

[In these minutes: 1. Discussion of College Technology Fees, 2. PeopleSoft Update]

## **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE (SCIT)**

### **MINUTES**

**WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, 1999**

**11:30 - 1:00**

**STUDIO C, RARIG CENTER**

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the view or, nor are they binding on the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.]

**PRESENT:** Maria Gini (chair), Steve Cawley, James Chelikowsky, Gary Jahn, Andy Lopez, William Peterson.

#### **REGRETS:**

Ann Hill Duin, Vicki Gaylord, Harold Grotevant, Laura Gurak, Charlene Mason, Kevin McDowell, Shih-Pau Yen.

**ABSENT:** Susan Galatowitsch, Ben Metzler, Marcel Richter, Andy Rotering.

**GUESTS:** Roberta Armstrong, Jodie Berg-Combs, Myron Lowe.

### **1. DISCUSSION OF COLLEGE TECHNOLOGY FEES**

Steve Cawley stated that student technology fees are now standard in the colleges and are accepted by the students because college have students advisory committees which decide where the fees will be spent. Two years ago, OIT tried to incorporate a central fee to pay for the modem pool, computer labs, and the e-mail system, but this was met by resistance because students would not be involved in deciding where the money is being spent. Without a student fee, this has left the burden of paying for these service on central administration. Currently, central has allocated money for these services through fiscal year 2000. After this date, OIT and the colleges will need to find a solution to funding these recurring services. He then talked about the handouts that had been distributed and mentioned that for fiscal year 2000, it is possible that all ITV conference fees might be charged to departments, instead of receiving central subsidies as is now the case. He then opened the floor for questions.

A coordinate campus member said that ITV should still be used for committees since the Senate Office saves more money by not having to pay traveling expenses, and it saves the faculty members' time.

Q: By looking at this sheet, it seems that each college charges a different fee and offers different services. Can anything be done about this?

A: At this point, it would be very difficult for OIT to ask the colleges to change the fees that they collect and how they are spent.

Q: I am only familiar with the technology fees in my college. What is the situation in other colleges? Is there enough money?

A: Each college has a unique situation so it is hard to compare them. I do not think that anyone has enough money, but there is a strategy to spend money wisely and be accountable to the students paying the fees.

Q: Would it make more sense to charge students a technology fee per credit?

A: Sometimes this would make sense. Other times it depends on the student's usage of labs and the modem pool, or which college they are enrolled in.

Q: Have technology fees been compared between comparable institutions?

A: This has not been done yet, although OIT could do this by looking at websites.

Steve Cawley then made the following points:

- Central funds will no longer be available so it will be student money versus college money
- A decision will need to be made about computer labs and their continued funding
- The Libraries have asked that their computers be treated like lab computers since students use them for the same purposes
- Central funding is a hot topic throughout the CIC
- Structurally, it is easier to incorporate a fee into tuition, but then the student voice is lost

Professor Gini noted that access will become more of an issue as more classes are placed on-line. Last quarter, she had students calling her at home because the modem lines were busy so they could not connect to view the homework.

Jodie Berg-Combs then asked if SCIT would be willing to form a subcommittee to discuss possible solutions to the college technology fees problem. The subcommittee could meet over the summer, or start next fall.

Roberta Armstrong asked that if a subcommittee be formed, someone from the student financial side be included who could tell the subcommittee what is and what is not possible.

Professor Gini said that SCIT would discuss this more, since no students were present today and the subcommittee should have a student representative on it, as well as two faculty/academic professional SCIT members.

## **2. PEOPLESOFT UPDATE**

Steve Cawley mentioned that training has started for the Human Resources system. Benefits will be brought up in fall, with payroll following next spring.

Roberta Armstrong said that dual registration, PeopleSoft in combination with the web, was started at Duluth on April 5. 100 students per day have registered on-line, with switches to paper registration a few times. The combination of PeopleSoft and the web has created a large, complex infrastructure, so Duluth is being used as a test model to work out the bugs. Crookston and Morris will be the next campuses to use the new system, and the Twin Cities, the largest group, will start on May 17. She then distributed a handout and highlighted various updates included on it. She then opened the floor for questions.

Q: Will students be the only ones who will be able to log on and make changes themselves?

A: No, since this is a self-service model. Faculty and staff will also be able to update their information on the Human Resources side. Security is an issue, so limits will need to be placed on the web front-ends.

Q: Who will have HRMS entry privileges?

A: Central HR staff as well as human resource professionals in the colleges. Typically, this will amount to a few authorized people per college, but for IT it will be about 45 people. If more security is implemented, then the system will be less user-friendly. Several applications, such as grants management, need an open system. This creates a data integrity problem, which will need to be solved before any financial data can be entered in the system. Reports can catch mistakes or changes, but departments are still struggling with the implications.

Q: I am not as worried about people changing information, which can be seen in reports and then corrected. I am more worried about private information being viewed or copied, since the HRMS manual shows several panels for immunizations and other private information. How much of this will be accessible to other people?

A: There is no plan to enter immunization information in the PeopleSoft system. The HRMS manual includes many panels that were developed, but never intended for use and can therefore be deleted. Part of the current problem is that no one really knew what central HR could really see about a person. Many times, a 'trust' model is used for internal personnel with multiple levels of security, since, many times, people working in the colleges are not strictly

HR professionals. Instead these duties are only part of their jobs. Therefore, they need access to complete these tasks, but there must be good controls over what they can and cannot do or see. Many current policies on access are also very vague and may need to be updated.

Q: Is the trend towards mass decentralization of functions?

A: This is an organizational issue that still needs to be solved. HR is in between since some duties still need to be performed centrally. There is no perfect solution. Training will be needed, but people also need to realize that certain elements, such as salary, are public information.

Professor Gini questioned how public these needed to be. She realizes that there is a book that contains the salary for every employee, but it takes much more work to go to where the book is housed, rather than just sitting at a computer and looking at salaries on-line.

Q: Has any decision been made with regards to faculty entering grades themselves?

A: At this time, it will stay the same. Otherwise, each faculty member would need to be issued their own operator ID and password. Then, faculty start asking for access for their TA's and the ability to review entered grades before they are submitted. With everything else happening, it is just easier to not do anything at present.

Steve Cawley said that as more security measures are implemented, more work will be sent to central HR which will lead to more paper and forms as is now the case. If there is to be increased decentralization, then more studies need to be done on technological solutions.

In closing, he commended the Student 2000 team for not missing any deadlines, since no school has the same track record. He then said that there is a HR Steering Committee, which is dealing with the privacy issue. Fennell Evans is the faculty representative to that committee and should be contacted with faculty concerns. If the committee would like more information on data access issues, then Peters Zetterberg might want to be invited to a future meeting.

Professor Gini then thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Rebecca Hippert  
University Senate