

Minutes

Indiana University

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

September 24, 2002

**Indiana Memorial Union Building
Bloomington Campus**

1:30 – 2:30 PM

2:30 PM President Brand's "State of the University" Address

Summary of Action Taken:

Agenda

1:30 in Alumni Hall:

University Faculty Council Meeting

1. Presiding Officer's Business
(President Myles Brand)
2. Agenda Committee Business
(Professors Robert Eno and Mary Fisher)
3. Question / Comment Period
(President Brand and Professors Eno and Fisher)
(10 minutes)
4. Status Report on PeopleSoft Implementation
(Professor Don Hossler, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Services)
(Circular U3-2003)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/circulars/02-03/U3-2003.htm>
5. Appointment of Student Enrollment Services Academic Priorities Committee Members
(Professor Robert Eno, Agenda Committee)

2:30 in the Frangipani Room:

President Brand's "State of the University" Address

ATTENDANCE

Members Present: Gerald Bepko, Bruce Bergland, Myles Brand, Ruth Person, George Walker, Anne Allen, Simon Atkinson, James Baldwin, Abhijit Basu, Julie Bobay, Polly Boruff-Jones, Richard Carr, Donald Coffin, David Daleke, Jeffrey Dean, Robert Eno, Deborah Finkel, Mary Fisher, Michael Foos, Janice Froelich, Anna McDaniel, Mary Popp, Vandana Rao, John Ross, Barry Rubin, Albert Ruesink, Dennis Senchuk, Moira Smith, David Vollrath, Richard Ward, Jeffrey Watt, Enid Zwirn.

Members Absent: Sharon Brehm, David Fulton, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Michael Wartell, Ann Gellis, Laura Ginger, Peter Iadicola, Marilyn Kintzele, Michael Nusbaumer, Mark Pescovitz, Cynthia Roy, Joshua Runyan, Roy Shreiber, Sarita Soni, Rosann Spiro, Robert Tarver, Kizhanipuram Vinodgopal, Kim Walker, Patricia Wittberg, Nanci Yokom, Judd Arnold, Bill Gray, Josh Runyan.

Visitors: Wane Pollard, Military Science, Bloomington; Becky Porter, IUPUI.

AGENDA ITEM #1: Presiding Officer's Business (President Myles Brand)

BRAND: I can see you down there, can you hear me? Our presiding officers' business...I invite you all to the State of the University talk which will take place following this meeting at 2:30 in the Frangipani Room, one floor down, in that direction. I'll report to you a little bit on the state financial situation, it has not improved. And, we will face another difficult legislative session; the tax restructuring that took place recently in the last short session is not adequate to solve the problem. There remains, depending who you ask, somewhere between 750 million and 1 billion dollar deficit and that's large enough that you cannot grow out of it. I'm not even sure you can cut your way out of it. And, certainly any cuts of a serious nature would involve K-12 and that would be devastating for the state not to mention any cuts to higher education. So I think the legislature will face another difficult task in trying to find sufficient revenue to resolve the issue. I don't know how much of that will be spoken about before the November elections but I'm sure a lot of it will be spoken about after the November elections. Indiana University as all of higher education has an important stake in the outcome of that. An important stake in the quality of life of people in Indiana and our ability to help the state, not just IU, but all of higher education, improve the economic climate for the future. So, keep tuned on that, no news to report so to speak, but it remains a critically important issue with respect to our own budget and our student tuition frankly. And I'll turn it over to Bob Eno and Mary Fisher for Agenda Committee Business.

AGENDA ITEM #2: Agenda Committee Business (Professors Robert Eno and Mary Fisher)

