



STEERING GROUP MEETING MINUTES

May 7, 2019

Wenatchee Valley College 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

Janelle Runyon, ctcLink Project Communications Manager

John Ginther, SBCTC Accounting and Business Services Director, ctcLink Working Group member

Welcome

Christy Campbell explained that based on recent feedback, this and future meeting agendas and presentation will be focused primarily on the action items and key discussions at the front end of the meeting. The project status update will be discussed at a high level following the key action/discussion items so as not to replicate the bi-weekly status report that is provided along with the meeting materials for each meeting.

Meeting Minutes

Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the April 23, 2019 meeting were approved as presented.

Deployments

Deployment Group 2 Go-Live Date – Request for Approval

Several weeks ago, the ctcLink Project team proposed a DG2 Go-Live and Upgrade schedule, which leveraged a holiday weekend. There was considerable debate.

The ctcLink Project office developed several scenarios for the DG2 colleges and SBCTC to consider. For business considerations, it is preferable to divide the process over two time periods, rather than be offline for six or seven days straight. The DG2 institutions (colleges and SBCTC) got together and chose option 2, which is outlined below:

Option 2: Perform Upgrade and Conversion 2 Cut-overs

- Takedown PeopleSoft Friday, Oct. 11, 2019
- Return access to PeopleSoft Monday, Oct. 14, 2019
- 2nd PeopleSoft takedown Friday, Oct. 25, 2019 Take down Legacy Oct. 24,2019
- 2nd return access to PeopleSoft Monday, Oct. 28, 2019; Live on PeopleSoft Oct. 28

All DG2 organizations were represented at the meeting and provided input:

- Clay Krauss said Tacoma leadership agreed it was better to split the dates as opposed to one longer outage and TCC preferred these dates.
- Lisa Hjaltalin said they had a discussion at Spokane and all felt this was the best option.
- Shanda Haluapo confirmed that, for Clark, this is the option [dates] that Clark must have.
- John Boesenberg said the SBCTC agency approved the dates.

ACTION: The Steering Committee unanimously approved the DG2 go-live schedule, with the caveat that the ctcLink Project team will work with DG2 members to finalize the exact “takedown” times (those times are currently set for 5 p.m.)

Christy wants to set expectations that future deployments will likely also be down for two different weekends. In addition, as each group goes live, any previously deployed colleges will also be impacted by cutover activities.

A lesson learned from DG2 (and as more colleges go live) is we will be planning the go-lives and understanding early in the cycle of the project how long the conversions and the configuration migrations will take. It is expected that each deployment as we move forward will need to be broken down into two weekends of cutover/go-live, with half the colleges converting one of the weekends, and two weekends later, the other half of the colleges converting. The conversion window for 6-9 colleges will take longer than one weekend. More to be confirmed, but she said it is important to set expectations early on.

Tim asked if two weekends will be enough for the largest deployment groups. Christy said we will know more after deploying DG3 and DG4.

Deployment Dates Selection Process

Christy shared a draft process for selecting future deployment dates:

Project Team Provides Deployment Date Options Based on Payroll and College Term Calendars

- Deployment and deployed project managers review deployment date options to gain consensus
- If no consensus achieved, deployment and deployed executive sponsors review deployment date options to gain consensus
- If no consensus achieved, deployment and deployed president review deployment date options to gain consensus
- If no consensus achieved, issue is escalated to Steering Committee for recommendation to cELC

- cELC reviews recommendations from Steering Committee and decides go-live dates for that deployment

Choi suggested the committee make sure it is on WACTC's radar that this could be a smoother transition if there were some work on coordinating academic and operational schedules across the colleges, even if it were temporary. It may make a much more reasonable way to determine what acceptable cutover dates might be for each DG. Examples given were start/end of registration times, financial aid deadlines/processing, due dates for payments, etc. How do we get awareness at the WACTC/presidents level that it would be a good idea for all institutions to band together and look for a more in-step schedule for the next few years since the number of institutions impacted by a go-live will keep growing each time.

There were no concerns with the process presented on the slide. Choi said the next step will be to determine what the process is for a more in-depth discussion with the presidents. **It was agreed to add this Deployment Dates Selection Process as a discussion item at the next cELC meeting on June 6.**

Adhering to current deployment groups (no future changes)

The group reviewed and discussed proposal language to form a recommendation to cELC for adoption and communication to WACTC/ presidents that colleges stay in current deployment groups (no future changes or moves). Choi noted this was discussed at the last cELC and there was broad consensus that it makes sense to lock down the groups. They were willing to take the Steering Committee's recommendation and move it forward in a more formal fashion to the full WACTC/presidents group.

