



# STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

January 14, 2020

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
- Paul Giebel, Moran Technology Consulting
- Whitney Dickinson, OCIO Representative
- Clay Krauss, Tacoma PM
- PM Position Vacant

### Guests & Staff

- Reuth Kim, ctcLink PM for Risks/Issues
- Janelle Runyon, ctcLink Project Communications Manager

## Welcome

Christy Campbell welcomed the committee and reviewed the agenda.

## Approval of Minutes

Choi Halladay presented the Dec. 17, 2019 minutes, which were approved as submitted. It was noted the minutes were particularly long, but it was for an extended length meeting.

## DG2 Go-Live Update (Clark College)

Christy said there are still issues being uncovered that were part of the implementation process. The ctcLink Project is accountable for errors during implementation (go-live) and is working with the SBCTC ctcLink Support organization to mitigate the problems.

Shanda said their biggest concern is around the SBCTC ctcLink Support (ERP Support) and having access to the SBCTC development team resources to put together long-term solutions.

Capacity and coordination, long-term tickets (e.g. some HR functions aren't working, 1098 configuration decisions caused double-counting)

Security, accessibility, and Continuing Education continue to be issues. We're getting support, but the issues haven't gotten any better since last summer.

Shanda suggested that Christy and Grant join the PM and ERP weekly Production Support meeting— even Carli and John—so that can better understand the capacity issues. As the Steering Committee, Shanda said the members should know about the service ticket dashboard.

Shanda said the Service-Level Agreement (SLA) is not being followed, which is concerning when DG3 go-live is in less than two months. Grant said they are not meeting it, but are getting closer.

Shanda said that while Clark does not regret going live, she is concerned that without making further

progress in these areas, future colleges are at risk when they deploy.

Clark College has been highly engaged in ctcLink Project realignment and deployment activities. She said if it's this difficult for a college that has invested time and energy for 10 years, she is concerned about post-go-live support, accessibility and a continuing education solution. SBCTC ctcLink Support has no capacity or developer resources to improve OSECE.

Choi said Pierce College's growing concern is that there has not been enough time since Clark's go-live to get all the lessons learned integrated into UAT and DG3. He said it feels like DG3 is a beta group again. It's probably too late, but how do we get those lessons learned incorporated into upcoming deployments?

Christy said we adjust as we go. The project timeline was built on the assumption that two weeks of post-go-live support would be sufficient. We continue to provide some support to DG2 and are still making fixes to implementation configurations as issues are discovered, while also trying to move ahead with DG3 and DG4.

If we (the ctcLink Project team) caused a problem during implementation, we own that, and are accountable to fix it. Just because it's now in Production (or live), doesn't mean the Project can step away. The testing environment authorization process (LDAP) had issues which caused about three days of log-in delays. This was not function of the ctcLink system itself, but an environment provided by our managed services vendor.

Choi said it creates operational issues on the campus when technical issues like this happen. If we are in a situation where no one is logging in to test, because they can't get to the correct environment, it creates a challenge. Shanda said she had hoped the security process would be in place by now for DG3. Christy said the project is doing what it can to get caught up after many delays.

Shanda said resources at Clark spent an inordinate amount of time fixing their finance configuration. Their entire business services department is all-hands on deck and working an average of 70-hour weeks, which is not sustainable. In DG3, even with the best intentions, there will be human configuration errors. It's never perfect and that's okay, but at the same time without a centralized ctcLink (ERP) Support, some of the things we have found or that have happened, just slip.

Shanda said every time we talk about issues, it's about resource/staff capacity and she is concerned. Do we have enough time to take the lessons learned from DG2 and restructure support in the way we need to be successful? We have a commitment to serve students with visual and auditory with accessible technology.

Clark College SMEs and staff are still trying to figure out the new system and how to do their work in ctcLink in a campus environment that is currently divided and facing budget cuts. They are are tapped out and stressed and their colleagues from other colleges are reaching out to pick their brains. As Shanda said during the Dec. 17 meeting, they don't have a business analyst to help develop business processes and the lack manifests as huge workloads for those impacted.

