



STEERING GROUP MEETING MINUTES

April 9, 2019

SBCTC Olympia, Bonanza Room and WebEx

Meeting Participants

Voting Members

- Reagan Bellamy, Wenatchee
- Kurt Buttleman, Seattle
- Shanda Haluapo, Clark
- Choi Halladay, Pierce
- Lisa Hjaltalin, CCs of Spokane
- Tim Wrye, Highline
- Grant Rodeheaver, SBCTC
- John Boesenberg, SBCTC
- Carli Schiffner, SBCTC

Non-Voting Members

- Christy Campbell, SBCTC
- Paul Giebel, Moran Technology Consulting
- Whitney Dickinson, OCIO Representative
- Ligia Cicos, Edmonds PM
- Clay Krauss, Tacoma PM

Guests & Staff

Dani Bundy, ctcLink OCM/Training Manager
Reuth Kim, ctcLink PM for Risks/Issues
Abraham Rocha, SBCTC Contracts Manager
Dennis Colgan, ctcLink Project Management
Kristy Snow, ctcLink OCM/Communications

Meeting Minutes

Approval of Minutes

Minutes from the March 12, 2019 meeting were reviewed and approved.

cELC Update (Roles/Alignment Document)

During the March cELC meeting, there was significant discussion regarding the College Roles/Alignment document brought to them for review and a recommendation from steering committee to share the recommended and required roles with all presidents at the WACTC business meeting the next morning. There was not much concern with the required roles (training, testing, security leads, etc.) since most of those positions go to existing staff. The struggle was around the Business Analyst positions. These positions are expected to be the “super SME” for the pillars and are potentially new roles for the colleges. The colleges had concerns around the financial aspect of hiring for these roles and not a clear understanding as to why these roles are needed because they believed they would be getting this type of support from SBCTC.

Grant said the colleges asked what roles they have now that would be similar to the expectations of the Business Analyst roles. Tim also raised the concern that smaller colleges may have a difficult time supporting those roles.

After about 30-40 minutes of conversation at cELC, Christy requested to table taking the topic to the

full WACTC the next morning until further discussion and planning was done. She shared some possible solutions that could be discussed further such as sharing staff across colleges and using one of our training vendors to deliver a boot camp for the business analysts roles to help colleges train up existing staff. Nobody is questioning the need, but the question is what are we doing to meet it? Grant said the challenge and goal is to be predictive and not reactive.

Christy spoke to Tacoma resources and they suggested possibly sharing these roles by region; however, this may be complicated. If we can train them, that might be a better approach. A recommendation will need to be created in about a month.

Tim expressed concern that cELC hears information, but the larger body of presidents didn't at WACTC. Christy explained that there is a report-out to presidents on key cELC topics (but there was a specific request from cELC not to bring the Roles recommendations to the presidents at the March meeting until the details noted above are more solid). Christy's March report-out did get some traction with some presidents. A few presidents approached Christy with questions/concerns after she reported to the group, specifically after she explained that all colleges should be engaged in ctclink at some level and all colleges need to have a PM and Executive Sponsor in place now.

Shanda expressed concerns regarding the recommended roles discussion as well. She feels like colleges have to make the commitment and the investment. When they're talking about going live, it will take resources and commitments. She likes the boot camp idea.

Clay asked where the conversation around ctclink permanent support after more colleges go live ended up. Grant talked about the SLA work and metrics, and additional staff at SBCTC that are being brought on to help with DG2 & DG3. He knows we need to be in a position before DG2 so that we can start to predict needs for future deployment groups. He's looking at leveraging a consulting firm to bring on board for go-live for DG3. Clay expressed that it's good for SBCTC to share plans to allay concerns about support structure. Kurt asked if there is a document that outlines the plan? There is not one at this time. Christy suggested a presentation at the PM Summit to talk about the support plan. Documentation is in development for the PM Summit and once it is created, this will be communicated out.

ctclink Program Status

Remediation (CCS, TCC Updates)

A few of these items have moved to a complete status. The FWL package 2 is marked complete, but there are some items being worked on before it is transferred over to support. Also completed Absence Management component and looking to complete the DRS Redistribution by the end of April – Christy will confirm this date.