Recommendation for discussion: Due to the high risk associated with additional colleges moving to later deployment groups and the inability for colleges to move to an earlier deployment group at this stage in the project, the Steering Committee recommends a moratorium on any future changes to the deployment groups that are currently in place.

Ligia asked what will happen if there is an unforeseen circumstance? How do we handle it if a college is not ready? Christy said at this point, the project team and other colleges would need to help them move forward.

Choi pointed out that the further down the road we are, the more real everything is. There is less opportunity for colleges to be unaware and not prepared. If for some unforeseen reason we do need Contingency Deployment (DG7), there was discussion that colleges need to be held financially accountable. The real opportunity is to communicate (a.) you now are locked in and (b.) there will be financial consequences.

Tim said the other concern is that if Governance considers a college to not be ready, that governance be able to make that decision.

Kurt said the committee's authority is to set deployment groups, so wondered why ctcLink Executive Committee (cELC) is involved.

Tim said if a college were to slip, it would bring a cost, thus the cost issue goes to cELC. It was agreed the cost issue would not be part of this motion, but would come up only at the time as such an issue arises. This would go to cELC since it could potentially have an overall project cost implication.

After additional discussion, the committee agreed on the following:

Recommendation: Due to the high risk associated with additional colleges moving to later deployment groups and the inability for colleges to move to an earlier deployment group at this stage in the project, the Steering Committee recommends a moratorium on any future college-requested changes to the deployment groups that are currently in place.

MOTION: The Steering Committee requests that the cELC adopt the recommendation [above] and communicate it to all presidents at the WACTC business meeting, and follow-up with a communication from the cELC co-chairs to the WACTC listserv.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

Executive Sponsor (ES) Engagement Discussion

Christy would like to re-engage college executive sponsors and asked for feedback from the group regarding what executive sponsors need and how best to assist them in understanding their role and serving as the ctLink executive sponsor at their college.

John Boesenberg—executive sponsor for the SBCTC agency implementation of HCM and FIN—said his PM had to educate him on his role. He originally thought it was more of an honorary position and found that not to be the case. He suspects other executive sponsors (ES) might be thinking as he did and not understanding that as ES you have almost a daily role of troubleshooting, supporting and cheerleading. He thought other ES might find it helpful to better understand their role, responsibilities and some of the tasks that may come with the ES role. He suggested a regular meeting schedule, perhaps more frequent than once per quarter. Maybe once per month.

Shanda said she echoed everything John said. Even though she has a very strong PM, she has found there is a tremendous role to play as ES. In the beginning, she was not clear on the amount of work and responsibility required of an ES, but has come to fully understand and fill that role at Clark. She suggested a monthly phone call as well. Perhaps a monthly phone call.

Tim – Would like to see a face-to-face meeting for the ES group for networking. Would like to start to build the network for the ES position.

Christy – Perhaps a re-kick-off and follow that up with a monthly check-in—WebEx or phone call.

It was noted that in the March 2019 survey to executive sponsors, 85% preferred to meet within their deployment group rather than with the larger group. Tim suggested maybe the executive sponsors could organize themselves for that. It wouldn't need to be project-driven. They could do monthly by DGs and we could do quarterly for all ES, or a combination. This is something to ask and determine at the kick-off meeting.

Choi – We are seeing some presidents that are ES. I do not think they have a clear understanding of the time commitment.

Christy – We still have a few colleges that have dual Exec Sponsors and interim PM, as well as a couple colleges

Ligia – Part of the role of the Organization Change Manager (OCM) is to guide the sponsors, give them a sponsor roadmap. Most of the colleges have combined PM and OCM role. Number one failure of project is lack of leadership support. ES plays a key role in building a coalition of sponsors across departments for support. There is not a lot of focus across campus in the OCM role. She thinks it is a gap in this project at the colleges.

Christy – Noted it is difficult. The hardest part is the budget. Some of the presidents do not

understand and there are other competing initiatives.