Clark College wanted to go first so they could be helpful to the other colleges, but they don't have any capacity to be helpful on an on-call basis. Susan Maxwell and the Clark College ctcLink Steering team are inviting DG3 PMs and SBCTC ERP support staff members to visit campus on Feb. 6 and 7 and see the ctcLink system in action and connect with their peers. They want to encourage DG3 college SMEs to get to know the ctcLink Support (ERP) staff members, instead of calling Clark SMEs who don't have the bandwidth to support other colleges.

## **ctcLink Support Organization – Update**

Grant Rodeheaver gave an overview of the ctcLink Support Organization.

### Preparations for DG3

The ctcLink Support team is participating in data migration testing along with the Legacy and project teams.

### Ongoing alignment and staffing plan

About a year ago, we added nine staff positions to the ERP Support organization. Six positions were filled before DG2 and two application support positions are open. The intent was to bolster support to be ready for DG2 and DG3, while also implementing service levels so we could start getting some metrics around how we're doing, and determine what we would need for DG3 and onward.

As of today, we're feeling the pain. People are under strain and working 50- to 60-hour weeks, but that's not sustainable. We're working on how we respond to tickets, especially those with a cross-pillar component. We have to look at how we are working together and the metrics to support additional people.

Shanda brought up the matter of centralized support with everyone working for the same department. John asked why it mattered to the colleges how the support team reporting structure is organized.

Shanda gave an example of an urgent, critical ticket submitted regarding payroll and time tickets. The ticket was submitted and assigned to Finance, because ERP Support thought it was a Payroll issue. It ended up being a Time issue through HCM. Finance and HCM support weren't communicating until Clark's human resources office called ERP later that afternoon to check on the ticket.

She said the ctcLink PeopleSoft system is integrated, but without all the team members under one unit, the ctcLink (ERP) Support team does not operate together in a timely, coordinated fashion. Shanda said their HR department has had a ticket out for two weeks, trusting that progress is being made, but they don't get any updates or feedback. These are not "one-off" issues and seem to be a structural problem.

She said Campus Solutions ERP support, including Student Financials and Financial Aid, is very good, but the other two pillars are not coordinating and communicating.

Grant said they are working on coordination per the Service Level Agreement (SLA). Tim Wrye said the SLA workgroup recommended a centralized coordinator with a big picture perspective; with eyes on the status of all tickets and the ability to prioritize resources to make sure tickets don't languish, especially those tickets handed from pillar to pillar. While there might be legitimate reasons for delay, there needs to be a central coordinator making sure tickets aren't dropped and to ensure response coordination and resolution times. This has been a focus of Information Technology Commission (ITC) meetings.

Grant said they are working toward that end to improve response and resolution times and shared high-level October to December metrics.

Clay asked about how help desk needs are dispersed out to the colleges. Grant said that according to the SLA, the colleges should handle Tier 1 and Tier 2 requests, with Tier 3 and Tier 4 requests (e.g. configuration issues, things out of the college's control) directed to the ctcLink Support Center.

During Clark College's go-live, a handful of ctcLink project staff were on-site. While it was not the intention, they ended up doing training on the fly for how to apply PeopleSoft to Clark's local

business processes. There will not be project staff on the ground at colleges in future deployments, so those colleges will need to have their new business processes ready. Long-term, the college-level resolution of issues could be helped with business analysts, but it's not a silver bullet.

Choi asked if there was a scaling-up plan for ctcLink ERP support staff based on what happened with Clark College's go-live and support. There was discussion that there should be specific planning and metrics about growing the support organization.

## **SBCTC Agency Accessibility Plan – Update**

Carli Schiffner shared a report from Mark Jenkins from the [SBCTC Agency Accessibility Workgroup Update](#) outlining its scope and frame of work.

SBCTC convened this internal committee to achieve compliance with Washington State Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) [Statewide Technology Standard Policy 188](#).

The committee's initial focus is producing a Technology Accessibility plan. Guiding documents and recommendations for this plan will be submitted to SBCTC Executive Leadership in February 2020.

Carli has also met with the Disability Support Services Council three times since last fall. Shanda said Clark College thought PeopleTools 8.57 would be installed by the end of January, but that won't happen.

Shanda asked for a weekly or biweekly update or phone call about progress. She asks that ctcLink (project and/or support) put together a timeline of when ctcLink PeopleSoft accessibility matters will be addressed.

