



# STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

August 13, 2019  
SBCTC 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 Boesenber, SBCTC
- Carli Schiffner, SBCTC

### Non-Voting Members

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

### Guests & Staff

- Dani Bundy, ctcLink Organizational Change Management & Training Manager
- Reuth Kim, ctcLink PM for Risks/Issues
- Janelle Runyon, ctcLink Project Communications Manager
- Ana Ybarra, SBCTC Interim Associate Director for Campus Solutions

## Welcome

Christy Campbell welcomed the committee and reviewed the agenda.

## Approval of Minutes

July 30, 2019 minutes were reviewed and approved with a revision to reflect that Teresa Rich is from Yakima Valley College.

## Executive Sponsor Seminar Follow-Up Activities

During the July 30, 2019 Executive Sponsor Seminar, the executive sponsors decided to meet by deployment groups, in a similar fashion to the DG project managers.

Kurt Buttleman, Seattle Colleges, has already convened the DG4 executive sponsors by phone conference and they determined “DG4 is the best deployment group.” They plan to set up monthly check-in phone calls initially and see how it goes from there. They have been actively exchanging emails around the potential change to DG4 go-live date and are communicating well together.

Christy said Pat Cisneros, Everett Community College, agreed to convene DG5 executive sponsors. Christy contacted Teresa Rich from Yakima Valley College to see if she would be willing to convene DG6 executive sponsors. Christy will follow up to see if she has interest.

Christy said DG4’s level of readiness and engagement was apparent during the DG4 Peer Review and can be attributed to college PMs working together on Common Process Workshops, Wave 1 work, and many other activities.

The Project Management Office has been proactively reaching out DG5 and DG6 with road shows and discussions to help them with pre-implementation activities to ensure they get engaged and ready for the implementation phase. Getting executive sponsors to work together like the project managers do will be critical to help get them ready to prepare for initiation phase and Peer Reviews.

## **DG4 Initiation Phase Peer Review Recap**

Christy said she heard mixed feedback, with some saying the process and deliverables were great and that people are learning a lot, while others said we're being too easy on the colleges. She said it's a balancing act. The main advantage of Peer Reviews is that colleges have a chance to talk to each other about the pre-work they've done, how they did it, and where they have potential gaps. The DG4 Peer Review was beyond Christy's expectations.

Ligia Cicos thought the DG4 Peer Review went well. She said they were kidding about giving each other good scores, but the truth is there were no surprises, because they've been collaborating a long time. For example, Carrie from Centralia, Daniel from Seattle, Pat from Highline and Ligia from Edmonds were all engaged during the Common Process Workshops and other activities, so DG4 was well-prepared. Jason Hetterle, the new PM from Wenatchee Valley, got up to speed quickly, is very proactive and a fast learner and has really impressed them all. In a short time, Jason caught up with veteran DG4 PMs who have had a lot more time together.

Christy said because most of the DG3 and DG4 colleges were instrumental in the project re-plan and re-launch, they have a strong sense ownership of the expectations.

Ligia said it was helpful to have the DG5 and DG6 PMs' perspectives and feedback.

Christy said the DG4 PMs had requested other college PMs — in addition to project staff — be present and that the benefits far exceeded what they'd anticipated. It helped the DG5 and DG6 PMs understand the process, the level of quality in the deliverables, and they will use the materials and what they learned from the discussions to revise their own deliverables.

Ligia said that it was useful for DG4, too, not only for their feedback, but because DG4 has to model a successful process for future DGs.

Tim Wrye reported that Pat Daniels, Highline PM, said that even though they all felt very prepared, they all learned new things from each other that they could bring back to improve their own documents and processes.

## **ctcLink Executive Leadership Committee 2019-2020 Preview**

When creating charters for the governance groups, we expected there would be consistency from year to year in the ctcLink Executive Leadership Committee; however, with the exception of one member, the entire cELC membership turned over.

Christy and Janelle met with Chris Bailey, 2019-20 WACTC Technology (WACTC-Tech) committee chair and cELC co-chair, at Lower Columbia College regarding cELC visibility and communications. They also discussed responsibilities set forth in the cELC charter of what is expected of WACTC-Tech Committee members who comprise cELC membership by position. It came as a surprise to members that serving on the WACTC-Tech committee also includes cELC membership.

Kevin Brockbank is the only returning member of cELC. Christy will review the charter with the new committee and bring them up-to-speed on responsibilities during the October WACTC meeting.

Christy wants to provide some level-setting on the project background and the committee's role to ensure consistent governance.

Tim reported he listened in to the WACTC-Tech meeting during the WACTC summer retreat as the Instruction Commission representative. He was impressed with the conversation and questions from the new members.

