



STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

June 29, 2021, Webex Only

Meeting Participants

Voting Members

- Reagan Bellamy, Wenatchee
- Kurt Buttleman, Seattle
- Rodger Harrison, Bellevue
- Carolyn Tucker - Skagit Valley
- Tim Wrye, Chair, Highline
- Chad Stiteler, Bellingham Tech
- Grant Rodeheaver, SBCTC
- Choi Halladay, SBCTC
- Carli Schiffner, SBCTC

Non-Voting Members

- Christy Campbell, SBCTC
- Paul Giebel, Moran Technology Consulting
- Rich Tomsinski, OCIO Representative
- Brian Lee, Clover Park Tech PM
- Clay Krauss, Tacoma PM

Non-Voting Commission Reps

- Peter Lortz, IC
- Carly Haddon, RPC
- Ruby Hayden, WSSSC

Staff & Guests

- Dani Bundy, ctcLink Customer Support Director
- Tara Keen, ctcLink Assistant Project Director
- Reuth Kim, ctcLink Quality Assurance, Risk & Issue Management PM
- Sandy Main, SBCTC Application Services Director
- Susan Maxwell, ctcLink College Advisor PM
- Shelley McDermott, OCIO Expert PM
- Sherry Nelson, ctcLink Project Communications Coordinator
- Johnathan Rider, SBCTC Infrastructure Services Director
- Janelle Runyon, ctcLink Project Communications Manager
- John Henry Whatley, ctcLink CS PM

Welcome

Tim Wrye welcomed the committee and Christy Campbell reviewed the agenda.

Choi Halladay has joined SBCTC as Deputy Executive Director of Business Operations, replacing John Boesenberg in his role on the Steering Committee.

Approval of Minutes

The June 1, 2021 draft minutes were approved as submitted.

DG6 Go-Live Dates: Discussion

Christy reported that DG6 colleges agreed that March 14, 2022 (option B) was a non-starter for the colleges. The Project Management Office will work with PMs as they convene to consider an alternative proposed DG6 Group B date. See details in [ctcLink Project Status Report \(June 7-18, 2021\)](#).

Proposed	Group A	Group B	Group C
Go-Live Date	Feb. 28, 2022	March 14, 2022	April 25, 2022
Go-Live Weekend	2/25 to 2/27	3/11 to 3/13	4/22 to 4/24

Tara explained that the reason the mid-March date is problematic is that colleges are on different schedules. It would require essentially converting the majority of a winter term and then rolling straight into grading. There's a concern or risk there about being in the position to get grading correct. With such a short time period in the transition between winter quarter and the start of spring, that's a really difficult time to not have your grading right (e.g. impacts to prerequisites for the subsequent term's classes.) Early April is problematic because the first week of April is the first week of spring quarter for the majority of colleges in this deployment group. Tim also pointed out the importance of getting to the 10th day for fiscal reasons (refunds, tuition collection).

What's next

After the go-live dates are agreed upon, the proposed schedule and Go-Live dates will be taken to Steering Committee for approval. Upon approval of Steering Committee the schedule will be officially baselined. Colleges will rank their choices for inclusion in one of the three groups. A key constraint is that no more than three colleges can be in a group.

Once colleges agree on three Go-Live dates, further information and guidelines will be provided to support a discussion about College Group alignment to A, B or C.

DG4 OAAP Go-Live

John Henry Whatley gave an update on DG4's transition to the new Online Admissions Application Portal (OAAP). The DG4 colleges worked through a mini-project to move away from the soon-to-be deactivated Ciber OAA and deploy the new OAAP product as of tomorrow.

They began working with the DG4 colleges with a BCFG-style meeting back in April. And provided demos and answered questions and showed DG4 colleges exactly what the feature functionality would be with the current product that was currently live with the other colleges that were on PeopleSoft. They worked through a few homework assignments and configuration and then went through a testing phase and did some internal testing. They also engaged the colleges at the beginning of June for end-user training. All colleges passed user acceptance testing and gave the green light to move forward. Colleges have received a transition/communication guide which included timing and next steps, updating local websites and web pages to make sure that the proper online admissions application URL is going to be leveraged with any messaging marketing or advertising.

