



STEERING GROUP MEETING MINUTES

May 21, 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
- Ana Ybarra for 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

John Henry Whatley, ctcLink Project Manager for Campus Solutions
Janelle Runyon, ctcLink Project Communications Manager
Dani Bundy, Organizational Change Management & Training Manager

Welcome

Christy Campbell welcomed the committee and reviewed the agenda.

Meeting Minutes

Approval of Minutes

The May 7, 2019 meeting minutes were reviewed and approved as presented.

Steering Committee Charter Subgroup Update

Tim Wrye, Kurt Buttleman, Grant Rodeheaver and Christy Campbell met last week.

Christy reminded everyone that all three of the ctcLink governance charters were developed by a ctcLink governance subcommittee (SBCTC/ctcLink project staff, college executive sponsors and project managers) as part of the new Investment Plan and project restart. At that time, the focus was specifically on project governance; therefore, post go-live/permanent roles for project managers and executive sponsors were not a consideration in the governance membership language. Now that the new governance model has been in place for a year, it is a good time to revisit the charters and make any needed updates.

Tim reviewed the subgroup's discussion at the May 21 meeting. One of the issues discussed is that the Steering Committee voting members include "six College Executive Sponsors" but, as Christy noted, those roles were not considered permanent ones in the past. With that current thinking, as more colleges go live, they may be dropping the Executive Sponsor (ES) role, which, if left

unchanged, would mean fewer colleges would have viable candidates for those voting roles. The same was noted for the Project Manager (PM) roles.

In general, the subgroup agreed there is a need to redefine the Executive Sponsor role. Tim said his preference would be to come to a system-wide agreement that each college needs a ctcLink Executive Sponsor indefinitely. After go live and stabilization, that role would shift from project implementation to ongoing management of the relationship between the college and SBCTC on all matters ctcLink. This would be an executive that is the primary decision-making liaison with SBCTC on an ongoing basis and may also be the senior/executive lead of each college's permanent, local ctcLink governing body (change control board, change advisory board, steering committee), but that would be up to each college.

Others agreed for the need for the ES to be an ongoing role. Beyond go live, it would not be a project role with the daily demands that come with implementation activities, so it would not require as much time.

The same concept was discussed regarding the Project Manager role. In many cases, colleges may be dissolving the PM role at some period after go live. In this case, it may be the senior business/functional analyst or some other "Super SME" that takes on that role at each college, which would also include an ongoing liaison with the SBCTC/ctcLink permanent support team.

Steering Committee Charter items for review and approval at the next meeting:

- It was agreed all three governance charters (cELC, Working and Steering) need language added that an individual cannot be a voting member of more than one governance group concurrently.
- The Executive Sponsor role title can be expanded to include "or senior college executive assigned to ctcLink oversight" to capture the need for a permanent/ongoing role at each college.
- The Project Manager role needs to be expanded in the SC charter to include "or Systems or Business Analyst" in that role title to capture the permanent/ongoing role colleges may decide to have.

Christy would like the subgroup to bring back a motion for changes to the charter at the next meeting.

Janelle will update the language in the charter in Google Docs and provide motion language for the next meeting. She will send out the notes from the SC Charter Subgroup meeting.

Christy noted the other governance groups will also need to revisit their charters and make sure the updated language is aligned across all governance group charters.

Additional next steps

The subgroup noted that both the ctcLink College Roles and Alignment document and the overall ctcLink Project Charter would need to be updated to align with this new proposal.

- Currently, the ctcLink Project Charter states that the College Executive Sponsor "*role is necessary early on in the deployment schedule, throughout the duration of the implementation, and for a period of time post go-live.*" This would need to be changed to reflect the permanence of this role at each college.
- The ctcLink Roles/Alignment document does not include the Executive Sponsor role because that document included long-term, permanent roles and, at the time, the ES role was not

considered long term and, therefore, it was not included.