Automated mapping for security is currently being designed by a consultant brought in to work with the project. Tacoma will go a different route, but Spokane is looking forward to the automation. There are still some issues being worked on by Johnathan Rider, but this should be done in time for UAT.

For third-party billing, this is currently in college UAT testing and should be done by the end of April. The reconciliation group consists of process flows and checklists to help colleges close out yearend financials, which should be completed by mid-May. We have a portion of the documents to get started with training documentation.

The new Chart of Accounts should be ready by the new fiscal year in July. The budget planning tool is still being worked on and should be ready to use by Jan 2020 for the 2021 fiscal year planning.

There was a parallel project called OAA Quick Wins with 16 items and 14 were approved by the colleges. This is being coordinated for the pilot colleges to use this during UAT. Tara and Christy walked through the application and made some suggestions for changes. This guides the online applicant through the process so they don't have to go back to enter more information after they get to the end. Would like our functional expert to give presentations to the pilot colleges, commissions and groups to present and see if the improvements made are enough. If the answer is "no," then we will need a new solution.

Training has moved its reporting status from red to yellow and explained there are different sprints in place in regards to UAT.

Deployment Group Alignment Decision for Shoreline CC

Christy Campbell expressed concerns with DG6. It is a large group of colleges near the end of the project. There is the concern some project resources may leave the project early due to the temporary roles they fill. There is a contingency deployment, but we are doing everything possible to avoid needing it.

Shoreline is asking to move from DG5 to DG6 because they have a new CFO and their full-time PM left the college. They recently named an interim PM and a new CFO. Christy recommends we honor Shoreline's request, but there is no more room for anyone else to move. Shoreline is behind all the other DG5 colleges and would not be successful if forced to stay in DG5 and causing a risk to DG5. Also, DG5 includes the first technical college, which will come with its own challenges that we have not experienced yet.

Shanda is concerned with the size of DG6 already. She expressed that DG2 has been over-the-top engaged and putting the effort and is concerned about the ability of project staff to help the larger, later deployments. She asked if we should look at implementing more deployment groups to help with the implementation. Christy explained that at the beginning, she was clear that DG2 and DG3 were going to be rough and we would learn a lot from them. However, the "sweet spot" would be DG4 due to the lessons learned. Christy is concerned about the number of colleges in the later deployment groups and the amount of wear and tear on the project team members. After the upgrade is done, things should be a little easier in the project. However, nowhere in planning did we account for gains in efficiencies in repeated processes, but have been working on creating a repeatable process to use with DG4 to DG6.

John expressed the need for this group to communicate the risks to colleges. Tim expressed concern about college presidents not hearing the imperative message. Christy clarified what she told the presidents. Christy told presidents that each college should already be working on project activities, identify their PM and Executive Sponsor, etc. If a college is not already doing this, they are behind. After Christy's message, some presidents reached out. Christy is currently trying to get disengaged PMs to engage and start the necessary work for a successful deployment.

Shanda expressed that she would not support the requested move because presidents need to be held accountable and hold their PMs accountable to do the work necessary so the project is completed in the timeframe and budget already approved. She explained that Clark has had issues, but she goes to the president with those and they figure it out as a college so nothing is held up. This led to a budget conversation and Christy explained that the contingency deployment would cost about five million dollars.

At the end of this conversation, there were not enough members remaining to constitute a quorum. This request was tabled to the next meeting.

Online Admissions Application Solution Update

Dennis Colgan explained that the OAA Working Group evaluated 15 institutions across the U.S. and totaled the top seven. Nobody got a perfect score (45 points). The average score was 26.5 points. Some colleges use a third-party application, but these have difficulty speaking to PeopleSoft.