Tomorrow morning, DG4 will be going live on the new product for the DG4 OAAP and will have an open support Webex on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. DG5 and DG6 will be going live on the new OAAP during their go-live.

ctcLink Support Organization Update

Customer Support Update

Production Support Update

The most recent production update handout is available online and was updated last week for the ctcLink Working Group: [Production Update \(SBCTC ctcLink Support\), June 23, 2021.](#)

Application Services

Sandy Main gave updates on several areas of Application Services activities.

OAAP Update

OAAP is going live for DG4 colleges on June 30, 2021.

CyberSource and KeyBank Project

Deadline is June 30. After midnight, colleges won't be able to use Bank of America. Everyone at the colleges and SBCTC is working hard. Colleges haven't done this for a very long time and most colleges have all new staff since the last time.

Two colleges are waiting for their merchant ID to be activated, which takes three to five days for CyberSource to activate it. Once they make the connection, ctcLink or Legacy team will engage with the colleges to finalize.

HighPoint HCX Mobile Update

Sandy said the new app rolled out June 19. Working very well and the app is available at the Google

Play Store and Apple App Store. Tim said they were able to make the class search changes that concerned some of their faculty.

Okta Login/password page

Johnathan Rider shared a couple of short videos to demo the new look and feel. He said the new login process itself is very similar to what we have today in ctcLink. Users will be able to log in and update their recovery/security settings.

Currently, the Okta planning group is seeking feedback on the rollout options:

- Active ctcLink users will be prompted to set up at least one password recovery option the first time they log into ctcLink after Okta is implemented. Users can do this at their convenience any time; whether on July 31 or thereafter. A user will not be able to move forward into ctcLink until they set up a least one option.
- Active ctcLink users may set up their password recovery options via the password reset portal after Okta is implemented, but within a *specified deadline*. Once that deadline arrives, users that have not set their password recovery options will be prompted the next time they log into ctcLink. Colleges would be responsible for sending out initial and reminder communications with instructions for setting individual password recovery options.

Tim reiterated that the colleges need actual college employees conducting user testing and experiencing that process; and not just seeing the video. His first reaction in seeing the video is “which recovery options are we actually putting in the practice and in which order?”

Users are presented with the options and ability to edit, but there is not clarity and instructions about if you have to do all of these, or can you pick and choose how many of you have to do and the like. This is not apparent from that from that screen and I want to make sure we're providing good information to our users. And also give the colleges he ability to have input into those decisions.

Johnathan said users won't need to set up all possible recovery options, but at least one.

This is not the full multi-factor authentication; it's just the Okta password reset.

Carolyn said they get a lot of pushback on campus about multi-factor authentication (MFA) and Johnathan clarified that colleges will be able to decide which employee they want to have MFA.

Tim asks that the security and help desk teams get clarity about the reset process. Johnathan said the process is the same as it is now and no change for what colleges need to do to help students or staff.

Requirements Traceability Matrix

Christy noted that because the June 16 meeting was cancelled, she didn't get a chance to fully preview the RTM review process to the Steering Committee.

Christy thought the two change requests listed as “approved by governance” that were descoped were sent to Steering Committee last week, but they had not been sent yet. Janelle forwarded those change orders to the committee during the meeting.

Christy will walk through those two documents at the July 13 meeting. Tim suggested that members read through the materials in advance of the meeting and identify clear questions they have, otherwise we'll never get through it. He liked Christy's idea of grouping the requirements as much as possible so the committee can tackle a high number of requirements and make sure that any questions get answered.

Christy will be sending out the remaining requirements and will group them. She will include those with change orders and mark them as “descoped” and the associated change request approved by governance at the time.

Then we will begin looking at the remaining requirements and confirming those that have already been implemented, those that have not been implemented yet, and a plan to implement. (The

majority have been implemented.)

We'll likely reserve about 30 minutes in each Steering Committee to focus on RTM review, with a goal to review all 2,488 requirements by the end of August.

The review includes:

- Approved scope that we're all aligned on
- Requirements implemented and how they were implemented
- Original requirements that have not been implemented

Tim asked for clear direction on which ones the committee needs to review by the next meeting. Christy said it will be the two documents Janelle is sending out today.