- The above may apply to the Project Manager role as well. College may plan to dissolve the Project Manager role at a period post go-live and, currently, the Steering Committee Charter names two college Project Managers as non-voting members.
- If colleges and the SBCTC decide these roles (Executive Sponsor and Project Manager) need to remain in perpetuity at some capacity/level as a liaison and point of contact for the ongoing governance structure and permanent ctcLink support model, as discussed, the charters and other documents will need to be updated to align with this concept.

Campus Solutions Global Design Review (GDR) Recommendation for Approval

John Henry Whatley, ctcLink Project Manager for Campus Solutions, presented the updated CS GDR Recommendation document to the Steering Committee. The GDR was held last spring to make global configuration decisions.

The document was reviewed by the Steering Committee during its July 31, 2018 meeting, but was not approved due to several outstanding items within the recommendation document that were still under review by various groups (commissions, councils, other).

John Henry noted that the remaining five outstanding items were removed from the document to be addressed by other means. They have been added to the Issue Log for future tracking.

All items within the document have been addressed/closed, therefore, the SC can make a recommendation to approve the recommendations.

ACTION ITEM: The committee voted unanimously to adopt the CS GDR recommendations.

Note: There was a brief discussion regarding the “Terms to Display” field and the “suffixes” field. Terms to Display is a global function (whether we will show quarterly only or annual (full year) of courses. ARC has made a recommendation and WSSSC and IC need to make their recommendation. Regarding the suffixes, (DDS, JD, RN, PhD), all educational title suffixes will be removed.

Project Manager (PM) Summit

The summit was held May 6-8 at Wenatchee Valley College. May 6-7 was for all colleges, while May 8 was focused on DGs 5 and 6 and their Initiation Phase activities.

Christy recognized the host college and staff for all their efforts. She also thanked the college PMs that presented best practices, lessons learned and tips/tricks for success. Overall, it was a very productive summit with project and OCM managers sharing information with their peers.

One of the biggest accomplishments of having the project team and all PMs together is that now all colleges have an implementation/Initiation Phase schedule. All colleges have a clear understanding of all work packages required to complete prior to implementation and all colleges should now be working on those activities.

Christy said while some colleges do not have a dedicated Project Manager yet, this does not mean they are “on hold.” She has been in direct contact with those colleges that have an interim and are planning to hire a PM in the near term.

Clay Krauss said it was great to see at the summit all the progress of the project to-date and how different deployment groups are engaging with the project and each other.

Ligia Cicos said she found it valuable to attend the summit in person. She said there is always something new to learn from others.

Christy said the next discussion with project managers (at a summit or similar gathering) will be “What happens after UAT and training?” Cutover activities will be the next major topic.

Remediation Update (Including Replacement Solutions)

Remediation Overview (CCS, TCC Updates)

There are 22 remaining open in-scope Remediation items. While that is a small number, there are some big-ticket items remaining in those 22, including the 2016, 2017, 2018 Financial Books, Close and Reconciliation Framework and the Continuing Education, Online Admissions and Budget Planning replacement solutions.

Chart of Accounts

The Chart of Accounts is set to be implemented in July for Spokane and Tacoma. The go/no-go decisions will come before the Steering Committee at the June 18 meeting. If this group decides to escalate the final decision up the governance chain, there is a special cELC meeting scheduled for June 20 so as not to hold up the process.

Lisa Hjaltalin said Spokane had a meeting with Emmett regarding cutover activities. They are feeling much better about the timing and final cutover activities thanks to that meeting.

Clay from Tacoma agreed that things are moving along as planned for the new Chart of Accounts go live, but there is a lot of work to do.

Ana Ybarra, interim Associate Director for Campus Solutions, said that Student Financials functional team wants to do some testing. Lisa agreed that SF is a huge concern for the new Chart of Accounts. Initial activities and dates were revised. Production cutover says July 2019, but does not have solid date.

Online Admissions Application

There is a tentative Recommendation from WSSSC to ctcLink Governance that we move forward with an RFP. WSSSC did not think any of the solutions were acceptable. Christy and Grant both noted their concerns that we will not find a solution that will meet the 45 requirements.

