



STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

September 10, 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 Boesenberg, SBCTC
- Carli Schiffner, SBCTC

Non-Voting Members

- Christy Campbell, SBCTC
- Bob Adams [for Paul Giebel, Moran Technology Consulting]
- Whitney Dickinson, OCIO Representative
- Ligia 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
- Eli Hayes, ctcLink Project Plan Manager

Welcome

Christy Campbell welcomed the committee and reviewed the agenda.

Approval of Minutes

Aug. 13, 2019 minutes were reviewed and approved as submitted.

Chart of Accounts Update from FirstLink Colleges & SBCTC

- **Tacoma Community College:** Clay Krauss said they're still working busily on the manual adjustments.
- **CCs of Spokane:** Lisa Hjaltalin reported that they are continuing to do the manual adjustment to the journals. The automation tool that was supposed to be in place on Sept. 1 is not up and running yet. The CoA implementation has brought to light other issues (e.g. they can't set up new program codes and issues with certain chartfields not flowing into the general ledger). Spokane has submitted tickets and SBCTC is working with them to resolve issues.
- **SBCTC:** John Boesenberg said the colleges have become proficient in the manual adjustments to the GL and – except for the issues Lisa noted – things are going as expected. He will follow up with Spokane. The automation piece is getting closer and is being worked on.

Christy said she would follow up with Emmett Folk regarding progress implementing the automation tool and will get a communication out to stakeholders.

Action: This topic is expected to be on every agenda to continue getting progress updates until issues are resolved.

Budget Planning Tool Requirements – Discussion and Approval

Christy discussed the Budgeting Tools requirements review process and work group participation. Volunteer members were from Clark, Tacoma, Renton, Peninsula, Clover Park, SBCTC, Pierce, Yakima, Bellevue, Highline and Spokane.

The review process was not to evaluate whether the Oracle tool meets requirements; but rather, which requirements the group wanted to send forward for Steering Committee approval. Christy clarified that “yes” is a “must have” and that “maybes” were “nice to have.” Of the 236 original requirements, all will go forward, plus seven (7) additional requirements for a total of 243 on the final list.

It was suggested the Oracle “vendor comments” column (a holdover from the original RFP materials) in the Budget Tool Requirements spreadsheet be deleted, because it looks like something was left out.

Next steps: Mythics/Oracle is building a prototype based on requirements and will walk through a demo with the work group to determine if the current tool (Oracle’s Planning and Budgeting Cloud Service) will meet all the needs/requirements identified for budget planning.

We are aiming to close this out in October and then work with a vendor to help us implement with a targeted group of first colleges. We are looking at DG2 and DG3 colleges as the sample set because they will have the integration with PeopleSoft. Colleges could potentially come on early if not already on ctcLink, but would need to integrate into ctcLink again when they implement.

Action: The committee moved to approve the 243-item Budget Planning Tool requirements list as requested by the work group. Motion passed unanimously.

DG4 Initiation Phase Peer Review Results and Gate 1 Recommendation

Reuth Kim gave an overview of the evaluation process and results from the DG4 Peer Review held July 29-30 at Highline College. DG5 and DG6 will benefit from this process because they can access the tools from DG3 and DG4. Reuth called out a few examples:

- Centralia’s business process maps shared at Canvas
- Edmonds gave a great overview of their supplemental systems analysis
- Highline business process maps in Lucid Chart (shared at cDR)
- Seattle Colleges training plan
- Wenatchee Valley resources for planning

Eli Hayes said that by comparison with the DG3 review, the DG4 Peer Review was more organized.

Christy said they learned a lot from the DG3 review and will continue to incorporate lessons to further improve peer reviews for DG5 and DG6. DG5 Peer review will be three days in December 2019.

The Global Design Adoption (GDA) courses will be updated as needed in November, but DG4 may begin GDA courses early in preparation for December Business Process Fit/Gap sessions.

Action: The Steering Committee unanimously approved DG4 to pass through Gate 1 and begin its Implementation phase in mid-October 2019.

Go-Live Dates Discussion and Approval

Eli Hayes gave an overview of the proposed DG3 and DG4 go-live dates, (the actual date colleges expect to go live on the ctclink PeopleSoft system. The starting dates for initiation phases don't change for any of the deployment groups; just the end date.

Given the size of the deployment groups, it's expected that DG5 and DG6 go-lives will require two weekends. Not sure about DG4 yet.

Deployment Group 3

March 9, 2020 was proposed as the go-live date, three weeks later than the original Feb. 17, 2020 date.

The date was revised to mitigate four major holidays – Thanksgiving, Christmas, New Year's, Martin Luther King – and college blackout dates. While initially concerned, after discussing on campus with stakeholders, college staff appreciated they wouldn't need to work on the holidays and DG3 members were all in favor.

It's not clear yet whether two weekends are required for DG3 go-live until we get feedback from conversions. If we need the extra weekend, conversions would run with effective dating, then over go live weekend, would bring in the remaining data.

Action: Committee unanimously approved March 9, 2020 as the DG3 go-live date.

