ERP Planning Group Minutes

Date: June 13, 2018

Present: Donna Artho, Dave Hammonds, Rose Kader, Judith Lewis, Scot Mertz, Chuck Mize, Tessy Rappe, Mary Robbins, Renee’ Starns, James Vanroekel, Dave Verghese, Charity Walker

1. Welcome and Good Things
   A. Donna – Interactive Fact Book now available online
   B. Dave V. – Payment kiosks to take credit card payment at the Bursars Office
   C. Dave H. – Old records on microfiche at the vendor to transfer the files to BDMS

2. Needs List - None

3. Introductions and Meet Dr. Judith Lewis
   A. Chuck introduced Dr. Lewis to the Group

4. Presentation by Dr. Lewis: “Communication, Collaboration, Consistency”
   A. Dr. Lewis gave a presentation to briefly share information on her evaluation of Enterprise Services and upcoming changes.
   - Gathering data regarding applications, projects, licensing, etc.
   - The need to be consistent with the intake of requests. All request should come through Cherwell.
   - Technology Oversight Approval Process – currently evaluating the process to help integrate and streamline the process.
   - Project Management Office (PMO) is involved in larger projects in scope and may reach out to functional areas to assist with coordination efforts.
   - The IT Division is making changes to the “Intake Process.” This is the Division’s methodology, undergoing internal refinement, to standardize the way that all requests come in to the division. More information to be provided in the future.
   - An emphasis on consistent task and project management to produce a reliable, dependable, transparent process for the campus.
   - Aware of the need to “load balance” requests.
   B. From meeting with several stakeholders, Dr. Lewis continued her presentation with the focus being on the ERP Planning Group’s direction.
   - Dr. Lewis referred to an EDUCAUSE Check List that summarized the steps that higher education bodies can follow to further define the mission, responsibility, authority, and how recommendations flow up the organizational hierarchy.
   - Two example models were shown to demonstrate how other higher education institutions defined their structure, capabilities, and decision frameworks. Dr. Lewis recommended bringing in a facilitator to help create an SHSU-appropriate
model. She explained the need for “progressive elaboration” on a model to move forward within the next four to six months.

1. The group was at a consensus that there is a need to have a clear understanding of the expectations, role, responsibility, authority, and direction of this group that is consistent with the mission/objective of the University.

5. Intranet vs Internet (Continued discussion)
   A. Chuck updated the group stating there is a need for future direction and discussions. There are several questions that are arising both technical and administrative in nature.
   B. The group discussed their concerns with MySam noting the following: the need for an updated look and organization, improved search capabilities, consideration for mobile devices, and channels for customization.
   C. Due to time, will address at the next meeting.

6. Data Standards – Address Coding Request (Continued discussion)
   A. Due to time, will address at the next meeting.

7. Needs List Revisited - None

8. Launch