Meeting Attendees

| Schools: Joan Wicks (SEAS), Victoria Savoy (SCPS), Brenda Kelley (Curry), Faye Miller (BIMS), Danny Steeper (McIntire), Brenda Davis (GSAS), Ed Barnaby (GSAS), Jennifer Hulvey (Law), Cyndy Huddleston (McIntire), Margaret Baxton (MED), Brenda Boyd (Batten), Alan Lee (ARCH), Clay Hysell (Nursing) |
| Core Team: Laura Hawthorne, Sarah Doran, Teresa Wimmer, Cheyrl Elzey, Denise Hubbard, Amy Nolasco |

Date & Time

Tuesday, April 9th; 1:00 – 2:00pm

Subject

Problem Statement Review and prioritization

Documents used for Discussion

SAFM Vision

Action Items/Follow-up Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Send the current security module document to Alan Lee</td>
<td>Denise Hubbard</td>
<td>04/12/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Draft tentative Phase 2 scope as related to PS #1 to be reviewed in the next SAFM Working Group meeting (04/23/2013). Identify, as possible, any dependencies and linkages/impacts to other problem statements.</td>
<td>Core Team</td>
<td>04/22/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Create another iteration of the pilot school process models to anticipate Phase 2 processes if double data entry is eliminated.</td>
<td>Amy Nolasco</td>
<td>05/10/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting Minutes

Overview

- The meeting began with an exercise where all attendees were asked to identify their top three priorities (pain points) from the list of problem statements in the Vision. The six problem statements with the most ‘votes’ were discussed and the full results are attached: 1, 2, 10, 3, 7, and 12.
  - PS #1 – Eliminate double data entry between SAFM and the Financial Aid Awarding Module had the most votes by far (11 votes)
    - Ed Barnaby – will users still be able to enter things into the Financial Aid module without entering into SAFM first? GSAS wants to prevent that. Answer: There may be reasons why some users will still need to enter awards directly into the Financial Aid module in SIS and some schools will continue to use as is. We will need to discuss options during the
requirements phase that will ensure appropriate behavior but also provide flexibility as needed.

- Faye Miller – how do we activate students for a different school? Cheyrl Elzey indicated that we haven’t envisioned the solution for that but having SAFM awarding be by term will help.

  o PS #2 – Lack of a consolidated award package view including federal aid or third-party aid in SAFM (5 votes)
    - Brenda Davis (GSAS) indicated that viewing all aid in SAFM would reduce the potential for over-funding.
    - The group discussed the possibility that this is more of a behavioral issue and the system currently supports the input of third-party aid. Also, Sarah Doran and Cheyrl Elzey pointed out that there are timing differences in awarding different types of aid, specifically federal aid. Federal aid is not awarded until after departmental aid is awarded so displaying federal aid would be useful to see if modifications are needed to prior terms, but won’t be available during the time period that schools are doing the majority of awarding.
    - Group agreed this could be addressed through policy implementation in the schools and at University level to manage timing and data entry issues; not a SAFM functionality issue.

  o PS #10 – SAFM does not currently support various populations including the professional schools (5 votes)
    - Laura – we want to keep the professional schools included to ensure that we are not moving further away from a solution that could potentially be useful to any school population.
    - McIntire, Nursing, Medicine and Law described some difficulties and differences they have in awarding aid.
      - McIntire – awards aid as part of a recruiting tool and it’s a very cumbersome process right now. Have not had enough of a chance to use SAFM to see if it can help.
      - Nursing & McIntire – don’t have assistantships. Every package is different; many different scholarships with various eligibility criteria.
      - Medicine – has an entire database that currently handles packaging and don’t see that changing any time soon.
      - Law – has 200 restricted scholarship accounts and needs support for auto-packaging.
- PS #3 – Automate Workflow Management, specifically allow for a review/approval process (4 votes)
  - No comments
- PS #7 – Target rollover for new fiscal year (4 votes)
  - Clarification that this is means pre-populating the next year’s targets (including PTAEQ information) with the prior fiscal year’s information in order to minimize repetitive data entry. Users can then tweak target information as necessary.
- PS #12 – Consolidated reporting view (4 votes)
  - ITS and SFS noted that tackling PS #1 may impact the priority of this as consolidated reporting that includes SAFM and the Financial Aid module data may be easier once the linkages are in place to minimize double data entry.
  - Discussion about roles and responsibilities in SAFM per a question from Alan Lee (ARCH). Clarified that schools will have the ability to specify access level and access to SAFM is separate from access to the Financial Aid module. There is a current security document that can be sent to Alan to explain the existing model. This will most likely change in Phase 2.