Deployment Group 4

Feb. 1, 2021 was proposed versus the original October/November 2020 date.

Revised to mitigate two sets of major holidays – two each of Thanksgiving, Christmas, New Year's, Martin Luther King.

Tim Wrye said while initial reaction was not good, as the campus community started discussing, it made sense. They don't want to short themselves on User Acceptance Testing and the new go-live time works better after all.

DG4 began its initiation phase March 2018 and will begin its implementation phase in late fall quarter 2019.

Action: Committee unanimously approved Feb. 1, 2021 as the DG4 go-live date.

Deployment Groups 5 and 6

Whitney Dickinson asked what the DG4 go-live date means to DG5 and DG6 timeline. Christy said there's no way to set the DG5 or DG6 go-live dates until we run through DG3 and DG4 timelines. The PMO is completing the DG3 plan and cloning it for DG4. Once we have that, can start pairing up DG5 and DG6.

Christy said the DG5 and DG6 initiation phase start dates have not changed, but their duration will go longer than in the original schedule. While we can look to tighten up the schedule, we don't want to do anything to compromise quality or reduce time needed for testing.

Deployment Readiness Documents

Deployment Readiness Checklist

Reuth gave an overview of the readiness spreadsheet for DG2. The tabulation will inform the two decisions to be made during the Sept 24 Steering Committee meeting: Spokane and Tacoma upgrade weekend and Clark and SBCTC go-live weekend.

Reuth said the spreadsheet will also capture the remaining remediation items.

Shanda hopes that we could come up with a template that shows the college is comfortable, even if it shows a lot of yellow, we would have mitigation plans in place.

Whitney suggested that a mitigation column be added. Tim said yellow should mean that there is a mitigation plan in place. Choi said it was not clear how colleges differentiate red from yellow and what the colors mean. The group requested an orange status be added. The following categories were agreed to:

- RED - Critical system or organization issue, no mitigation available
- ORANGE - System or organizational issue with workaround (mitigation plan)
- YELLOW - Somewhat ready for Go-Live small issues unresolved, doesn't impact Go-Live
- GREEN - Ready for Go-Live

John Boesenberg said the SBCTC team found the template useful and modified/added items they needed. The group suggesting adding OCM and Performance Testing to the spreadsheet. Reuth said colleges could add other items to their list and personalize.

Christy said if a college is not ready to go, we don't want them to go live. They would need to wait until next go-live round.

Action: The Steering Committee unanimously adopted the readiness framework with changes discussed, understanding this is an evolving document and will continue to be refined. Any revisions will be agreed upon by the Steering Committee.

Organizational Go/No-Go Recommendation Sign-Off

Christy gave an overview of the form which requires CEO (president, chancellor, SBCTC Executive Director), Executive Sponsor (college or agency) and Project Manager (college or agency) to sign off that the organization is ready to go live or not.

Action: The Steering Committee unanimously adopted the Go-Live Recommendation with changes as outlined in discussion.

Guided Pathways Workshop Update

Facilitator Update

Ligia Cicos gave an overview of the Guided Pathways (GP) requirements workshops. She reported that Daniel Cordas is writing a detailed, formal outcomes report about the Guided Pathways (GP) requirements and the recommendations will come to Steering Committee soon.

The goal of the Guided Pathways Requirements workshops was to create a functional requirements list and to evaluate how PeopleSoft Campus Solutions meets GP needs. First created broad common process to define scope of GP, developed requirements by role (faculty, student services, advisors, etc.).

During the first workshop in April-May the group mapped processes and gathered requirements. Participants developed about 600 functional requirements.

Between workshops, the ctLink project team evaluated requirements to determine which were met fully, partially or not at all with CS 9.2.

In the second workshop in August, participants reviewed 200 requirements in a PeopleSoft product demonstration to determine if the baseline product already met requirement, whether it could (a.) be

met with a local configuration, (b.) a global configuration, (c.) a customization, or (d.) was not met not at all.

Requirements were sorted into three groups

1. Met as delivered or local configuration – about 70 requirements
2. A majority delivered – about 50 requirements
3. Needs another review – they need more information

Votes on functionality during GP workshop

- Enable sub-plans: All voted yes, but one abstained
- Support meta-majors: Majority voted yes, one no, one abstention

New Requirements / Next Steps

Christy said there was a follow-up meeting about sub-plans. Clark, Tacoma, Spokane will be addressed through the SBCTC support organization

Packaging of Guided Pathways Requirements

Some will need to go to ctcLink Executive Leadership Committee (cELC) for consideration because it would impact budget and timeline:

- Package 1 = PeopleSoft System Not Met (Pre-workshop evaluation)
- Package 2 = PeopleSoft System Not Met (System Wide workshop decision)

Some would need to go to Steering Committee:

- Package 3 = PeopleSoft System Partially Met (Need Changes to ctcLink Configuration or Customizations)
- Package 4 = PeopleSoft System Met (ctcLink currently Configured or Customized per requirement)

ctcLink Governance Decision Options Template

Christy reviewed the ctcLink scope management process and a proposed governance decision template for those instances where governance will need to make a decision on, for example, a new requirement, a change to an existing requirement or the removal of existing requirements.