Janelle will also re-send these items in the July 13 meeting packet.

ctcLink Program Status

Christy gave an update on project status. See [ctcLink Project Status Report \(June 7-18, 2021\)](#) for details.

Budget

We are on IT Pool stage gate 6 and are close to closing that out. Approval of the next and final stage gate (7) is in progress.

Deployment Group Status

Balancing day-to-day jobs with ctcLink activities continues to be a struggle for some of the colleges and this is something that we've got listed as both a risk and an issue, because some colleges are impacted by it where other colleges are just identifying it as a potential risk.

DG5

DG 5 is preparing for cycle 4 data validation as well as some of the parallel testing. They're all making good progress. They've gotten through security. There have been few hiccups, but significantly better than we experienced with the other deployment group. Bellevue, Grays Harbor and Green River are reporting yellow, largely due to staffing constraints.

DG6

Columbia Basin and Lake Washington are reporting yellow. This has a lot to do with the staffing. Some of the colleges have had staff leave the college and are having a hard time hiring new staff. They've looked at some retired folks to come in. They've reached out to other colleges so they really are trying to get who they need and get them hired on at the college to be able to do their role.

Program Risks and Issues

Reuth gave an update on the top risks and issues. See [ctcLink Project Status Report \(June 7-18, 2021\)](#) for details.

Top Risks

ctcLink Project Team Resources

As the project comes closer to project closure, there is a risk that ctcLink Project team members will transition off the Project looking for new roles and job opportunities.

DG6: BPFH Homework Configuration Quality Concern

DG6 PMs are concerned about their SMEs' level of understanding of the impacts of their decisions in configuration homework (HW). DG6 PMs have found, in many instances, their SMEs seem to lack practical understanding of the application of their configuration decisions and are concerned about the impacts on workload this will have in future work packages. **Action:** ctcLink team has provided

BPFG homework dashboards and we have seen drastic improvements. On 6/23/2021, the dashboard stats were reviewed with the DG6 PMs and had only one college with one assignment (total) in late status.

DG5 & DG6 Security

DG5 colleges are continuing to populate security workbooks and participate in the Security Support weekly sessions. In mid-July, college SMEs will review security workbook load in the SVX environment.

Top Issues

DG6: FIN Data Validation Quality Impacts to DG6 College Project Teams

The FIN GL, Asset Management, and Grants/Project Pillar Data Validation Workshops were not sufficient for the DG6 SMEs to begin data validation and did not adequately cover how to do the data validation work.

DG6: Complex PMO Schedule not adequate for DG6 college planning

SBCTC PMO DG6 schedule, intended for PMO, is difficult to use for DG6 colleges when planning local implementation support activities.

Issue #126 DG5: PMs and SMEs Trust in project

DG5 colleges individually informed the ctcLink PMO that Issue #126 is in resolved status.

Issue #125 DG5: PMs Concern about project dates

DG5 colleges individually informed the ctcLink PMO that Issue #125 is in resolved status.

Reuth thanked all the executive sponsors who worked really closely together as a group and the college PMs for making this happen and providing feedback so we could make adjustments and changes to resolve both of these issues.

Moran Q/A

Paul Giebel said that from a QA perspective, Moran continues to see a recipe for success. Not to diminish any of the risks or issues, but from his perspective, we've got 34 colleges; 17 live and 17 in various states of deployment, which is unique in itself. Then we've got replacement solutions in various states of deployment. The Project's been able to make progress on those items, not without bumps or hiccups, within the larger project due to hard work by the colleges, Project and Support. Just keeping environments up to date from a support standpoint is a huge project in itself and implementing fixes to support tickets that come in.

Altogether, they see things from a little bit different perspective than looking at individual issues that come up. Going forward, the issues continue to be the same things – and will be until next April/May – and that is PEOPLE. From staffing the Project to completion and staffing the Support organization; not to mention colleges staffing to ensure they're successful in their deployment. Those are the key things we're going to continue to look at.

ctcLink Project-Related Commission/Council Topics

No topics or issues presented.

Agenda Items for Future Meetings & Meeting Closure

- **July 13, 2021** – DG6 Go-Live Dates discussion, possible action; Requirements Traceability Matrix
- **July 27, 2021** – DG6 Go-Live Dates discussion; Requirements Traceability Matrix