Grant agreed and said they were enthusiastic and appreciated the briefing materials and governance information that Janelle Runyon and Sherry Nelson prepared for Chris Bailey to send out to welcome new members. Several said they had spent some time reviewing and look forward to getting more engaged.

Christy said she looks forward to working with and engaging the committee to make hard decisions.

### **New WACTC-Tech/cELC members 2019-2020**

- Chris Bailey, Lower Columbia College, WACTC-Tech Chair (DG3)
- Kevin Brockbank, Spokane Community College president (DG2) - returning member
- Amy Morrison, Lake Washington Institute of Technology president (DG6)
- Shouan Pan, Seattle Colleges chancellor (DG4)
- Julie White, Pierce College Fort Steilacoom president (DG3)

### **Past WACTC-Tech/cELC members 2018-2019**

- Joyce Loveday, Clover Park Technical College
- Marty Cavaluzzi, Olympic College
- Ivan Harrell, Tacoma
- Deidre Soileau, Pierce

### **Chart of Accounts Update from FirstLink Colleges & SBCTC**

- **Tacoma Community College:** Clay Krauss said their temporary resource has been going through the manual reconciliation process.
- **CCs of Spokane:** Lisa Hjaltalin reported they've been moving handily through manual updates to journal. They found some issues with the CoA migration which have created other problems with being able to close the month. Payroll journals stuck in process, A/P journals that are locked up and won't post, A/R journals out of balance, program and budget code problems. They have not been able to post payroll journals. While they are working very hard, if these issues don't get resolved and journals posted by the end of the month, all the manual work will need to be redone at the beginning of next month.
- **SBCTC:** John Boesenberg said SBCTC is working on it. Some of the issues require technical fixes and they've been sent to Oracle and recently escalated to severity level 2. Finance ERP Support met with Emmett late yesterday to review remaining issues. As SBCTC is having its own issues with the AFRS CEMLI related to COA, we have delayed closing July. This should provide at least a few more days to resolve and close the month.

Christy reported that Emmett is still working on the automation process and expects to have it tested and in place by end of the month. Janelle will contact Emmett for another update and will also connect with John Boesenberg to make sure the report is inclusive of all issues and who is working on them.

**Action:** This topic is expected to be on every agenda to continue getting progress updates.

### **ctcLink Scope Change Form/Process Draft**

During the Executive Sponsor seminar, they walked through the Change Process (ctcLink Enhancement Request process). This sparked further conversation about Scope Change decisions and the need for a process.

This topic was deferred to the Aug. 27 meeting.

Next Monday and Tuesday during the Guided Pathways workshop the project team will walk through the 700 requirements to demonstrate where Campus Solutions 9.2 (a.) meets requirements as currently configured, (b.) does not meet requirements, but could with configuration change, (c.) where a customization may be necessary within ctcLink PeopleSoft, or (d.) cannot meet requirements and would require a supplemental system or process.

Christy expects some scope-level change requests to come out of that Guided Pathways workshop by the Sept. 10 or 24 meeting, so it's important to get a process in place.

## ctcLink Program Status

### Program Risks & Issues

#### Risks

- **Chart of Accounts:** Until the CoA issues are resolved and automation is in place and operational, this will remain a high risk.
- **Clark Student Financials:** There were issues in financial aid data flowing to the general ledger. Some of the files and crosswalks didn't translate over correctly in the fourth conversion, so Clark College did an extra data validation cycle (4B) and we are hoping to get this resolved and closed.
- **G/L and SF Conversion:** The project team is running parallel tests with payroll, student financials, and financial aid as it feeds into the general ledger. The project team has created additional testing and training documentation to troubleshoot and reconcile. Lisa agreed that all colleges should be concerned that this is done right.
- **Security Mapping:** The majority of the framework is built and is in the ctcLink Reference Center. Colleges can go and look at the documentation, which is listed by business process and maps the current Legacy roles to new roles. The roles have been moved into the solution validation environment so colleges can see the roles and begin aligning to them. Building out this framework was a significant body of work not in the initial plan. Clark is working with it and will provide important feedback. This is our greatest issue as we head toward go-live.
- **Accessibility:** Level Access has begun phase 1 testing on student self-service, Highpoint mobile, HCM employee self-service, and Finance employee self-service for travel and expenses. Next week, we begin weekly meetings with Level Access. If Oracle has a fix on its roadmap (i.e. list of future fixes) or if it's on a release, we decide what we need to fix, whether immediately or in the future. We look to Clark for help with this. Oracle said they are adding fixes to new releases, but we're not always on the latest release.

