

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE
UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF MEETING
September 23, 1999**

Members present were: David Anderson, Monique Anderson, Richard Bayer, Mary Dale Blanton, Heather Collins, Tom George, Fred Gilliam, Robert Hinde, Laura Howes, Faye Julian, Buck Jones, Suzanne Kurth, John Lounsbury, Frank Masincupp, Anne Mayhew, Christian Miller, Johnie Mazingo, John Muldowny, Mike Mullen, Robert Peterson, Paul Pinckney, Max Robinson, Rita Smith, Frank Spicuzza, Linda Tober, and Michael Ware

Members absent were: Eric Haley, Mary Holcomb, Robert Maddox, Ryan Paradis, Rhea Scruggs, and Carol Seavor.

Proxies attending were: Walter Green (Asa Bishop) and Sarah De Young (Delores Smith).

Julian called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. Since there are new representatives, each was asked to introduce themselves.

I. Education Policy Committee Representative

Council member Robert Peterson was chosen by acclamation as representative of the Council to the Educational Policy Committee.

II. Larry Stiles, Banner Update

Stiles reviewed the history of the Banner project noting that, with the exception of Financial Aid and the Undergraduate Prospect Recruiting System, Banner implementation is currently "on hold." The brief history follows on pages 12475 and 12476.

He reported UTK has joined in the forming of a consortium of large schools which will work toward the modification of Banner to meet the needs of large and complex universities. Until those modifications can be made, the present legacy systems will be made more functional with efforts to improve access (e.g. Web access) and service.

Discussion focused on the importance of the legacy systems meeting academic interests and needs, the modification of policies to meet Banner capacities, and the status of degree audit programs.

Mayhew emphasized the importance of the legacy systems serving academic interests, and the faculty being a strong conversation partner for all modifications. Bayer noted that he and the Provost represent academic interests on the Steering Committee. Mayhew added that faculty groups such as the Undergraduate Council and Faculty Senate should be involved in the decision making regarding legacy systems since new systems implementation will be such a long time in coming.

Pinckney noted that academic policies had been changed because Banner was unable to accommodate University policies, and that those changes took effect prior to Banner implementation. He inquired whether the changes still needed to be put into effect. Julian added that a list of those Banner driven policy changes and proposals could be produced. A seconded motion requesting such a list of policies and procedures be included in the minutes for further action by the Council passed. The list follows on pages 12477 and 12478.

The reinstatement of the DARS degree audit in place of the long delayed CAPP audit system was also discussed. Spicuzza noted the importance of a degree audit system for advising and hoped some of the problematic elements of DARS could be addressed. Julian added that DARS should be updated and a degree audit system would be in place prior to the minimum three and one-half year delay for the CAPP.

III. Curricular Material

A. College of Education

George presented a single change from the College. Council approved.

All material requiring Faculty Senate approval appears on pages 12473 through 12480.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda M. Tober
Secretary to the Undergraduate Council

Brief History of Banner Project as of September 23, 1999

The University began a search for complete student system to replace a hodge-podge of legacy systems in late winter 1997. Then Vice-chancellor of Information Infrastructure Sue Mettlen charged a task force to complete its work by June 1, apparently in hopes of applying for some one-time state money for Y2K remediation. After a study of three packages from two vendors (Datatel and SCT's Plus in addition to Banner), all six study groups found SCT Banner to come closest to meeting UTK's needs. There were concerns expressed at that time about "gaps", especially from the Bursar. All felt that time was inadequate to do a thorough job.

The University contracted with SCT in the summer of 1997, acquired equipment and started training in the fall of 1997. The project was immediately organized around a three tier structure – twenty six functional work groups reporting to a small Advisory Committee which in turn reported to a somewhat larger Policy Board. Workgroups began the tedious process of identifying "issues" with the product requiring either a change in UTK's business rules or a modification to the product.

Ultimately over 160 issues were identified. About half the issues were resolved with a recommendation to change business rules. The other half would involve from 15,000 to 17,000 hours of effort to either modify the Banner baseline code or to program an extension of baseline capability. At the so called "arctic summit" in Nov 1998, the entire list was examined by a sub-committee of the Policy Board. Approximately ten issue recommendations were rejected or referred back for study. The remainder were approved and in January 99, the administration agreed to locate the resources to fund the modifications.

In March 99, a substantial contingent of Banner project participants went to the Banner Summit Conference in Orlando. At that time, two significant developments occurred. First, discussions with a number of other comparable institutions convinced UTK that it would be foolish to commit to such a substantial modification of the product. It would render the product impossible to maintain, given SCT's schedule of upgrade releases every three to four months. Second, UTK began discussion of a possible collaboration with other large universities. The outcome was the formation of the Banner Large School Student Systems Consortium. The initial six institutions decided to hold an exploratory meeting in Knoxville.

Representatives from the six universities and SCT met in Knoxville for two days in third week of July 99. We discussed each institution's most important issues, agreed that there were common issues, and created a working group to study Accounts Receivable (AR) issues. We also added two additional institutional members and capped the membership at eight. The consortium now consists of: Georgia Tech, Mississippi State U, U of California - Davis, U of Oregon, U of South Florida, U of Tennessee Knoxville, Virginia Tech, and Wayne State U.

