



STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

June 4, 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

Janelle Runyon, ctcLink Project Communications Manager
Dani Bundy, Organizational Change Management & Training Manager
Reuth Kim, ctcLink PM for Risks/Issues

Welcome

Christy Campbell welcomed the committee and reviewed the agenda.

Approval of Minutes

The May 21, 2019 meeting minutes were reviewed and approved as presented.

Proposed Amendments to Steering Committee Charter

The committee discussed three proposed language changes to Steering Committee Charter:

Item 1 - Committee Composition – voting members

Committee Composition: Voting Members subsection

- **Current:** Six college Executive Sponsors (selected, for minimum two years, can be staggered terms)
- **Proposed revision:** Six college Executive Sponsors: The senior college executive assigned to ctcLink oversight (selected, for minimum two years, can be staggered terms)

Tim Wrye said the reasoning behind expanding the definition of that role is because even after implementation/go-live, colleges will need an executive-level person accountable for ctcLink at a high level, which may or may not be called an “executive sponsor” on a long-term basis.

Item 2 Committee Composition – non-voting members

Committee Composition: Non-voting Members subsection

- **Current:** Two college project managers (selected, for minimum two years, can be staggered terms)
- **Proposed revision:** Two college project managers or ctcLink functional/business analysts (selected, for minimum two years, can be staggered terms).

The committee discussed various options to allow senior functional staff – and not just project managers – to serve after go-live. The idea was to get members who are involved in the project at a high level. Ligia, Edmonds CC, said the committee wants to have people who are heavily engaged on the project side.

Shanda described the model at Clark: the PM role will stay on until the last deployment group is in optimization. Even after a college goes live, there's still a role to play. The expectation is that this is a collective investment we make as colleges and for the system. There are so many important considerations, like Guided Pathways

At Highline, they hope to hire a couple of functional analysts and phase out the project manager role after go-live.

At Tacoma, after they go live with the 9.2 upgrade, will be less of a PM and more of a coordinator or liaison.

Ended up slightly amended to: “ctcLink functional/business analysts”– instead of “senior systems/business analysts”– which aligns with ctcLink Roles Document.

Item 3 Member Selection

Addition to Committee Member Selection section

- **Proposed addition:** An individual may only serve as a voting member at one level of ctcLink governance; however, the individual may participate concurrently as a non-voting member at other levels of ctcLink governance.

ACTION: Amendments passed unanimously.

Working Group and cELC will update their charters as applicable... They were waiting for approved language.

Chart of Accounts (CoA) Go/No-Go Decision at June 18 SC meeting

Christy gave an update. User Acceptance Testing on CoA began May 28 and runs through June 14.

There will be discussions with Tacoma on June 12 and with Spokane on June 14 to get feedback on readiness and understanding of any issues they come across in UAT. The plan is to have Go/No-Go recommendation from the pilot colleges for the June 18 meeting.

“What if” scenarios

- What if all the colleges say it looks good and there are no critical issues outstanding, that's an easy recommendation to the Steering Committee to vote to approve.
- If there is dissension/disagreement about readiness, this group may not want to make a decision and will send to cELC. There is a June 20 placeholder meeting for cELC to make a decision, if necessary.

Lisa, CCs of Spokane, said that what they had agreed to was that they would have a meeting with Emmett on June 12 and would decide whether the remaining obstacles can be cleared up and mitigated by June 14. It seems like people are able to do the testing, but the CS and HCM environment was only available to test starting today. She directed her staff to go out there (to ctcLink) and do their normal activities, including transitions crossing the two years (e.g. opening a purchase order in one year and it gets finish in the next year.)

Christy said Emmett Folk is working on a dashboard for exit criteria for those discussions. some of those items are: UAT success, college understanding of new CoA configuration changes, understanding of cutover activities and their impact, preparedness to start new cutover/migration to new CoA, preparedness to operate under new CoA, reporting and a few other areas.

Lisa said they need to do a communication to staff at CCS about how to work with this when it's ready for everyone else, to give them crosswalks. Christy expects an update on this soon.

Clay, Tacoma CC, said they are organized on their end and ready for their meeting next week. He noted it is important that we have a quorum on June 18. It's the biggest risk on the project we face right now. We don't want to rubberstamp anything, but we need a quorum.

Christy said if one or both districts say they are not ready, then it needs to go to cELC. The impact of not going live on the CoA is a delay to the other colleges and it's an increase in budget. If the CoA is not in a place where the pilot colleges can be successful, the impact to the pilot colleges would be equally damaging.

Lisa expressed concern about others making the Go/No-Go decision for the colleges if the colleges don't feel CoA is ready, because they cannot withstand another unsuccessful implementation.

