sessions small, but is aware they will need to go back to other targets.

Report on visit to Virginia Tech (Keith and Cherise)
Cherise and Keith reported on their trip to Virginia Tech on February 5, 2001. Cherise reported she meet with an employee of Cornelius and Associates, primarily the technical team and a few functional people. She was given a lot of information. Virginia Tech cautioned on things they would do differently if done again such as having only one person doing conversion mapping, and managing their campus’ expectation. Based on Georgia State’s go live date expect August 2003 to be the date everything would be really complete. Virginia Tech felt the key to their success was based on identifying key dependencies by getting groups together and having meeting based on key dependencies, which motivated their time line. VA Tech also encouraged site visits, subscribing to listservs, not believing everything SCT says and keeping on SCT. VA Tech was not really happy with DARS. VA Tech also suggested using clip-ons to handle academic regulations and to keep modifications to a minimum.

Keith reported it was interesting the way VA Tech did reporting but stated he would not recommend Georgia State doing reporting like VA Tech. They used report instances with read-only version of Banner “as of last night” from where comes most of their reporting. All of VA Techs infrastructure was done under SUN. It was recommended to use Citrix. Their financials were really nice and VA Tech used a lot of resources, for instance they had seven DBAs.

A question was raised regarding using VA Tech’s project plans and Bill cautioned project planning should be based on institutional culture. Others project plans should be used a starting point.

Security Concerns
Per Dean of Arts and Sciences “if unmet demand can’t be captured, there will be no Banner”. Unmet demand and rollover sections are issues the campus is concerned about having information available in Banner. It was suggested Mike Moore attend the training with the Registration Focus Teams. Bill Fritz wants to convince the campus to not
have Pre requisite checking on the first year. Another issues are standards and how data is entered in Banner. Dan H. described the Data Standards subgroup formed out of the Implementation Team as a subset of the General Person Focus Team. Dan H. will provide to Bill information on the Data Standards his group is working. It was suggested that the issues go beyond general person information and the group will need to be expanded.

Another issue concerned the security of data and the authorization of persons to change data. In OASIS different groups owns screens. Banner has two methods to set up security. One method is via value based security. The other method is to set up security by role and level.

A clear process needs to be developed and roles identified now.

Team Reports
Joann reported she was optimistic about an interview with a candidate for her Associate Director of Technology for Student Accounts. The candidate went through a Banner implementation at a prior university, was a technical lead and worked on account receivables. The Student Accounts Focus Team had not met yet, but has been learning Financial Aid and will be attending training with the Registration Team the week of February 25. The Student Accounts Focus Team training begins the Week of March 19 and April 30. Joann reported she had not been in contact with the SCT Consultant, Susan who will be doing the training.

Trey reported he is working on the Person Registry Committee with Art Vandenberg, which is dealing with the same issues as his focus team. The Person Registry is developing a data warehouse type structure from which most data will come out. The committee will have another meeting on Tuesday.

Dan H had a concern about faculty feeds. Mike Moore needs to know exactly what Dan needs. Trey suggested he, Dan and Mike get together to discuss the issues.

Dave Bledsoe, Dan Niccum and Tim Woltering will give their team reports at the next Implementation meeting.

New Business/Old Business/ Adjournment
Implementation Teams should send general vacation plans to Cherise.

Meeting adjourned.

Recorded by:
Wanda Taylor