



Executive Leadership Committee Meeting **DRAFT**

October 3, 2019, 2 to 3 p.m.

Peninsula College, Keegan Hall, M227

Meeting Participants

Voting Members

- Jan Yoshiwara, co-chair, SBCTC Executive Director, ctcLink Project Executive Sponsor
- Chris Bailey, co-chair, Lower Columbia College president
- Kevin Brockbank, Spokane Community College president
- Amy Morrison, Lake Washington Institute of Technology president (**Bill Thomas attended on Amy's behalf**)
- Shouan Pan, Seattle Community Colleges chancellor
- Julie White, Pierce College Fort Steilacoom president

Non-Voting Members

- Christy Campbell, ctcLink Project Director
- Choi Halladay, ctcLink Project Steering Committee chair
- Grant Rodeheaver, SBCTC Deputy Executive Director for IT

Guests & Staff

- Tim Wrye, Highline College, IT Commission representative
- Janelle Runyon, ctcLink Project Communications Manager
- Eva Smith, Edmonds
- Bradley Lane, Instruction Commission
- Bill Belden, WSSSC
- Brett Riley, BAC
- Scott Wagemann, RPC
- Call in user 4

Welcome

Chris Bailey opened the meeting and welcomed cELC committee members. Since he and several other voting members are new, he asked Christy Campbell to walk through the purpose of the cELC meetings and the committee's role within the overall ctcLink governance structure.

Prior to this meeting, Christy Campbell held individual calls with each of the new voting members to give a project update and project governance overview.

Review of ctcLink Governance Model, Process and Escalations

Christy Campbell provided an overview of the current ctcLink governance structure, which was developed as part of the project re-plan in 2017 in collaboration with a volunteer group of college project managers. It's a complex structure with three levels of governance and colleges have a strong representation and voice throughout all three levels.

The Working Group is at the first level of the governance structure and is made up of six voting members from colleges, along with SBCTC and project staff. In each key pillar/area one ctcLink project member and one ctcLink/SBCTC support staff member share a vote. This was done to ensure the SBCTC permanent support team and the temporary project team members are on the same page regarding enhancements or changes to ctcLink.

This group makes about 50-70 percent of decisions that come through ctcLink governance, including functionality decisions that are within ctcLink scope, configuration changes and

coordination with the system's Data Governance Committee on state and federal reporting and other reporting mandates that may require a configuration or setup change.

The ctcLink Steering Committee is made up of 6 college executive sponsors and the three SBCTC deputy directors, along with other SBCTC and project staff as non-voting members. Anywhere from 30 to 40 percent of decisions are addressed at this level.

This committee considers recommendations from the Working Group, schedule changes within the overall deployment schedule, decision on scope that are within the current budget, and the overall scope and function of the PeopleSoft modules.

This group (ctcLink Executive Leadership Committee) has authority over anything that goes beyond the \$145 million budget or the June 30, 2022 end date, as well as any issues or decisions escalated to cELC by the Steering Committee.

As outlined in the governance diagram, Christy reviewed which groups/individuals can make enhancement/change requests and how those requests flow through the governance structure (slide #4 in the presentation slide deck).

How do presidents escalate issues/concerns?

Move this up to governance category?

Kevin Brockbank said the governance process doesn't have a place for presidents to go directly when they have concerns.

Nowhere in gov structure for when a concern bubbles up to the president level. Gov process doesn't fill that role. He said as a deployed college, he reaches out to Grant Rodeheaver when he has issues, but is concerned Grant wouldn't be able to entertain 10 presidents that have issues. But, presidents will want an answer...

Christy explained that the governance structure does have mechanisms in place for escalation. The hitch in this particular example may be that there are a few colleges (Cascadia included) in which the president has chosen to take on the college's ctcLink executive sponsor role and, naturally, they would think to escalate their concerns to their level, which would be their colleagues/cELC.

Chris agreed and said when things do bubble up to the president's level, they need to have a mechanism for voicing concerns. He would like some guidance on what to do in the future if a president contacts him directly as cELC chair and wants an issue addressed by cELC, so he can redirect and provide them with the next step.