ENO: OK, can you hear me through this mic as well? OK, let me start out by welcoming new members to the University Faculty Council who are here for the first time. We don't meet very often, we don't get to know one another very often, and so it's hard for people to get a comfort level to be able to speak in general meetings as the year goes on. Usually we don't meet in these

great cavernous facilities, it's a little bit more intimate, it's a little better than the type of public speaking I feel I'm doing right now to a group of colleagues. But, the key to remaining interested and involved with the UFC is being able to speak up and taking the opportunity to meet colleagues from other campuses when we get together in this group. For many of us it's a pretty rare and valuable opportunity. The University Faculty Council is coordinated through an Agenda Committee which you had something to do with electing the Agenda Committee which is composed largely of the presidents' of the faculty councils on all of the campuses and it's directed by the two co-secretaries of the University Faculty Council, the Presidents' of the Bloomington and IUPUI faculty councils...I am the President of the Bloomington Faculty Council and Mary Fisher, who is sitting to my right is President of the IUPUI Faculty and she is the Co-secretary along with me of the UFC this year, she'll be sharing the duties that come when you sit up front here and have to say something from time to time and next year she'll be the Senior Co-secretary and doing what I'm doing now. Also up here at the front desk is Mike Foos from IU East. Mike our Parliamentarian, he's been our Parliamentarian before on several occasions and I seem to recall there was once an issue that came up and Mike solved it so he's an invaluable member of our group and very well acquainted with the University Faculty Council. Sitting to my left is Kyle Kinnaman who is on the staff of the University Faculty Council that doubles down here in Bloomington with the Bloomington Faculty Council Office and then gathered around the table you have colleagues who are members of the council, you have ex-officio members such as Chancellors, like Chancellor Bepko, and Chancellor Bergland, whom I see, chancellor persons. And also visitors are able to come, faculty visitors are free to come and sit in on the meetings if they can enjoy them, if they have tendencies that make them want to do this. And our guests who come to speak, including Don Hossler today, who will be talking to us. We don't have a lot of business today, this is a short meeting because we're going to be adjourning by 2:30 to Myles' State of the University Address. The major substantive item we have on the agenda is Don Hossler talking about the PeopleSoft implementation process. We have a very small turnout today as you can see, but this message that we're going to hear is one that's going to be very important to us in increasing importance and Don has asked to come so we can become better informed about it. The University Faculty Council's business largely comes out of its committee structure. Many of you are members of UFC committees and the next time we meet which will be up at IUPUI on October 8th we'll have another abbreviated full session meeting, our agenda's likely to be quite light once again and then we'll meet in committees and the committees are the areas where we'll probably begin to generate real agenda items for us to consider on policy and other practical issues and the spring term is likely to have some important activity for us as the agenda becomes clear. Mary is there anything you can think of, I have left out of that overview?

FISHER: No, I would also welcome everyone and we're hoping for a very productive year. Looking forward to the Presidents' address to give us a direction for the University from the administrative side.

ENO: That is the Agenda Committee Business.

**AGENDA ITEM #3: Question/Comment Period
(President Brand and Professors Eno and Fisher)
(10 minutes)**

BRAND: OK, on your agenda is a question and comment period in an open forum if you'd like for a couple minutes. Any questions or comments you wish to make? Seeing and hearing none we'll go onto Item 4 on the agenda and that's the status report on PeopleSoft implementation and Don Hossler I call on you.

**AGENDA ITEM #4: Status Report on PeopleSoft Implementation
(Professor Don Hossler, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Services)
(Circular U3-2003)**

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/circulars/02-03/U3-2003.htm>

ENO: I should note you have a circular that you should have at your table with regard to this, circular U6 I think, no circular U3, the memo from Don.