This will come to the Steering Committee at the next meeting.

Choi offered to reach out to Matt Campbell to get more details regarding WSSSC's recommendation.

Continuing Education

Christy, Tim, Abraham and others met with the CampusCE CEO and others in Seattle on Monday, May 20. They discussed implementation approach of the project and the impact to those that are already on CampusCE.

In regards to separating the costs from currently deployed in CE, the negotiations to try to pin down a cost per college have been unproductive. The cost is the big hiccup.

The negotiations committee working with Abraham hopes to have this resolved in the next few weeks, then it will come back to the Steering Committee for a recommendation.

Accessibility RFP Update

The RFP was posted on May 10. The goal is to have multiple bidders to provide accessibility testing

of PeopleSoft.

We want to know before DG2 go-live if we are looking at just a handful of accessibility issues or if it is much more than that.

Budgeting Planning Tool

The committee has not met yet. Christy will be setting up a meeting. The commitment is to deploy a budget planning tool in January 2020. Tim asked that there be a representative from Highline on the committee if there is not one already. Also need to add someone from BAR.

Financial Aid Customizations

Most of these have moved from testing to production.

Risks and Issues

Risks / Moran QA Report – April 2019

Paul Giebel, Moran Technology Consulting, gave an overview of the April report highlights.

- Governance is working. We had no governance four years ago, so this is great progress.
- Project Management Office is fully staffed and working well together. Sometimes you have good people who may not be in the right role. We've made some adjustments and will continue to do so.
- Training and testing – Have made tremendous improvements since March and April.
- Organizational Change Management (OCM) – Marked improvement in number of opportunities for engagement for the colleges. A lot of feedback from the colleges. Important to recognize that OCM is critical. Saw the issues in the first go-round when colleges did not focus on OCM.
- Technical environment – The team is working through some of the hiccoughs. Security issue is problematic, but will learn more in the coming days.
- Continued college engagement. Provide opportunities and make sure colleges are taking advantage

Risks

Christy reviewed the top risks and issues from the May 10 Status Report

- Clark Financial Aid (FA) Data Validation –Not well validated, because the first time seeing FA data is in cycle #4. To mitigate, Clark requested to test and validate data in cycle #4B. ctcLink team has discussed this with Financial Aid SMEs and this will be taken care of in cycle #4B.
- Clark expressed risk impact to college Continuing Education (CE) program; it seems likely Clark will start with OSECE and possibly move to CampusCE. Decisions are dependent on cost for CampusCE, support for OSECE and impact to students. To mitigate, 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. CampusCE group is meeting next week.

Issues

- Security Mapping activities to mitigate UAT timeline have not addressed the new Security Design Production user access. **Update per May 10, 2019 status report:** Update: 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.

The mapping activities are critical. We are in UAT with DG2. Roles will be implemented between sprints 4 and 5. We need to set clear expectations that what they see will change. Security mapping validation will occur in the last two Sprints, because of a financial aid update. We had to do six sprints because there is a new update for Financial Aid.

ctcLink Program Status

Deployment Group 2

Getting through UAT, getting ready for training.

Deployment Group 3

A few hiccoughs with BPF. Have put some improvements learned from DG2 into data validation

Deployment Group 4

DG4 is in the Initiation phase and all colleges either have passed or are nearing the 50% mark for initiation deliverables completion.

Deployment Group 5

Attended the DG5 and DG6 half-day at PM Summit. In July will visit the college teams to talk to them about their initiation phase and preparing for implementation phase.

Deployment Group 6

Attended the DG5 and DG6 half-day at PM Summit. Fall visits are being schedule to go over the OCM and initiation phase activities. They will start reporting in November.

Overall

Christy is interested in revising the main Status Report page to show the Project's status rating vs the deployment group's rating of status.

Meeting Closure

The next meeting is scheduled for June 4, 2019 at SBCTC Olympia and WebEx.