Christy said the escalation path for concerns in the governance structure is the college Project Manager escalates to their executive sponsor and if that needs to be escalated further (to the project/SBCTC), the concerns would go to the ctcLink Steering Committee and/or Christy.

College Project Manager → escalates to College Executive Sponsor → Executive Sponsor escalates to Steering Committee (Choi as chair)/Project Director (Christy)

ctcLink Quality Gates/Milestones

Christy reviewed the five phases within each deployment group's progression to implementing ctcLink: Initiation, Structure, Construct, Transition and Deploy. She explained the activities listed within each phase are a mix of project responsibilities/tasks and college responsibilities/tasks. (Slide 6).

Deployment Groups & Timeline

Christy reviewed the deployment groups and timelines for each (slide 7). She said initially we had planned for each deployment group to be a one year activity, but holidays and college blackout dates were not built in to that timeline. The project management office (PMO) has since gone through the schedule, worked with college PMs on determining key dates when their SMEs are not available due to college business activities, academic calendar, etc. and then worked with the Steering Committee to lock in new dates for DGs 3 and 4. Christy said the next step will be to lock in dates for DGs 5 and 6, which will go to the Steering Committee for review and approval by the end of this year.

For the new members, Christy explained the recommendation that came from the Steering Committee to cELC earlier in the year that there be no more changes to the makeup of the deployment groups. Earlier this year, several colleges had requested—and received approval—to move to later groups, but at this time the last group (DG6) is the largest group with 9 colleges, which is already a risk, so both the Steering Committee and cELC approved the moratorium on any college-requested changes to deployment groups.

College Initiation and Engagement Schedule

Christy noted the importance of the College Engagement Schedule because all colleges are in various stages of engagement with ctcLink. While there is a focus on the upcoming DG2 deployment and DG3 implementation activities, we need to ensure DG4 is ready to enter the implementation phase (Oct. 14 kickoff) as well as providing some guidance for DGs 5 and 6 on their Initiation Phase work.

Christy said it's important for every college to be on track and ready because if one college isn't ready, it impacts the entire deployment group.

Pilot Remediation Overview and Status

Christy provided some background on the Pilot Remediation for Spokane and Tacoma colleges. She explained while the remediation phase itself was closed out and signed off by all parties in December 2017, all of the Remediation was not complete, but there was a plan and an agreement to complete the remaining items.

Of the original 195 pilot remediation items, 15 remain. Five (5) of them are related to fiscal year closing processes and 10 are related to the solutions being replaced that did not meet the needs of colleges as designed by the initial vendor (continuing education registration tool, online admissions application, and budget planning).

Accessibility

Accessibility testing was not on the original list of remediation items, but Christy explained it was added as concerns arose from colleges and ctcLink governance that the Oracle PeopleSoft and Ciber-built solutions needed to be tested by an external vendor. An RFP was developed in May, Vendor contracts were awarded and a statement of work was developed. Testing began in August and additional testing will take place later this year. The first phase of testing is complete, which included student and employee self-service. Based on the findings, Christy and team have been working with Oracle to determine which findings will be addressed in their upcoming software updates/releases.

Clark and a few other colleges have helped us prioritize the issues (mainly tabbing, color contrast and labeling issues) and we are working to resolve them.

Continuing Education

We now have a contract with CampusCE. This has been a long haul, with many continuing education committee (CEC) members participating in the process. The CE replacement solutions work group will be holding a business process fit gap workshop at Green River College with all stakeholders to ensure all requirements are met by the CampusCE solution or if any customizations may be needed.

Online Admissions

The project developed and implemented several enhancements (“Quick wins” that were vetted through governance). Meanwhile, a vendor has been working on a prototype of an online admissions application. If the OAA work group likes it and it meets our needs, we will need to purchase it. If it doesn’t meet our needs we can go out to RFI to see what is out there in the marketplace and also continue to improve upon the current application.

Budget Planning Tool

Christy explained that back in May 2018 we traded the Oracle Hyperion budgeting tool for the PeopleSoft Budget Cloud Solution (PBCS), which was not only a savings and locked in the price for 5 years, but also appears to be a more useful tool for budget planning. Oracle/Mythics developed a prototype for the Budget Planning Workgroup to review. The group plans to have a recommendation to the Steering Committee within the next month.

ctcLink Program Status

Biweekly Status Report

Christy shared the front/overview page of the biweekly status report. It gives a high-level snapshot of program status in the key areas of schedule, scope and budget as well as an executive summary of latest activities. It also includes a project-reported status of each deployment group, as well as the individual self-reported red/yellow/green status of each college/agency. Christy noted that DG2 is yellow due to the Security mapping work that is behind schedule due to the team having to rework some of the vendor’s delivered solution.