HOSSLER: Thank you for inviting me to the first meeting of the University Faculty Council. There's a number of things that are going to happen this year. Bob and Mary thought it was important for me to get this on the agenda. I also want to make note of Rebecca Porter who is sitting on my left. Probably the only person I spend more time with now than Becky is my wife. My point in saying that is that really to make this provision to work it's been really important, especially two large campuses see this as a partnership in terms of moving forward. You may well have some questions that I may turn to Becky because she has a clear...she has a better sense of things than I do... Admissions is up and running and I think relatively speaking with the way these types of implementations go because they're always difficult no matter what system...it's gone relatively well I think, the proof's in the pudding where on most campuses we're at or beyond record enrollments and that couldn't have happened with the type of admission process there was. We had a survey and there were kinks to be worked out and some were helpful but it's up and running, it's working now, and I think that the end of a... somewhere between 80 and 90 percent there. Which I think is all we could have aspired to if you look at the way these kinds of implementations go across the country. The next big dates are starting in July 03 and running through December 04 we're supposed to link up the registration and records, student financials, what is called [one word missing] Operations and Student Financial Aid Operations. And, in the language of the project that's been described as a phase implementation meaning that on July 1 means that all registration and records comes up and then a few months later all student financial aid. Many of these things really have to operate in tandem; students can register if they haven't paid their bills. They can't pay their bills if they haven't received financial aid, we can't bill them once they register again prior to the Bursar's systems up and running so the phase implementation means that parts of the registration and records and parts of bursars' system and parts of student financial aid will be brought up during that 18 month period. I think we are supposed to anticipate that this will probably be a full year effort at implementation before we'll see...given a lot of students with admissions, we're not all... but after a year we're certainly sitting a lot closer than we were when we first turned on the switch. That's the kind of time line we're looking at and again I think whatever report you hear whether in this venue or on your original campus, one of the things you all have to keep in mind is it's really hard. Almost every week it seems like we learn more as the professionals who work in all of our offices across all the campuses, but especially in Bloomington where you have the... we are discovering things that didn't look possible that now are truly possibly. Another question

becomes can we not buy the software or is that policy so... that it can't be changed. Those are the kinds of the decisions that we are working through. But, just Al Ruesink another committee and I think in the last SIS executive committee meeting there has been a lot of good news in terms of things that prior to meeting these people thought... the experts across our campuses have gotten into the guts of the software and discovered that will work just fine. I think that's going to be more and more... I have no intention of... these are examples of the kinds of issues that are being dealt with. There is one other issue that you should be kind and supportive to all the student services folks on your campuses because really during the... and working through this phase of implementation what your professionals in your student services areas and support staffs they are using, moving forward on many projects simultaneously. One is the SIS and SES. SIS is the project that if you will, if any of you have ever worked with an Excel spreadsheet, in order to produce the calculations you want you have to know the buttons and you have to identify what kinds of analyses, what kinds of mathematical equations are going to be used to arrive at that spreadsheet. SIS project is very [one word lost] is setting up all of those processes in the software. Once those modules are done they're going to be handed over to an organization that's in the process of develop SES—Student Enrollment Services. And that organization is going to do just what the key service organizations that are currently using with the legacy project once the Business school are... with the software, those folks will make the software work, they'll run the programs right if you need to create bills, if you need to work financial aid, or you need to tell a student what their GPA is or need to change grades. That has to be done in the entire new environment with PeopleSoft and then... until that's done we still have to be able to register students, to award financial aid, and bill them, and admit them with the old system. So, there are really three projects going on at the same time. One is the SIS, the setting up of those large collections if you will. One is the SES, and that is getting people trained to work in the PeopleSoft system because it's really different than our existing system. And then the third area is until the existing systems go away they still have to be able to work. These are really memoirs of the kinds of issues that are... this is not an exhaustive list, you don't want an exhaustive list. If you want one, send me an email and I'll send it to you. But these are exemplar of the kinds of things we are having to work through. Paper placement—we have the last couple policies and some campuses, not all campuses follow the policies which is... And you can see the issues here... the way PeopleSoft is structured it would be very expensive to mirror, to try to mirror those, different policies on each campus and the variation between the victims. And, in a moment I'm going to get to some organization here... pass/fall, variations related to waitlist and checking in either on campuses that use the automated course exchange. I think there are a few... that are using it. How about that? You'll recognize these as... related issues. Anyone here—there's some good news about folks in the registrars' office on the two big campuses that are working on... that a fair amount of the kinds of... of ace can be replicated. Some, not all of it, but more than was initially thought. GradPact. There isn't an easy way for PeopleSoft to support GradPact.

BRAND: GradPact was initially instituted for a number of reasons, one to provide clear pathways for students who did want to graduate on time and have some benchmarks available to them to know how they're doing and also to demonstrate publicly that we do in fact provide opportunities for students to graduate in four years. I think we're in our third graduating class with GradPact Don and how many people have claimed the guarantee.

HOSSLER: I don't know those figures off the top of my head.

BRAND: I bet it's not very many. Because after the first year...what?

HOSSLER: It's in the hundreds.

BRAND: in the hundreds.