CUNY and Florida International colleges are using a bolt-on from Oracle Consulting and Christy reached out to get more information on the cost and roadmap on this. Each of the colleges had unique qualities, but none of them shined on their accessibility.

This is now with the Washington State Student Services Commission (WSSSC) with Joe Holliday and Matt Campbell leading the process to develop a recommendation to Steering Committee. Joe and Matt had a conversation with Maricopa Community College system (Arizona) about what they are using and will continue to have conversations with them moving forward.

Dennis has been trying to find an OAA version that we could replicate and tweak to fit our needs so we don't have to build ours from scratch, but the colleges he has reached out to have not been willing to share their coding. Some options for moving forward are: use the 14 OAA Quick Wins, adopt another college's OAA and adjust to fit our needs, fix our current OAA, or submit an RFP to find what is on the market that will fit our needs. There are plans in place to allow students from the First Link colleges to test the new OAA system. **Christy recommended the WSSSC get a walkthrough on the improvements at their next meeting May 2-3 and Tim asked for this to go to the Admission and Registration Council at their next meeting April 24-25.**

Shanda asked if the goal is to be ready for DG2, because she is very concerned we might go forward with products that don't meet our requirements. Christy expressed that the goal is to have this ready to implement with DG2, however, there are concerns if this does not go through the commissions and councils, it may not address all the issues. This also will need to go through Working Group for approval.

Currently, accessibility is an issue. Shanda asked which accessibility standards we are evaluating against. We will use an RFP to bring in a vendor to test accessibility and are striving for the standards set forth in the state, federal and college system policies:

- [State OCIO Policy 188 - Accessibility](#)
- [Accessible Technology Policy: Vision, Mission, Policy Statement and Recommendations for Adoption](#)

Continuing Education RFP Update

Abraham Rocha sent a draft contract, terms and conditions to CampusCE. He said he had a long conversation with Loren Pace, CampusCE Corporation CEO, about pricing.

CampusCE said colleges already under agreement have better pricing than they would receive under the new plan contract. Campus CE is willing to honor the current pricing they have with colleges already using their services. Bellevue is currently charged more than others, but their underlying price is actually lower. They are the largest single campus in the college system. They also have unique configurations and add-ons, which is leading to the difference in cost. Colleges will be able to opt in or opt out and colleges currently on CampusCE can stay with their current pricing. Those currently on CampusCE, if they decide to stay on their current instance, but they will not get ctcLink integration.

Christy expressed her vision that there would be a new instance and cost for all colleges, but this is

not in the contract currently. She explained – using Clark as an example – saying that if they go live in October, but want to keep their current CampusCE instance, they will not be able to integrate into ctcLink. Christy also explained that the initial cost of adopting CampusCE is included in the implementation of ctcLink, but any upgrades or changes would be a cost to the colleges. There were several questions raised around pricing structure, requirements, and functionality. **Tim will gather these questions and send them to Abraham so they can go to CampusCE. These questions will be sent to Grant and Christy beforehand.**

Shanda did not know that Clark was to go back to OSECE or that OSECE was even in play. Christy explained that there were a couple things done to OSECE due to remediation, but the project is not currently working on OSECE outside of that work. Dani and Christy will meet with Tara to understand what the communication was about OSECE.

Subgroup Update for Steering Committee Charter/Membership

The subgroup has not met and will prepare for a future meeting. Members who volunteered to work with Christy:

- Tim Wrye, Highline College
- Kurt Buttleman, Seattle Colleges
- Grant Rodeheaver, SBCTC

Meeting Closure and Agenda Items for Future Meeting

Christy closed the meeting and moved items 5, 8, 9 to next meeting agenda, April 23.

5	Deployment Group Alignment Decision for Shoreline CC	Christy
8	Subgroup Update for Steering Committee Charter/Membership	Subgroup Members
9	Executive Sponsor Next Steps	Christy/Janelle/Reuth