

WACTC - Tech
Strategic Technology Planning Task Force
Lake Washington Technical College
Minutes
July 19, 2018

In Attendance: Brian Culver, Dennis Curran, Elliot Stern, Eva Smith, Glenn Colby, Grant Rodeheaver, Katie Marks, Marisa Herrera, Mark Jenkins, Reagan Bellamy, Tammy Frankland

Not In Attendance: Chad Stiteler, Chato Hazelbaker, Kari Desser, Teresa Holland-Rich

Introductions

Two new reps from HR who weren't able to attend the kick-off meeting

Review of Last Meeting

- Kick off meeting – Goal was to try to get our heads around what we are to be doing as the task force.
- Ryan Carstens prepared a document of core technologies regarding governance and a strategic plan – took notes within this document during first meeting.
- Most things from notes/minutes have been compiled into the working document.
- May need to get away for the word “Core” to help us define the things that are align and are most important.
- Stay focused on the framework for the future so when there are new technologies and processes coming on we have something in place to
- What are we looking at for the criteria to help with new technologies and processes
- What are some of the criteria we are looking for in aspects of governance?

Grant had meeting with Gartner yesterday. Planning on bringing them to the August 20th meeting to help us facilitate our discussion.

Review and Discuss “Working Document”

Basically a repository of our thoughts from Kick-off meeting. Refining for us to present to WACTC – not a formal documentation

Whiteboard drawing – what is the core technology

- The real core is ctLink
- What are the things outside of that
- Then how do we recommend purchases in core

This discussion broke down to the First diagram

- All of the related technologies that we are still doing RFPs for matches a lot of what we are talking about
- The center – represents our core functions

- Maybe in 5 years we take a look at the changes/additions to the core circle
- What moves into the blue circle – things we have already made investments in
- Blue – systems that have already been committed or integrated
 - There are things that fall outside the blue ring – All colleges have to adopt ctLink so it is our core system
 - Have already been integrated with PeopleSoft
 - PeopleSoft tools have some of the things that aren't integrated
 - Some challenges and need for governance in integration – how do we handle schools who don't agree with cost, etc.
 - Need to be able to sync with ctLink
 - Identify actual needs in addition to what is needed with ctLink
 - There is nothing that prevents a college from using something else that would fit in the blue circle

Is this process going to lead to a strategic technology process? How do all of these things fit together?

Ryan gave us the pieces and then we came up with

Need a process for doing the strategic technology plan

Have ctLink governance – criteria for system-wide integration

Strategic Technology Plan – discuss where they fall in ctLink and IT Governance

Guiding Principles (From Eva) need to be at the center of this

- Why is ctLink project governance different than IT governance process? – why two separate
- Missing data governance
 - ctLink is a project and have to meet OCIO requirements
 - Set up something that stays around for everything including ctLink
 - Why is it only IT governance? IT governance includes all stakeholders
 - We have to define how decisions are made, etc. for all IT software and processes
 - Need a body capable of evaluating requirements to approve or disapprove RFP
 - We need governance so everyone doesn't go and do what they want
 - Anything that comes up through for recommendation – if it integrates with ctLink it has to go through the project governance
 - Long-term when the project is up and running it would go through Strategic Technology Governance
 - Strategic plan will not specifically dictate technology. Technology to support would come through strategic technology governance.
 - Would need to look at plan to see if it is within the scope of things
 - First principle is How are requests are initiated and where are they coming from
 - Doesn't matter where it comes from, it matters how the governance reviews it and makes the decision
 - Commissions will need to take a responsibility in this.
 - There is no real discussion about integration – lots of things we have in common at colleges but all paying separately for them.
 - This should have been happening a couple of years ago with the ctLink project
 - **Tammy will share a document of how they did some of this at Everett**
- IT Commission compiled a list of all of the different systems being used, as well as of vendors, for guided pathways – there are other vendors out there

- What are the types of functionalities we need, what are the systems out there that provide the functionalities and do they integrate with PeopleSoft
- There should be a piece of this in the governance to decide from this research
- We should regularly be review what the systems are and what is next on the horizon
- Add a circle “complimentary technology” – doesn’t integrate with ctcLink but it’s okay
- Data governance fits all of these – we would have to consider it with complementary technologies as well
- ctcLink project is requiring that colleges have data governance
- Add ctcLink circle overlapping Data Governance, guiding principles, strategic technology governance – making clear that it is a project

Scope & Definitions

**From Eva

Governance Continuum

Common Process Development and Discussion “Next Steps and Work Plan Development

Next meeting – August 20th – 10-2:00

Location – Can do Edmonds – in-person

If we can’t get Gartner in on the 20th – we have another meeting to work with them.

What is the final document that should come out of this task force?

- The framework for governance – how do we make decisions as efficiently as possible, who has the right to, what criteria, etc.
- The guiding principles around it. Include what this would look like, the terms, how we implement this. A living process – do we review yearly? Keeping it as fresh as possible.
- Will be providing presentation to WACTC on proposed framework for the governance structure.

How do we get there?

- Have something to present to WACTC in October so we can have a final in December for them.

What are the processes?

**From Eva

Governance Considerations

**From Eva

Eva will draw process for next meeting

Once it has been finalized, we can talk people through it.

The dollar amount to be spent will determine how much time you will have to invest on the research of product and cost

Continue adding things into working document.

Come up with a draft process for when Gartner comes in.

Can make the recommendation that this task force group continue on as part of the governance structure.

Eva will make arrangements for the next meeting

Grant will work with Gartner to get them on the calendar