HOSSLER: I don't think it's as high as 500 because some of them didn't want to...

BRAND: To take additional courses. It served us very well...

HOSSLER: No one has...

BRAND: The guarantee..right...that was my understanding. Remember we said if you can't get the courses and you do everything you want to and designate a major and so on and you can't graduate in four years and follow all the rules, then we did something wrong. So we'll provide your ability to take the additional courses you need to graduate. I think there have been about three classes that have gone through all four years in GradPact already and we haven't had to meet the guarantee because in fact we do a darn good job. You only offer a guarantee if you can produce and we do a darn good job and so no one had to take advantage of the free tuition. But yet it's something that's comforting to students and their parents and certainly to legislatures in general. OK, so I have a great fondness for this program. Having said that however, as we move into the PeopleSoft/SIS change, we're not going to be able to sustain all the functionality including one of my favorite programs, GradPact. And, I would, Don, strongly recommend that you do not attempt to sew, configure SIS that includes GradPact. The university cannot afford at this time significant dollars to put in to do this. I would like to question open if it turns out for whatever reasons either to our publics or to our students that we need to reinstitute it we might want to come back and reconsider. But, I would strongly recommend that you not put that functionality into the SIS system. The university is facing some difficult financial times, people are going to have to see, change the way they deal with a number of these issues, for example waitlist issues. Not everyone is going to have the same functionality they have grown to know and love and understanding that I think that GradPact should fit into that position as well.

HOSSLER: course numbering, I think if you turn the page over you'll see that we have...this kind of gets into the territory of, why do we have to change the way we keep records for the software...it's all embedded with issues related to the [one word lost]. The ability to do computerized switches, not the manual switches. There's something called... functionality in the software which allows you to take a series of what if's and to pick up certain outliers. So if you're trying to see if a student is now enrolled. If we change and try to use the structure and logic embedded in PeopleSoft to describe our courses we would lose all those kinds of tasks. And those are things we're already able to do in our existing systems. So you get some forms here, none of these are meant to be a final decision, but I was trying to provide some very specific examples of the different ways what we now know as W131, how it could be described, in a way is not too differently from the way its commonly described and still capture the function in PeopleSoft. If another exemplar of the kinds of decisions that people working on the project

are dealing with and maybe I'll just make a couple more comments. The other thing you have before you is a list of the faculty that have been appointed to a committee, the Academic Priorities Committee. That's a committee that will be the first step in the process, a very important first step in the process in keeping these kinds of issues with faculty and presenting to them the functionality of PeopleSoft, the impact on policy if we have changes in policies, but also the impact on the cost side if we say that the policy has to say... and that will be the group along with at least some, there will be some advisory committee, members of this committee will be advising who are not faculty members like Becky and I are in the process right now of recruiting some assistant deans from the regional campuses and large campuses who could also be... Sometimes frankly they will have the best sense of how to change completely on the operations of the academic units. But this committee will be a very important committee in terms of thinking and hearing the issues and making recommendations in terms of how important is the policy versus the cost and making the policy.

PORTER: Just to follow up on the comment President Brand made in relationship with GradPact and [one word lost] we reserve the right to revisit that. That's going to be an important consideration as we go through and we're making some of the decisions on this first implementation. There are going to be some items where it's not going to be feasible to implement or work around or go on vacation. We have try to recognize where people's time is spent and what we can do and we are indeed configuring a list of ok, once we get through this first phase what comes back for consideration. As faculty...honestly on vacation...I think that's an important item to keep in mind that if the initial answer is that we don't think we can do it at this time, it really is saying that we can't do it at this time, it's not an absolute so we're never going to be able to implement.

RUESINK: Don, you say a couple of places where costs will be low, or costs will not be low. Can you put some approximate...are we talking about 20,000 or 200 million? Where are we?