Christy said that's why all the preliminary discussions are happening with the pilot colleges who are impacted directly by going to the new CoA. If the recommendations from the pilot college districts are that they are ready, it will be a much more straightforward decision.

If one or both districts say they are not ready, it is a cELC conversation anyway, because it impacts timeline and budget, which, according to the charters, is CELC and the presidents' decision.

Lisa clarified that it's not that CCs of Spokane are not ready, it would be that the ctcLink system is not ready to process transactions to give expected results.

Christy said that's why Emmett is working on the exit criteria which identifies the issues: systems, people, lack of training. It's more than just the colleges, it also evaluates ctcLink project staff, the SBCTC business office

The agenda packet for the Steering Committee to make the decision will include the exit criteria and a point-by-point evaluation by the colleges, as well as by the project team and SBCTC business operations for readiness. The criteria and dashboard will include the recommendation by the pilot colleges.

Remediation Update

Remediation Overview (CCS, TCC Updates)

Of the 11 remediation items open, the majority are about 2016, 2017, 2018 Financial books closure and reconciliation framework. Once the framework is accepted, we will work with Training office and vendors to create training for how to reconcile and close books.

Ten open items need a replacement solution, including Continuing Education, Online Admissions,

Budget Planning. There's one Financial Aid customization remaining for DG2.

Finishing up the last piece of Faculty Workload with the additional requirement found during UAT.

DRS Redistribution has been put into production.

Absence Management – one issue was part of remediation, the other was a DG2 global reconfiguration. Currently in UAT as part of DG2.

Security Audit Controls – Original redesign was one-size fits all. The redesigned roles are granular. Unfortunately, the vendor did not include some of the basic roles. This is in process.

Security Mapping – expectation is to have by the end of the month, production roles based on the new security design. And then have the month of July for colleges to test them.

Student Billing/Third Party billing is in UAT.

CampusCE Contract (Continuing Education)

Mike Nielsen, Green River; Tim Wrye, Highline; Abraham Rocha, SBCTC contracts officer; and Christy, went to CampusCE headquarters in Seattle at the end of May. Objective was to get closer to a written contract and a plan for pricing. While we came to some common understanding, we did not meet our goal. Abraham is waiting for feedback to finalize the contract.

CampusCE requested metrics from the colleges regarding their CE size, student headcount and FTE and staffing levels by FTE. We sent out a spreadsheet to gather that information, with a June 3 deadline. We about 18 responses of 30 districts.

Tim Wrye said we need to verify their functionality against the RFP requirement list.

Christy agreed and said that unless we go through that due diligence, we run the risk of the product not meeting the RFP requirements.

Accessibility RFP Update

Abraham had multiple responses from individual staffing providers and had to tighten up the RFP language to get specific expertise; not just staffing agencies. Abraham will reach out to subgroup team members so they can review the responses. This will be awarded to up to five vendors so that colleges and universities across the state can use the contract.

Online Admissions Application

Choi said he got received feedback from discussion with Washington State Student Services Commissions (WSSSC) Chair. WSSSC said it is not wedded to any particular methodology to get the OAA product they want. They have a document that outlines about 20 items in priority order the functionality that needs to be fixed.

They submitted this statement to the Steering Committee:

“The Student Services Commission (WSSSC) is asking that we move forward with a formal RFP process that will seek to identify vendors who might provide an online admissions application that more fully addresses the 45 prioritized criteria defined by the OAA Workgroup.

Ultimately, we felt that the options that emerged from the initial research, as well as the “quick fixes” did not sufficiently address the needs identified by the Workgroup and affirmed by the Commission.”

Matt Campbell, 2018-19 president, Washington State Student Services Commission, May 16, 2019

There was a discussion about costs, staff resources, possible modes (RFI or RFP) and the need to confirm the two requirements lists (Dennis Colgan's list and the WSSSC list).

Choi said they (WSSSC) do not care if it is an RFP, RFI or in-house, they just want the end results.

ACTION: Choi to set up a follow-up meeting. Thursday at Pierce College to discuss OAA with Choi, Christy, Matt, Tim and the ctcLink resource (if available).

Security Redesign - Mapping

Had a call with Johnathan Rider and Bill Welch. Preliminary mapping to be ready mid-month. By end of the month (June), expect to have roles in production. That gives us July for colleges and SBCTC to test the roles. For all other colleges, the security mapping takes place somewhere between BPGF and data validation, so their security roles are validated by the time they get to UAT.

Budgeting Planning Tool

The Budget Planning Tool subgroup has some committee member changes and is waiting for a replacement member to be named. Choi said they are hoping that BAC and BAR are willing to add a person. He will send an email to seek a volunteer.