Overall, the project is tracking yellow and will remain in that status until remediation items discussed earlier are closed out. In addition, the schedule status will remain yellow until we have go-live timelines for DG5 and DG6.

Kevin Brockbank, Community Colleges of Spokane, explained that Spokane is self-reporting as red due to several existing items they are working through. Security (roles/permissions) is the big item putting them in the red since it was delivered late, but he explained Spokane made the decision to hold off on implementing the new security model as part of the DG2 upgrade. They wanted to separate out any issues that may come up as part of the 9.2 upgrade and not have the new security roles issues in addition to that, so they plan to start implementing the new security roles in November.

PeopleSoft Security Model Update

For the new members, Christy provided some background on the Security Redesign and why it was needed. She explained that our original implementation partner designed security as if people's roles/jobs are the same across all colleges, and we know that isn't the case depending on the college's organizational structure and size. A more granular, task-based approach was needed because, for example, not all HR directors, registrars, advisors, etc. have the exact same responsibilities and tasks at each college.

As a solution, we brought in a vendor to help us redefine security and they used the University of Georgia's task-based security as a model. Unfortunately, upon testing the roles, the team encountered issues in how the roles were built out, so a key project resource spent the last 2-3 months cleaning up the roles and building a framework to help colleges understand the roles and worked with Clark College on how to build out the role assignments. The delay in getting the new security in place is due to this required cleanup work.

Christy said Clark has been a great partner through this process. It has been rough for them because, ideally, security roles would be set up before User Acceptance Testing (UAT) and that was not the case. Bill Belden, Clark College, was on the line and said there are concerns and they have their work cut out for them, but that Clark is working very hard to ensure their go-live goes off without a hitch.

Deployment Group 2 Update

IN preparation for the upcoming DG2 deployment, Christy said the team performed a mock cutover for both the upgrade weekend (Spokane, Tacoma) and the conversion weekend (Clark, SBCTC). The upgrade mock cutover went very well, nearly flawless and within the planned timeline. The conversion weekend mock event was a bit more challenging, but it served its purpose as there were lessons learned, course corrections, timing and sequencing of tasks that the team learned and will take into not only the DG2 Clark/SBCTC go-live, but for the future go-lives for the rest of the deployment groups. It will be a constant learning and adjusting as needed as we move forward with each deployment group.

Chris Bailey thanked Bill and Clark for allowing some LCC staff to be onsite to observe and assist anywhere needed. It gives them a chance to get a feel for what to expect.

Deployment Group 3

Christy said things are going well with DG3, they are all reporting "green" at this time. There are some concerns, mainly, again, around security because within the ctcLink methodology, security mapping for production security would be complete before colleges start UAT. The

hold up for DG3 is finalizing the security for DG2. There are concerns at the DG3 colleges about that.

Chris asked Christy to give a recap of the concerns raised by Cascadia College (a DG3 college). Christy said Cascadia also had concerns about the hold-up with security, as well as concerns about the SBCTC project team not being robust enough to handle the multiple deployments, specifically that DG4 was starting implementation activities when there were still concerns about DG3 activities. Christy said to get the project completed within timeline/budget, the deployment overlap was necessary. Having PMO staff assist with getting later groups engaged and starting on pre-work, self-paced training, and other work is critical. The PMO office staff members are taking on that work so the functional/technical staff can continue working with DGs 2 and 3. Christy understands their concerns, but said we need to take advantage of getting that work going whenever we can and will need to continue.

Deployment Group 4

Christy reviewed the DG4 dashboard report. The DG4 colleges are making great progress.

DG5 – Many of the DG5 colleges are behind the target percentage of completion of Initiation Phase activities, but Christy said this is exactly why we are having colleges do this early self-reporting. The team reaches out to colleges not making progress. This is our mechanism to identify concerns early, address any issues where they may be struggling with activities, so we can address it now and help where needed so that it's not a surprise closer to go-live.