HOSSLER: When it gets high you're getting a cost ranging anywhere from \$100,000 to \$300,000. To give you an example of some of the kinds and this particular example does not directly touch on example on the list...Example of...there are some functionality in the Student Financial Aid and Bursar and its quite different and our current functionality, in this case it's not a positive difference. There are really two ways to address this. One is to use PeopleSoft product, but not in the way its configured. The cost in the additional staff just for the two large campuses alone for additional staff to make this work, just for the PeopleSoft [a couple sentences lost]. The cost would be about \$100,000 a year in additional staff. The modifications are about \$40,000. You can guess which way we'll go with this when making our decisions. There are other instances however where these are the kinds of things the committee will be very much involved in. The hard question will be is it worth \$100,000; is this policy so central that its worth more than the \$100,000 in programming time to make the changes and there's no other important things to add to this. These kinds of programming changes are not one-time costs. A new version of PeopleSoft is released about every 3 years, they have to do that because, one reason is that tax laws change. Software has to reflect the changes in tax laws. Federal and state financial aid policies change and it has to reflect those changes. You don't know this but actually right now there are a cadre of people from UITS that make all those changes every year in our existing system; those changes are... Every time PeopleSoft releases a new version there is a significant

possibility that the \$200,000 modification will cost another \$150,000 to work with the new version of PeopleSoft. So whenever you...that's why there's this great... that every time you make a modification it's quite possible that you'll have to pay the cost of that modification every time a new version of the software comes out. And that's what the committee will help, will help wrestle with some of this...the cost/benefit analysis of how central is this policy to the academic mission of the institution juxtaposed the cost and other costs of...

WALKER: Are there any significant cost items that effect only graduate programs?

HOSSLER: Actually, what I just talked about George was actually the undergraduate programs. This really only affects the large campuses, but the way fee remissions are handled, whether they are grant fee remissions or institution-level fee remissions, the only way to do it in PeopleSoft. ...\$800,000 for the two campuses to hire enough people ...

ENO: I'd like to note something about how this is going to impact upon the University Faculty Council. If the costs involved remain what Don expects them to be I...what's happened in the past in similar situations is that our computer specialists on this project, in cases where there seems to be high cost for a high benefit have managed to find work-arounds that have turned out to be low cost. And I'm always optimistic that as soon as they find some free time, which they have none of right now, they'll be able to explore PeopleSoft further and find ways to reduce the cost of these modifications. But, what's really going to impact on us relates to issues such as the one that we just dealt with with GradPact. In the case of GradPact, to my knowledge, the faculty has no policy establishing GradPact. GradPact was an administrative policy and so the compromise that's made saying well if it's going to be too costly and hurt the academic side to support, to divert the reallocation of resources to this modification, it's better to cancel GradPact. That can be made by administrative fee out and perhaps it just was, but in the case of faculty policies it's much more difficult. The first item on this list, grade replacement policy, indicates that if we maintain our own policies campus by campus of having variant FX policies, grade replacement policies, and on some of our campuses, it is the prerogative of various units, we have units that opt-out of the FX policy by calculating grades without regard to the FX for internal purposes of admission, probation, and so forth. If we insist on maintaining those policies it would be a very high cost in GradPact, excuse me a very high cost in PeopleSoft, but how can we change our policies? What are the mechanisms going to be? The University Faculty Council has authority over some aspects of grade replacement, but we can't dictate to campuses their grade replacement policies. The campuses have authority on their campuses, but they can't dictate to the units, we have authority divisions that are going to be very difficult to work through and what we have to do is have very clear cost/benefit analyses that make the issues clear and that assign the costs of maintaining a policy through modification to those campuses or units that feel it's worthwhile for them to bear that cost. It's something that's going to be quite difficult for us to work through if we actually face these decisions and it looks like we're going to have to and that's probably going to occupy a significant amount of our time in this council during the spring term given the momentum of the project right now. Please...

RUBIN: I have a question for both Don and Bob...this issue of when items come back or come to the UFC for discussion is one that still bothers me. We talked about it a little bit last year and I'm not sure if we ever found a final resolution for it and I'm not sure we will this year. But, I

guess I wonder what your thinking is as to when the UFC will be involved in those kinds of discussions. Clearly if there's a faculty policy, the UFC should be involved, but what about something like the waitlist, I don't know how the faculty council has ever voted on the waitlist. My guess is that's an administrative decision but that is so far from the students, schools, and faculty that I would think nothing has been discussed in the UFC to get some sense of the overall context that we'll look at it from. And, I guess, what is your thinking on that? How would the UFC interact with the committee and...