As detailed in the ctcLink Governance Charters, changes to ctcLink can be requested by the following channels: ctcLink Executive Sponsor(s), Commissions Chairs, Data Governance Co-Chairs, ERP Leaders, CPW Facilitators, External Mandates.

The SBCTC ERP and Project Team(s) analyze new requirements to understand impacts to the system, processes and level of work to implement the new or changed requirement.

And then it goes to Working Group for review, then Steering Committee. If there are timeline or budget impacts, it goes to cELC.

The template provided an outline of the content to be considered for any upcoming scope changes. It would include a problem statement, describe the advantages, disadvantages, budget implications, etc., and include a recommendation from PMO for the committee's consideration.

Christy explained one of the first items that will require this type of analysis and decision is requirements/recommendations (meta-majors) that will be coming out of the Guided Pathways

workshops.

The group agreed this was a good framework for governance to use moving forward.

Whitney asked how we will account for the time and effort to analyze these requests. For example, if it takes 400 hours just to do the initial analysis, the analysis could be a project unto itself.

Security Mapping Delay Mitigation Plan/Schedule for DG2

Christy reviewed the DG2 Security Mitigation and Validation plan/schedule the team has been following since late August. It was developed to address how best to mitigate the security delays (getting the right roles in place that work for colleges/SBCTC). The roles as originally defined by the vendor weren't workable. A significant amount of work has taken place to correct this. To mitigate the security delay for DG2, the new security model was incorporated into UAT, which extending UAT through September 13. This is allowing for regression testing of the business processes with the new model. Some of this is cleanup of roles that won't be needed. The validation may extend into next week.

Security is an item on the Readiness Checklist discussed earlier so colleges and the SBCTC agency can tell us whether they are ready or not ready for go live in terms of security/roles. John Boesenberg confirmed that, for SBCTC, the outstanding issues with security roles/mapping were not show-stoppers for Go Live. Shanda confirmed the same for Clark College. Christy said while it may not be as perfect as possible at go live, local security teams will be adding/changing roles as there are changes in the organization anyway, so these are things that can be cleaned up and perfected after go live.

ctcLink Program Status

With under 10 minutes remaining in the meeting, Christy gave a quick overview of key items:

Program Risks & Issues

- Still significant concerns from Clark College around Student Financials/Financial Aid and the conversion and data flowing to the General Ledger. The team was expecting Cycle 4B to mitigate this issue, which didn't fully come to fruition. This is still a very big concern for Clark in understanding the data that goes from CS, SF/FA through to the General Ledger. Discussions with Clark finance staff while PMO is on site at Clark will take place tomorrow.
- The GL and SF conversions is a related issue and also remains a high risk, which is being addressed as well.
- Regarding accessibility, Christy just received the findings from Level Access for Phase 1 (Student Self Service, Employee Self Service,

Implementation Colleges

DG2

Spokane and SBCTC both show as red. John Boesenberg said it would be yellow now. Lisa said the red reflects the issues with the year-end close and the remediation items.

DG4

Christy reviewed the DG4 dashboard. Making good progress.

DG5

Christy reviewed the DG5 dashboard. There are some gaps and concerns.

Remediation: Replacement Solutions Update

Accessibility Testing

Cycle 1 testing with Level Access wrapping up and Cycle 2 about to begin. (Testing Mobile this week to finalize Phase 1).

Christy has a spreadsheet of findings from Phase 1 testing and is updating it for review. Presentations as well.

Level Access does not fix these items, but we have about 102 hours remaining for Level Access to guide our work. As we fix and Oracle fixes, we have that time remaining for Level Access to review what has been fixed.

This will be part of the Sept 24 SC package

Phase 2 (OAA, OSECE and CampusCE) starts next week.

Campus CE Negotiations Update

First round of contract negotiations still underway as we try to arrive at a pricing structure.

Online Admissions Application Next Steps

Continuing to make improvements on current OAA, but have not had time to start an RFI. A vendor offered to make a prototype for free with no strings attached.

Action Items Review and Agenda Items for Future Meetings

Sept. 24, 2019

- Meeting will be held at Clark College
- DG2 Go or No-Go decision
- Load testing
- Accessibility findings/prioritizing
- Christy to report back about CoA automation tool

Meeting Closure

The next meeting is scheduled for Sept. 24, 2019, 1 to 2:30 p.m. at Clark College.

Action Items/Follow-Up

Item	Description	Person	Date Open	Status
13	Revise the Budget Tool spreadsheet and delete the "vendor comments" column.	Sherry	9/10/2019	Done 9/11/2019 - Sherry revised, uploaded at Steering Committee minutes page
12	Follow up with Emmett regarding CoA automation tool.	Christy	9/10/2019	
11	Prepare for October cELC orientation	Christy, Janelle, Choi	8/13/2019	

Item	Description	Person	Date Open	Status
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"> cELC Update ctcLink Project Scope discussion 	Christy/Choi	6/18/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete, cELC on 8/13/2019 agenda Complete, discussed 7/30
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