## **Upcoming Steering Committee Action Items**

### **DG3 Go/No-Go Decision approval date and process**

A special Steering Committee meeting was set for Feb. 18 for a preliminary readiness conversation. The final Go/No-Go decision will be during the Feb. 25 meeting.

Reuth gave an overview of the Readiness Checklist template, which is based on the DG2 list with revisions and enhancements made since. Readiness criteria for the Support and Project sides of the house are different than the colleges.

Clay asked when colleges will receive the system down times and other implications which impact DG2 colleges, for the DG3 conversion. They need this to develop communications plans for students and staff. Christy said she and Tara are working on it. Christy said she would develop a preliminary schedule as well as a date when colleges could expect the final schedule.

### **DG5 Go-Live Date**

Christy said we can estimate based on 2020 payroll dates, but we need the official 2021 payroll calendar to set a DG5 Go-Live dates. It's looking like October 2021, but not the first two weeks of the month given quarter-start dates.

## **ctcLink Scope Changes and Costs to Colleges**

The committee discussed the governance approval process/escalation when additional long-term funding is needed. As a governance body, Steering Committee has authority over project budget for the current fiscal year, but the ctcLink governance bodies do not have authority to commit SBCTC or the college system to long-term costs (e.g. maintenance contracts, service subscriptions).

The ctcLink Project will pay implementation costs for OAA and CampusCE, but total combined maintenance cost will be approximately \$700,000 annually. The specific amounts per college vary widely.

Choi said such decisions need to go before the Business Affairs Commission (BAC). The next BAC meeting is Feb. 20. If more colleges opt out of CampusCE, the calculation of cost-sharing changes.

Tim said that if we go out for an RFP for a single solution for the PeopleSoft system, the colleges should be held to the solution. The CampusCE RFP was written in such a way that colleges could opt in or opt out, which has proven to be problematic for contract negotiations.

Christy asked what level of documentation is needed and who to work with. John said that to get a recommendation or decision, BAC will need data and preliminary contracts ahead of time and that Christy should reach out to Ed Jaramillo, BAC chair, and send him materials.

## **ctcLink Program Status**

Christy reviewed highlights. Refer to the presentation deck for additional updates on the status and QA reports.

### **Program Risks**

#### **Inclement Weather**

Reuth said this risk reemerged because of recent snow. This currently impacts DG3 project activities and DG4 BPFPG Sessions. ctcLink PMO is developing a communication for how to handle inclement weather. The team worked closely with the DG3 and DG4 PMs to avoid cancelling the sessions, but WebEx is not the best delivery method due to the nature of BPFPGs.

### **Remediation and Replacement Solutions**

#### **Budget planning tool**

First statement of work is ready and we hope to kick off in February. The PMO is working with Clark, Spokane and Tacoma to establish timing.

### **Moran Quality Assurance**

Paul said their main concerns continue to be the same: DG3 cutover, ongoing issues out of DG2, post-go-live support.

### **Overall Status**

See the Jan. 17, 2020 Status Report for details. Overall status is yellow. Shanda said the project needs to do a better job explaining status of security mapping, accessibility and other issues that we are delayed.

### **Implementation Colleges**

#### **DG3 and DG4**

Christy said she is surprised more DG3 colleges are not self-reporting as yellow. Seattle is the only DG4 college self-reporting as yellow, mostly due to short turnaround time on homework.

### **Pre-implementation Colleges**

#### **DG5**

Expects to kick off its implementation phase on March 30 with the Global Design Adoption (GDA) courses.

#### **DG6**

Christy said there are still at least two colleges that do not have a 100% dedicated project manager. She will be reaching out to them to see how they're doing and what kind of support we can offer to help them get there.

### **Steering Committee Nomination Subcommittee Update**

Choi said Kevin Brockbank has agreed to represent the ctcLink Executive Leadership Committee on the ctcLink Steering Committee Nomination Subcommittee. Choi, Kurt Buttleman, Kevin Brockbank and Tim Wrye will need a short, 30-minute meeting with Christy to discuss process.

### **Agenda Items for Future Meetings**

- Jan. 28 – Steering Committee – Susan Maxwell will attend to give the DG2 update, but will not attend as a voting member
- Feb. 18 – Special meeting for preliminary readiness conversation
- Feb. 25 – Go/No-Go Decision