



Executive Leadership Committee Meeting Minutes

March 21, 2019, 2:00 – 3:00 p.m.

South Puget Sound Community College, Olympia

Members Present

Jan Yoshiwara, co-chair, SBCTC Executive Director, ctcLink Project Executive Sponsor

Joyce Loveday, co-chair, Clover Park Technical College president

Kevin Brockbank, Spokane Community College president

Choi Halladay, ctcLink Project Steering Committee Chair

Grant Rodeheaver, Deputy Executive Director for IT, SBCTC

Christy Campbell, ctcLink Project Director, SBCTC

Ivan Harrell, Tacoma Community College president

Marty Cavalluzzi, Olympic College president

Deidre Soileau, Pierce College Fort Steilacoom interim president

Others in Attendance

Reagan Bellamy, Human Resources Management Commission

Brian Culver, WACTC-Tech Information Technology Commission representative

Bill Belden, Student Services Commission (WSSSC) representative

Charlie Crawford, Instruction Commission representative

Scott Wagemann, Research and Planning Commission representative

Whitney Dickenson, WA State Office of the Chief Information Officer

Janelle Runyon, ctcLink Communications Manager

Welcome

Committee co-chair Joyce Loveday welcomed everyone to the meeting—both online and in-person.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes from February 15, 2019 and December 13, November 7 and October 4 2018 were approved.

Joyce mentioned the lack of quorum at previous meetings, which is the reason there was a backlog of minutes to approve today. She noted that meetings with legislators, Achieving the Dream conference and other competing priorities played a role in attendance the last several months, but also reiterated the importance of attendance and involvement among all cELC members. Christy Campbell noted that at this particular time, the lack of quorum at

recent cELC meetings has not slowed down project activities since most of those project day-to-day decisions are happening in the Working Group and Steering Committee. The governance was designed for that very purpose; only very high-level decisions go to cELC and there have not been any recently. Christy noted there is language in the cELC charter around meeting attendance that the group may want to review at a future meeting, as leadership and support from cELC is important. Joyce also noted if timing is an issue on a particular decision, cELC could always call a special meeting.

ctcLink Steering Committee Update

Choi Halladay gave an update on recent Steering Committee discussions and decisions:

Deployment Group Alignment

Bellevue College requested to move from Deployment Group (DG) 4 to DG 5 and Columbia Basin requested to move from DG 4 to DG6. The requests were made based on each college's assessment of their readiness, leadership changes, etc. The Steering Committee approved these changes.

Christy announced that Shoreline has also recently asked to move from DG5 to DG6 due to retirement and the need to hire a new project manager. This request will be going to the Steering Committee.

Continuing Education Approach

The successful vendor for continuing education solution is CampusCE. Choi noted the unique situation with this is that about 13 colleges are already using CampusCE and have an individual relationship (and contract) with the vendor. The challenge now is how to reformat that relationship around the new, centralized contract that will be in place now that this third-party solution is the solution for all colleges, with a centralized contract.

The Steering Committee unanimously approved the following approach earlier this year:

1. ***A global standard and common baseline of CampusCE will be developed for all colleges.***
 - *Current CampusCE colleges that choose to continue using it must implement and adopt the new standard baseline product, and may choose to pay the vendor for additional functionality as desired.*
 - *Colleges must work with the vendor directly for any customizations or functionality beyond the approved baseline/standard.*
2. ***Colleges may opt out of using CampusCE, and not pay. Any CE data from another source/solution required to be reported (e.g. financial data) will be the responsibility of each college to manually enter into ctcLink/PeopleSoft.***
3. ***As the successful vendor/product, CampusCE will be the only 3rd-party CE solution with automated integration between ctcLink/PeopleSoft, at this time.***
4. ***Agreed-upon baseline product costs and initial implementation/re-implementation costs are included and supported by SBCTC as part of the ctcLink implementation schedule.***

- *Any college choosing to implement/re-implement CampusCE outside of its scheduled ctcLink implementation may incur separate and/or additional costs (e.g. integration with Legacy)*
- *SBCTC will negotiate annual costs per college for the approved common baseline implementation.*
- *Customizations and changes beyond the approved standard baseline are the responsibility of each college.*

A small group of volunteers from the original CE RFP scoring committee is assisting Abraham Rocha in working with CampusCE on finalizing the contract negotiations based on the approved approach.

Training Approach

The original ctcLink training approach was focused on deployments rather than long-term sustainability. The new approach is focused more in the same manner of how we serve students so that online and instructor-led training can move from “project” to more of a long-term sustainment mode for ongoing training beyond project implementation. . The training that can be delivered online will be packaged and available on an ongoing basis and those that are more detailed and require instructor-led

Security Redesign

The new security redesign is a much more granular system and gives colleges a more flexible way of assigning roles and security permissions. It is a much more comprehensive approach, which will benefit all colleges. Christy noted we have a resource on the team working to group roles logically so the mapping activities at the college level is less time consuming and easier to accomplish. The automation of this new tool should be complete by end of April.

Kevin Brockbank asked about the single sign-on issue that was brought up previously regarding the small percentage of employees that work at more than one college in different roles, which could cause issues if they have access to pages/functionality at one college that they shouldn't (but would) have access to at another college. This issue is being addressed, but has not yet been resolved.

ctcLink College Roles/Alignment Recommendations

The Steering Committee approved the following on March 12, 2019:

Adopted the College ctcLink Roles Alignment document as the recommendation to Washington State Community and Technical Colleges for the roles necessary to successfully implement ctcLink as well as the required ongoing personnel needs once the ctcLink system is in place.