HOSSLER: That's a really big question Barry and I should just stop there. What I'm really hoping for is through a combination of ongoing conversations with folks like Becky and Mary, and Bob, and through this committee to identify some type of... The reason... are needed is to identify and sometimes...to those issues that will be important up to the UFC. I have thought about if we miss something when the UFC or the various faculty councils [several words lost]. We had this phone conversation, Becky, Bob, Mary about whether course numbering is something that vote on and the general consensus was "no". And yet no one thought it would be wise to just go ahead and change the course numbers without letting everyone know that these issues are out there and there will be issues like that. We may not always catch them. The other thing that we clearly comments that there is real tension between the lucrative process of faculty governance and the need to make decisions that deal with software. And, make no mistake about it, the failure to make a mistake, for this implementation date, I would, my guess, if we don't make this implementation date, we automatically, on the [one word lost] side of this, probably another somewhere between 7 and 10 million dollars to the cost of implementation because the costs to keep the mainframe going for one more year is 5 million dollars more. And I suspect there will be times, I don't want to say this in some kind of imperious way, but there will be times probably where [several words lost]. We'll pull an ad hoc group together... Because the timeline leaves us no other choice. But it's critical that we use some academic advisors to PeopleSoft. We tried and I know that Bob worked with the College of Indiana almost cried in the back of a meeting...just couldn't handle it, what the decisions...PeopleSoft and academic advising per se. To even stay with our existing system is a misnomer because we would have had to buy a new, updated version of that software. [microphone problems, some words lost]. My...we had a telephone conference with units, they were just units...the implementation, and they were pretty much like everyone else [several sentences unclear] I wouldn't say anybody was absolutely enthusiastic but to say that the costs of the new system versus the costs of PeopleSoft is higher real dollars and higher in [several words lost].

FISHER: Don, I did have one question. In many of these instances such as course numbering there will be an obvious cost on the PeopleSoft side, but I'm thinking of all the course syllabi that would have to be renamed, the Course Catalogs, all of that type of work. Will the cost/benefit analysis identify what all those other pieces would have to be and then estimate a cost for that or process to identify the complexity of that side of it?

HOSSLER: Some of those were part of the discussion, but I this isn't my style, I'd much rather. But what occurred to me is those costs will be one time costs where if you make the decision not to go with the PeopleSoft product you are in perpetuity saying either we can't do the kinds of things we've done in the past or the cost of doing them is a cost we own every time they upgrade PeopleSoft we would have to redo them. We don't have the functionality [several words lost] So,

we certainly don't want to use any more of your session, but that's part of this analysis. Is there one-time cost or is there cost, does this decision mean we have to pay those costs every time that we upgrade.

RUESINK: Part of the reaction to that too is that's outside of the readings, this group and we look at estimated costs. We do look at estimated costs of units outside of the immediate units that have to maintain an area of concern. [a few words lost].

**AGENDA ITEM #5: Appointment of Student Enrollment Services Academic Priorities
Committee Members
(Professor Robert Eno, Agenda Committee)**

ENO: Folks, we have a practical time deadline. We have to get over to Myles' speech by 2:30, it's a televised speech. We really have to bring this to a close, we have a piece of business that we have to do by the regulations we passed last year along with Don's cooperation concerning this SES Academic Priorities Committee. The UFC appoints the committee, and on the 24th of September memo that you have in front of you, you have a list of names that the UFC Agenda Committee has recommended to the UFC for appointment to this committee with terms specified. The basic term is four years but we've staggered the terms to get the, to make sure we have a phased turnover of personnel. So we really do have to move on and move to that item and this is a motion from the Agenda Committee to the UFC to vote on these appointments.

BRAND: OK, any comments on the appointments? Looking at the September 24th memo, it should be right in front of you.

ENO: I'm sorry to cut off the discussion about this topic. We'll be having more discussions on it later.

BRAND: All in favor of this committee please say "Ay" [AY]. Opposed? [none opposed]. OK, we've done our business.

ENO: We need to move to the Frangipani Room at the other end of the Union for the speech. Thanks to all of you for coming.