### Moran Quality Assurance

We just received the July Moran QA report and are getting ready to respond to new QA review. We are yellow in Phase Scope, because remediation items and the need to revisit the Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM) items to determine which requirements were de-scoped that may need to be re-scoped. Schedule is yellow, because we don't have certain solution timelines in place. Training and Testing are both still yellow due to staff changes and they are completing deliverables "just in time." They are building out the foundation for this and future deployments. Technical Environment is yellow as they look forward to the ERP Change Management Board being reimplemented to improve coordination, scheduling and vetting, especially for items brought to Working Group. Moran continues to call out Security and Staffing issues.

## Implementation Colleges

### DG2

The ctcLink PMO self-reports the project as yellow. If we don't have Security Mapping in place in the next two weeks, we could see this going red. Clark self-reports as green; SBCTC is yellow due to resources, security and staffing; Spokane is red around finance, security and remediation issues; Tacoma is green.

### Draft timelines for DG3 and DG4

Christy reviewed the proposed DG3 and DG4 schedule revisions to go-live dates.

During pre-planning for relaunch, the proposed generic 12-month Deployment Group schedules were created based on basic assumptions: three months for requirements, three months for development, three months for testing, and three months to do mock run, end-user and go-live activities.

As we get ready for the deployments, we are now reviewing go-live timelines to accommodate blackout dates, quarter breaks, payroll dates, and holidays, which means some of these timelines do not align with a 12-month window. We do not want to cut time needed for BPFs, training, data validation, user acceptance testing.

DG3 kicked off its Implementation Phase in January 2019 with an originally proposed January/February 2020 go-live date. The revision proposes a March 9, 2020 go-live. Feedback from DG3 has been fairly positive. They are working some things out regarding priority registration (whether to do in Legacy or wait until ctcLink).

DG4 will kick off Implementation Phase in October/November 2019 with an originally proposed October/November 2020 go-live date. The revision proposes a March 9, 2021 go-live, so the original 12-month calendar becomes nearly 16 months. DG4 goes through two Thanksgiving and Christmas holiday periods, so instead of three weeks, it's six weeks, plus start-of-term activities and other blackout periods.

None of this work changes the "start" times for any deployment groups (i.e. initiation phases are already underway for DG4, DG5 and DG6); but rather, it takes a detailed look at the "go-live" times based on blackout periods and holidays.

One might assume these revisions automatically translate to a shift in DG5 and DG6 go-live dates, but until we lay out their activities and blackout periods, we cannot set their go-live schedule.

DG5 will start on time – January/February 2020 – and could expect to go live on a similar schedule as DG3 (i.e. March 2021).

DG6 will start its implementation phase on time (approximately September/October 2020) and, because it also includes two Thanksgiving and Christmas holiday periods, will also have a longer timeline similar to DG4 (i.e. February/March 2022).

Once we have DG3 timeline finalized, this will give us a repeatable calendar for DG4 and then we will modify the activities and dates for DG5 and DG6 to firm up their activities and end dates.

Choi said Pierce College had already pre-planned and put the community on notice to not request annual leave from September to go-live on the assumption they would be working through holidays and breaks. Pierce had questions about availability of self-paced training in December, so people can start training.

Choi reminded Christy and the project team to ask DG2 colleges about the timing of DG3 go-live

because of the need to take PeopleSoft offline systemwide.

Tim Wrye said that October and February were the best dates systemwide for go-lives. When we're already struggling to get DG6 engaged, how do we counteract the attitude this is another delay?

Christy said it's not a delayed *start*, it's a delayed *finish* to allow for holidays and blackouts.

Choi said their message is to let the colleges know this is to their benefit, because we have learned things during FirstLink and DG2, both of which were "one-off" deployments. DG3 is the first real deployment group. We need to tell the colleges they will gain a lot by going through the initiation phase and other activities.

Christy wondered if there is an opportunity for earlier deployments to help the later deployments. We do not have an implementation vendor, so we won't have 25 to 35 boots on the ground at the colleges during go-live. There will be a war-room, but in the revised project methodology (without an implementation partner), the learning process has been extended so colleges can go through their initiation phase activities, learn more and take on ownership.

Tim said we should socialize the revised DG3 and DG4 go-live dates with the other deployment groups and explain that this does not delay when they start activities.

#### **DG4**

Christy reviewed the DG4 dashboard. They are making great progress, ranging from 60% to 68%. Pre-kickoff for implementation phase will be mid-October, when they're expected to be at about 75% completion.

#### **DG5**

Christy reviewed the DG5 dashboard. Colleges are expected to be at 35% completion of initiation phase deliverables in July 2019. Numbers range from 16% at the low end, to 36% at the high end, with most in the mid-20s to low 30s. In August, the completion target will jump to 45%.