This will take approximately three months to implement the solution. The goal is to have it implemented by January 2020. If the committee determines the existing Oracle product does not meet the existing requirements, we will have to go out to RFP.

If we have to go out to RFP, we will not meet Jan. 2020 deadline.

ACTION: Choi to send an email to BAC and BAR seeking a representative.

Top Risks & Issues

Reuth Kim reviewed some top risks and issues. Top risk is Chart of Accounts. These are spelled out in the May 24, 2019 Status Report.

Risks

Critical

- SBCTC – Risk of resource diversion due to Chart of Accounts adoption.
 - If manual work is required, SBCTC Agency go-live activities could be impacted by the diversion of SBCTC staff resource. SBCTC researching all potentially impacted areas to test what could happen and determine mitigation steps.
- Clark – 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.
 - Update: ctcLink team met to discuss options for OSECE and CampusCE. Preparing to deploy OSECE and waiting on vendor contract negotiations. CampusCE request for enrollment information sent to campus Continuing/Corporate Education directors. PMs were asked to follow up locally with their CE directors to help meet June 1 deadline

Issues

High

- Security Mapping activities to mitigate UAT timeline, have not addressed the new Security Design Production user access.
 - 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.
- DG3 Cycle 2 Student Financials (SF) Conversion – Configuration was not accurate or completed to execute conversion as of May 20, 2019. John Henry and Chandan submitted this risk to get ahead of the matter.
 - Update: SF will attempt to update and complete configuration, execute conversion May 30, 2019 with SF Functional validation thereafter. College validation impact can be minimized or not impacted at all (college validation dates June 12 to July 2, 2019). In the future, will do spot-checks during conversion cycles.

Quality Assurance Report

Those marked yellow (Phase Scope, Schedule Status, Training, Testing, Technical Environment) will remain yellow for at least a couple more months.

- Training: The team is working with vendor, GP Strategies, to create training materials.
- Technical Environment: Future PeopleSoft updates/bundles and third-party software installation and support work is being managed by the IT Division outside of the Project's responsibility. Overall planning of these changes needs to be tightly integrated with the ctcLink DG2/DG3/DG4 schedules. This becomes more challenging with the overlap in implementation schedules. Draft SLA agreement has been distributed to the colleges.

Whitney asked about how the coordination is going with updates.

Christy said they look as far ahead as they can to be aware of Oracle updates to coordinate resources, timing and testing cycles.

ctcLink Program Status

Christy gave a brief overview of each deployment group's status.

Deployment Group 2

In the middle of UAT training/testing, security mapping, developing end-user training content, and preparing for deployment. The team is working on the cutover and transition plan so they can prepare for all activities during the two weekends of deployment/upgrade.

Deployment Group 3

Have completed the BPFQ sessions. Some late homework came in, but she thinks we have it all now. Just started data validation for conversion Cycle 2.

Deployment Group 4

Still in the Initiation phase, being reported in the Status Reports, and looking forward to peer review

in July 2019. Showing about 50% complete in PWA and expect that to be about 75% by the July peer review. They will then have several months before the Implementation phase kickoff in November.

Ligia said she has been working with Reuth on a PWA miscalculation and, once that is fixed, will see bigger numbers.

Deployment Group 5

Currently doing site visit check-ins in June to prepare them to complete Initiation phase deliverables. Have begun Initiation Phase reporting in PWA.

Deployment Group 6

Fall visits are now being planned. The project is working more closely with future DGs than we have in the past.

Several colleges still don't have a project manager (PM). Three are advertising for PMs, but every college needs to have a dedicated PM and a separate executive sponsor to support the PM and champion the project.

Overall Status

Added a "self-reported status" section for colleges on the first page to the PMO-reported status per deployment group.

In DG, we report yellow overall. Clark is yellow mostly due to Student Financials and CampusCE/OSECO and accessibility, SBCTC and Tacoma are green, and Spokane's red status is around the financial year-end close.

For DG3, all colleges are green at this point.

Additional Discussion

Ligia noted that it seems to be difficult getting the Budgeting Tool process going. She asked if there is anything, the Steering Committee could do to help. Christy said she is looking to Choi to recruit another member to the reporting tool subgroup.

As noted earlier, Choi said BAC/BAR is more than willing to add someone else and he will work on it.

Meeting Closure

The next meeting is scheduled for June 18, 2019 at SBCTC Olympia and WebEx.

Item	Description	Person	Date Open	Status
1.	Meeting at Pierce College on (before cELC meeting) to discuss OAA status	Choi	6/4/2019	Choi to arrange meeting on June 6 at Pierce College COMPLETE
2.	Send out a recruitment email to BAC for budget tool subgroup member	Choi	4/9/19	Choi to send as soon as possible