Deployment Group 6

DG 6 colleges are engaged in Initiation Phase activities and will begin the public self-reporting in December. The PMO team is visiting DG6 colleges to prep them for upcoming activities (called "Initiation Roadshows"). Christy said she has been impressed by the work many of the DG6 colleges have done in a very short time. There are several colleges that were not very engaged just six months ago and they are now doing great.

Budget

The ctcLink budget is tracking at about \$4 million under budget, but the funds are allocated for solutions such as CampusCE, Online Admissions App, and implementation of the budgeting tool.

Christy noted that due a state mandate, we had to revamp/rework our technology budget and how funding is tracked and approved.

She noted there has been some interest in the ctcLink project again by at least one legislator. Sen. Carlyle has requested a ctcLink update on Oct. 16.

OCIO Conditions

Christy noted that the OCIO conditions were set by the OCIO as part of the project restart and updated Investment Plan/Budget in December 2017. The OCIO approved the restart, but had several conditions. Most conditions have been completed, except for those that are ongoing throughout the project and the approval of the four replacement solutions discussed earlier.

Moran QA Report

Christy explained that Moran Technology Consulting is our external quality assurance vendor. An external QA is required by the state for large technology projects such as ctcLink. Moran meets with key project, college and SBCTC leadership every month and develops a monthly report with any recommendations.

Chris noted that the tone has changed since the project re-plan and restart. It used to be a very negative tone. Christy said that the negative QA reports back then were probably accurate for where the project and implementation partner were at during that time. Much has changed.

Top Program Risks

Christy reviewed the top program risks. (See slide 20).

- College PM and Executive Sponsor engagement is critical to the success of each college.
- While it's understood that colleges have many other priorities, ctcLink needs to be a priority. Clearly colleges can't stop other work, but it is also critical to get this project done on time and on budget.
- Leadership understanding of the resources needed. It takes resources, long hours, long days. As an example, one PM in DG3 said they were running about 55 mph during the Initiation Phase and the minute they entered the Structure Phase and started doing the big work, it immediately ramped up to 120 mph. PMs at the college need to be able to manage, lead and inspire the resources. And, presidents need to be aware.
- SBCTC Support Organization - Grant said planning and analysis continues on the size and scope of the support organization. Some depends on the Service Level Agreement regarding what colleges will handle locally vs. what the SBCTC team will support. It's a moving target, but working on understanding those metrics. For DG2 and 3 they have added 9 positions and filled 6. Choi said as a DG3 college he does feel like we are still ethereal about when does something rise to SBCTC service desk vs. what colleges will handle through their local help desks. It's a balancing act that we are still working through.

Additional Discussion

Chris asked Bill Belden to share how much of a resource strain it has been for user testing (UAT). Bill said all areas of the college (student services, HR, business office) have been extremely taxed to perform normal duties and the ctcLink work. Clark has been stretched pretty thin. As a larger organization, they've been able to bridge much of it, but it has been expensive and taxing on resources. But, these are the efforts required to go live.

Christy noted that Clark has been through a lot and has done a tremendous job getting to this stage. Clark was the first to go through the global design, new testing strategy, the complete re-do of all the training. It's been rough but they have been an excellent partner and they (along with the FirstLink colleges and DG3) are getting through it to make it an easier road for everyone else. Bill said Clark are dedicated and everyone is working hard to

make this happen. After they go live and see what the gaps are, Clark might be able to help other colleges with planning and insights on what to expect and what to do.

Cheers and beers all around for the Clark team!

Key Messages for WACTC Business Meeting

- Good progress has been made, but it's not time to celebrate yet.
- Clark, Tacoma, Spokane can share their knowledge.
- It's not just the colleges ahead of us, but those behind us too. We are all in this together.
- Business Analyst role and other permanent roles. Christy would like to bring that issue back up again. She has been working with a vendor to create a curriculum for existing staff to become business analysts. Could have a program ready in early 2020 so colleges can grow their own experts. Eva Smith, Edmonds, said they have had good luck with growing their own, hiring from business schools early in the project so they can get exposure early on and learn the system, as well as hiring internally.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.