Bellingham Technical College has a new project manager (Ms. Nat Reilly) who hit the ground running and has already really driven up their numbers.

Bellingham is the only technical college in DG5, so it plays an important role helping set the groundwork for the remaining technical colleges in DG6. Members of the project team met with all the technical colleges last week around clock-hours, credits and conversion. One of Christy's main concerns is that we built conversion programs to be repeatable, but if there's a need to have something different for technical colleges, we will need time to plan for that.

Peer Review for DG5 colleges is slated for November 2019.

## **Replacement Solutions Update**

### **Security Mapping**

Addressed earlier in meeting.

### **Accessibility Testing**

Level Access' findings and our report will be part of the readiness package for the Go/No-Go decision during the Sept. 24 Steering Committee meeting.

### **Campus CE Negotiations Update**

Christy said negotiations are still underway. We have tried to understand their pricing model. We

removed those colleges that don't have a continuing education department from pricing. Tim said CampusCE would not revise its pricing model, so we proposed one and are still waiting to hear back. The goal is to have a contract in place by some time in September.

Christy said that Mike Nielsen, Green River continuing education director, suggested that late September would be a better time for college CE directors to get together to do the CampusCE fit/gap review.

### **Online Admissions Application RFI**

The RFI is in early draft stage. The OAA work group needs to get back together to discuss next steps. In the meantime, we are continuing to make improvements on the current OAA (which is also part of phase 2 accessibility testing). After the RFI, we should know whether there's a better product available or if our OAA (with additional fixes) is the better option.

### **Budgeting Tool Next Steps**

The Budget Planning Tools work group got together to review the full list of 250 original business requirements over the course of two sessions. Every single requirement to go forward, plus they added seven or eight to the finalized list. (Volunteer members were from Clark, Tacoma, Renton, Peninsula, Clover Park, SBCTC, Pierce, Yakima, Bellevue, Highline and Spokane.)

They will send a recommendation to move forward with the requirements to the Aug. 27 Steering Committee meeting.

Oracle/Mythics is building a prototype PBCS (Planning and Budgeting Cloud Service) based on: (a.) requirements, and (b.) sample organizations based on prior templates for Pierce, Peninsula, Spokane, and SBCTC.

Oracle will present its prototype to the Budget Planning Work Group, which will then recommend either the PBCS or to move forward with an RFP to during the Sept. 24 Steering Committee meeting.

Based on discussions, Christy does not think a single instance will be the best solution.

### **Action Items Review and Agenda Items for Future Meetings**

#### **Aug. 27 for approval/vote:**

- Budgeting Tool Requirements list
- DG2 Go-Live Readiness Criteria checklist
- DG3 Go-Live date
- DG4 Peer Review Gate 1
- Scope decision draft template, forms and process

#### **Sept. 10**

- Guided Pathways scope discussion

#### **Sept. 24**

- DG2 Go or No-Go
- business planning tool RFP or PBCS

### **Meeting Closure**

The next meeting is scheduled for Aug. 27, 2019, 1 to 2:30 p.m. at SBCTC and via WebEx.

## Action Items/Follow-Up

Item	Description	Person	Date Open	Status
11	Prepare for October cELC orientation	Christy, Janelle, Choi	8/13/2019	
10	Ask Emmett Folk and John Boesenberg for a CoA update	Janelle	8/13/2019	Reached out 8/20 and got some initial feedback
9	Check in with Pat Cisneros about DG5 ES group and Teresa Rich about DG6 ES group.	Christy	8/13/2019	
8	Communicate with DG2 colleges about timing of DG3 go-live dates, because of impact of taking PeopleSoft offline systemwide.	Christy	8/13/2019	
7	Agenda items not covered 6/18 due to time constraints: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>cELC Update</li> <li>ctcLink Project Scope discussion</li> </ul>	Christy/Choi	6/18/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete, cELC on 8/13/2019 agenda</li> <li>Complete, discussed 7/30</li> </ul>
6	Meeting at Pierce College to discuss Online Admissions Application (OAA) status	Choi	6/4/2019	Complete
5	Send out a recruitment email to BAC for budget tool subgroup member	Choi	4/9/19	Complete
4	Working Session for college reps for CampusCE	Reuth	4/23/19	Shared proposed changes during 5/21/19 meeting.
3	CCS to provide an updated list of remediation items	Lisa		Status?
2	Subgroup for SC Charter/Membership	Janelle	4/9/19	Meeting scheduled and held 5/15/19
1	OCIO Requested milestones and readiness tracking for Chart of Accounts for FLCs	Christy	2/11/19	Christy sent Whitney information on 2/19/19; Status Reports will include Chart of Accounts info