- The working group agreed that PS #1 is the most important issue. The core team (Laura, Phil Trella, ITS and SFS) will meet to draft phase 2 scope around PS #1.
  - The question was brought up as to how current processes would be impacted by eliminating the double data entry and that it might be too early to analyze that. Amy Nolasco indicated we could make some assumptions and take a stab and revising the process models and these would be draft and subject to change as we move through this fiscal year but will help in requirements development thoughts.
  - Cheyrl Elzey indicated that there are some things that will need to be completed and some pieces of the other problem statements may need to be addressed as precursors to solving PS #1. Examples are PS #6 and PS #3. Project/Award validation in SAFM and some kind of review/approval process will need to be supported in SAFM before we can make SAFM a single point of entry for awards.
    - The core team agreed we can draft some assumptions around items that will need to be addressed in tackling PS #1 and present back to the working committee at the next meeting.
  - Teresa Wimmer pointed out that there also may be functional issues that pop up as users begin and continue using the phase 1 iteration of SAFM and these may need to be addressed as they arise.
VOTING RESULTS

Which three problem statements are most pressing for your school at this time?

Votes collected April 9, 2013 at first working group meeting for Phase 2.

Attending from schools:
- Joan Wicks (JW) SEAS
- Victoria Savoy (VS) SCPS
- Brenda Kelley (BK) Curry
- Faye Miller (JFM) BIMS
- Danny Steeper (DWS) McIntire
- Brenda Davis (BD) GSAS
- Ed Barnaby (EB) GSAS
- Jennifer Hulvey (JMH) LAW
- Clay Hysell (CH) Nursing
- Cyndy Huddleston (CNH) McIntire
- Margaret Baxton (MB) MED
- Brenda Boyd (BB) Batten
- Alan Lee (AL) ARCH

Schools not represented: Darden

1. Eliminate duplicate data entry (11 votes)
   - JW, VS, BK, JFM, DWS, BD, EB, JMH, CH, MB, BB
   Group agreed this was one of the top priorities for Phase 2.

2. Add ability to view 3rd party and federal aid with departmental aid (5 votes)
   - JEW, DWS, CH, BK, BB
   Group agreed this could be addressed through policy implementation in the schools and at University level to manage timing and data entry issues; not a SAFM functionality issue.
   Sarah & Amy Note: there is still value in providing some view of federal aid numbers (even just total) in SAFM along with EFC and COA for reference particularly when making changes to awards. Maybe modify problem statement?

3. Automate workflow management (4 votes)
   - JEW, BD, EB, BK
   Group agreed this needs to be addressed before work on No. 1 can proceed.

4. No automatic tuition recalculation after changes (2 votes)
   - CH, BB

5. Can’t roll up targets above PTAEO level (1 vote)
6. Project/Award validation (1 vote)
   MB
   *SIS team pointed out this will have to be addressed as part of No. 1.*

7. Target rollover for new fiscal year (4 votes)
   AL, BD, JEW, JFM

8. Placeholder awards not associated with student (0 votes)
   *LFH Note: recall it was departmental-level users who saw the value of this; none of these individuals are part of working group who represent dean’s office level only.*

9. Automatic process for charging tuition to grants (1 vote)
   JFM
   *Big issue; highly desirable solution; beyond Phase 2 and not limited to SAFM/SIS.*

10. Customization to support professional schools (5 votes)
    JMH, MB, CH, CNH, DWS
    *Will require detailed analysis of each professional school’s processes and needs; not part of Phase 2 but important to retain as goal.*

11. Compliance with University’s assistantships policy (1 vote)
    VS

12. Consolidated reporting view (4 votes)
    VS, AL, EB, CNH

13. Copy package information from previous term (0 votes)
    *LFH Note: Again, issue that seems more pressing for departmental level users.*