Perhaps half- to full-day session .focused around ES. Half of ES are new, so a good time to re-engage that group and provide guidance and resources so they can better understand their role on campus.

Will look into possibly co-scheduling with upcoming WACTC meetings.

ctcLink Integrated Cashier Credit Card Implementation

On behalf of the Working Group, John Ginther brought this enhancement request to the Steering Committee for approval. See [the enhancement request from Working Group for details](#).

The Steering Committee unanimously approved the following:

1. Support the idea of moving forward with an integrated cashier credit card solution
2. Start with a discussion with CWU to determine whether the product they use (TouchNet) is a viable option for our system and, if so, can the SBCTC leverage CWU's existing contract.
3. Bring findings back to Steering Committee to determine whether an RFP is needed.
4. Either way, also do an analysis of the SBCTC resources that would be required to successfully implement a cashier credit card solution and determine resource costs for implementation and how it will be funded.

Christy added that since we are already a NelNet customer, there could be opportunities to enterprise/enhance that contract moving forward (with NelNet). It was agreed it was worth having that discussion.

ctcLink Program Status Update

Budget

The budget is currently tracking at nearly \$2.4 under budget. Christy said we had initially planned for CE, OAA and Hyperion replacement to be much further along than they are, so that money has been allocated, it just hasn't been spent yet.

Deployment Group 2

DG2 involved in training, testing, deployment. Security mapping activities are underway for UAT. Had hoped to be further along by now.

Deployment Group 3

Finishing Business Process Fit Gap and getting close to Data Validation. After Data Validation, they will head to Security Mapping. Want adequate time to prepare.

Deployment Group 4

Tight, close-knit group that is meeting with and supporting each other. Jason Hetterle, Wenatchee Valley College PM, just started in November and is already engaged and doing a great job.

Deployment Group 5

Early visits are being scheduled. Initiation phase status reporting has begun. All colleges but one have downloaded their initiation schedules.

DG5 colleges are engaging with the earlier Deployment Groups. They are starting to get nervous as

they see what is ahead for workload.

Deployment Group 6

100 percent of the colleges have downloaded their project Initiation Phase schedules.

Additional Discussion

PM Summit Update

The Steering Committee meeting was held concurrently with the PM Summit in Wenatchee. All colleges will attend on May 6 and 7 for a wide range of topics. Day 3 is specifically for DGs 5 and 6 to do a deeper dive into Initiation Phase deliverables.

Brief highlights from the Summit were shared. As of today, only one college has not downloaded its initiation schedule.

Ligia reminded colleges how important the Common Process Workshops are and sought new leadership volunteers. Three potential PMs are interested. Many of the participants have already been to one or more CPWs.

Highest Risks

Chart of Accounts - First showstopper would be Chart of Accounts. Weekly meetings are going on. Initial approach didn't consider student financials, so Emmett is working with pilot colleges to test it and to make sure the plan is solid for cutover and implementation. There is no backup for implementing in July. It is imperative that Spokane and Tacoma have a successful "go live" of the Chart of Accounts to start the fiscal year.

Student Finance - The team is working on validating Student Financials data and developing options for a cycle 4B which includes SF data.

Impact to college Continuing Education (CE) program - Seems likely that Clark will start with OSECE and possibly move to CampusCE. Decisions are dependent on cost for CampusCE, support for OSECE and impact to students. **Update per April 26, 2019 status report:** ctcLink team has met to discuss options for OSECE and CampusCE. We are preparing to deploy OSECE and waiting on contract negotiations for CampusCE RFP.

Shanda asked about the possibility of using OSECE as the ctcLink solution if we cannot come to terms with CampusCE.

Issues

- Security Mapping activities to begin UAT have impacted college experience of UAT. **Update per April 26, 2019 status report:** The ctcLink team is highly concerned about getting timely information from the Security team in order to have adequate time to set up functional security settings for the UAT sprint cycles.
- Security Mapping activities to mitigate UAT timeline have not addressed the new Security Design Production user access. **Update per April 26, 2019 status report:** The ctcLink team is highly concerned about the Production Security Mapping for DG2 Colleges and entering new Security into one of the UAT cycles. Although there are no other options due to the schedule, this will be a challenge for the DG Colleges and SB as well as potential impact to the remaining UAT cycles.

Meeting Closure

The next meeting is scheduled for May 21, 2019 at SBCTC Olympia and WebEx.