As part of the above approval, the Steering Committee also requested that *cELC recommend to all WACTC Presidents that the necessary roles as outlined in the ctcLink Roles Alignment document be in place at their college prior to their college's DG implementation, and sustained post-GoLive.*

The committee reviewed the one-page summary and had a long discussion about the recommended roles and taking the above request to the full WACTC (all presidents) at the business meeting in the morning. In the end, Christy Campbell suggested—and members agreed—to table taking the ctcLink College Roles recommendations to all presidents until there is more clarity around the level/type of support that will be provided by the SBCTC agency with the permanent ctcLink production support team.

Some of the concerns and discussion items included:

- Christy reviewed the Roles/Alignment document summary, which was provided with the meeting materials. She explained the recommended “Functional/Business Analyst” roles by pillar are highly recommended, critical roles in which people need to have extensive PeopleSoft expertise. These can be expensive roles to fill, but there is the opportunity to build that knowledge from within during implementation if those resources are identified in advance. While these roles are “recommended,” best practice is to have this business/functional analyst expertise on campus. Tacoma has indicated having two Business Analysts has been key to their success with ctcLink moving forward.
- Christy mentioned the option of using one of our training vendors for future ctcLink training for those “Super SMEs”—a ctcLink Boot Camp type approach for that higher-level training that would be needed for the Business/Functional Analysts.
- Brian Culver said Cascadia took the roles recommendations to their Board of Trustees. As a small college, they would not be able to afford the business analysts roles. He asked Grant Rodeheaver if there might be options moving forward for SBCTC expertise to fill that gap or if there are other options for smaller colleges that may not be able to fill all the recommended roles.
- Grant said this is something he is working on. As we scale up and get more colleges on ctcLink, it needs to be determined what level of support will be at the state/centralized level vs. the college level. He said it is a reasonable expectation, but may mean more staff at the State Board.
- Christy noted again the possibility of using a training vendor to deliver ctcLink-specific PeopleSoft training to colleges that want to build the skillset from within.
- Choi noted the additional challenge is not only do these people need specific PeopleSoft expertise, but in many cases they also need expertise regarding their local college business processes.
- Charlie Crawford and Kevin Brockbank both expressed concern that this could create a system of “have and have nots” based on each college’s size and resources. Kevin noted CCS is a larger district, but they do not plan to hire these specific Analysts positions as they have built and will build expertise from within, train from within. He

is concerned there is not a rock solid answer to how this required expertise will be supported across all colleges and what the SBCTC will be supporting.

- Ivan asked if there is a plan for the level of support that will be needed at the State Board at each deployment group up through the last when all colleges will be on ctcLink. Grant said we do not have specific numbers yet. They are adding 9 positions now in preparation for DG2 and DG3. The Service Level Agreement (SLA) work and monitoring how support goes with DG2-3 will provide more metrics to understand the overall need. At this point, he cannot say exactly what will be needed at the SBCTC level, but data-driven metrics from upcoming deployments will help determine the support need. Right now, they are in a reactive mode, but with adding more staff and gaining a better understanding of support needs through DG2 and DG3 they will have better metrics to understand the need and be more proactive moving forward.
- Grant also said he is looking into service vendors that can help during go live to provide additional support and expertise.
- Kevin suggested there be a more solid explanation on how we are going to share equity and functionality across all colleges regardless of size and resources before this goes to the presidents.
- Christy suggested more study time before taking the college ctcLink roles recommendations to presidents. Jan Yoshiwara agreed, saying it merits more conversation.
- All agreed that this conversation was a great step in the right direction, but there is more work to do.

Deployment Schedule and College Engagement

The Deployment Timeline slide shows where each college is in the deployment group cycle, and shows the nine (9) colleges now in DG6 if Shoreline is approved to move from DG5 to DG6.

Christy said the College Initiation Engagement slide drives home the message that all colleges will soon be engaged in ctcLink at least at the Initiation Phase level. This message is important, especially for DGs 5 and 6 as the “Wait and See” mode that many colleges said they had been in when Christy first came on board is over. That thought process was understandable before the project restart since there was uncertainty and multiple project delays in the past, but that is behind us and we are moving forward. All colleges should have a project manager hired or in place soon. Joyce and Christy will share that message with presidents at the WACTC business meeting in the morning. Included in the message will be the concern of colleges being ready within their deployment group and the additional costs associated with colleges not doing the work now and asking to move to a later deployment.

ctcLink Budget Update

Christy noted that the OCIO requested a change in the budget approval gates so we went through an exercise of breaking down the technology budget into 6-month approval gates rather than one-year approval gates. Budget remains the same, just reporting it differently for OCIO and getting “approvals” for funding in 6-month increments.

Top Risks

Engagement of college project managers and executive sponsors is at the top of the risks list, as noted earlier. If they have not done so already, Deployment Groups 5 and 6 need to hire a PM and their executive sponsor should be engaged in supporting the project locally. Resource availability is also a key issue, especially in light of other college and system-wide initiatives and daily college operations. It is also important that colleges understand the resources (people and time) needed for the project. The project management office is working to provide a resource plan that colleges can use as a guide for implementation needs.

Meeting Closure

Due to limited time, Christy asked members to review the remaining slides on their own; especially the Remediation updates, and reach out to her with any questions.