The Accounts Receivable working group met in Atlanta to narrowly define issues to work on. The AR group is now developing detailed specifications for the modifications and extensions to baseline. Some may be completed by consortium members, some with contributed code and some by paying SCT to complete the modifications.

The consortium met again on Friday, Sept 17, via video conference. This meeting concentrated on a review of the AR work and on the leadership question for the future of the consortium. It appears likely that UTK will assume the leadership role for the first year of the consortium.

At the present time at UTK, both the Banner Financial Aid and the Banner Prospect Recruiting modules are in production and we plan to continue using them. The Banner Catalog system is in production, but a substantial amount of data entry is necessary before it will be very useful. Effort on the remaining modules is in a holding pattern to give SCT time to add functionality to the product and to give the consortium a chance to bear fruit. It is anticipated that it will be at least two years before additional Banner modules are brought on line.

In the meantime, the University will pursue an aggressive effort to add functionality to the legacy systems. Most of this effort will be focused on improving client access to data and processes (e.g. web access). The objective is to built services around a self-service model as much as possible. These "life extension" efforts are NOT an effort to supplant the Banner system with improvements to the legacy system – they are explicitly planned as "life extension" efforts to buy time to make the Banner system workable.

**Academic Policies and/or Procedures
Reconsidered because of Banner
Policies (* policy changed):**

- *** Maximum Undergraduate Course Load** – The University policy was that the maximum number of hours students may register for per term is 19 hours with the provision that each college may further restrict the maximum hours. Banner could support only one maximum course load. The Undergraduate Council affirmed the University policy for all undergraduate students, eliminating the provision that each college may further restrict the maximum number of hours.
- *** Add and Drop Deadlines** – Banner provides for only one add deadline, drop with “w” deadline and drop with “wp/wf” deadline, and does not support multiple deadlines depending on student level. The Vice-Chancellor and Provost reaffirmed the Undergraduate Council approved add, drop with “w” and drop with “wp/wf” deadlines. They are yet to be supported though they have been announced for Fall of 2000.
- **Incomplete to F Grade Process** – Banner does not provide a means to administer the policy of changing I(ncomplete) grades to “F” grades. Recommendation was to retain current policy and procedures governing “I” grades.
- **Career Repeats** – Banner cannot support current policies regarding the three career repeats without computation in the grade point average. The debate and discussion by Undergraduate Council and Faculty Senate was reaffirmed and accommodation for the policy was requested.
- **60 Hour Senior College Residency Requirement** – Banner cannot accommodate the University’s requirement, but the requirement was reaffirmed as critical for the University.
- **Six Hour Overlap in Arts & Sciences Requirement** – CAPP (degree audit) the College’s curricular allowance for six hours of overlap between major requirements and distribution requirements. This issue was referred to the College for review.
- *** Last 30 Hours Association** – Banner cannot administer the association requirement and, in any case, the colleges routinely waive the requirement. The Undergraduate Council removed the last 30 hours association requirement, but reaffirmed the requirement that students take the last 30 hours at the University.
- **High School Deficiencies & Graduation Requirements** – Currently students must remove any high school deficiency in order to meet graduation requirements. CAPP (degree audit) is unable to use admissions data in order to identify deficiencies by individual student. The appropriate calculation for meeting graduation requirements therefore cannot be made. Several alternative proposals to change the way in which deficiencies might be calculated were deferred with the long delay in any CAPP implementation.

Procedures:

- **Mini Term Calculated as Part of Spring Term** – Banner considers each term separately for purposes of calculating grade point averages, i.e., mini-term grades would no longer be calculated as part of spring term grades. For purposes of academic review, possible dismissal, and advising for mini-term, reconsideration of various procedures was necessary with the limited Banner option. One of the proposals was to not permit students on academic review to register for mini-term prior to completion of spring term. With the delay of Banner, current policies remain in effect.
- **Cross Listed Courses** – Banner cross-listed courses by section in the Timetable. Technical recommendations approved to support current cross-listed courses.

- **Courses Not Taught in Four or More Years** – In order to monitor the regularity of course offerings, a report is submitted identifying those courses that have not been offered in the past four years. Banner provides no mechanism to identify these courses. The value and need for this report was reaffirmed and it was hoped that upgrades in the Banner system would eventually accommodate this need.
- **Grading System by Credit Level** – Banner cannot support grading by credit level and student level. The grading is based only on the course. Agreement reached to use only the grading system assigned to the course.
- **S/NC Grading on Class Rolls** – Current policy is to suppress S/NC grading option on class and grade rolls. Banner cannot suppress the option. However, no serious disadvantage or negative impact was seen for either students or faculty if the option was not suppressed.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE



College of Education
Associate Dean
Academic Degree Programs and
Administrative Services
202 Claxton Addition
Knoxville, TN 37996-3400
(423) 974-6639
FAX (423) 974-8718
Email: tgeorge1@utk.edu

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 9, 1999

TO: Dr. Linda Tober, Assistant Dean
Undergraduate Academic Affairs

FROM: Tom George *TG*

RE: Item for the Undergraduate Council Agenda

Enclosed is an item for the next Undergraduate Council Agenda. Please call, if further information is needed.

Sport and Physical Activity

Request Change in Programs

1. On page 115 of the 1998-99 UTK Undergraduate Catalog, eliminate the Sport Management Minor.

Effective Spring 2000