



# STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 17, 2022 – Webex & SBCTC Olympia

## 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
- Chris McLain, Lake Washington Tech Executive Sponsor
- Brian Lee, Clover Park Tech PM
- Clay Krauss, Tacoma PM

### Non-Voting Commission Reps

- Peter Lortz, IC
- 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
- Susan Maxwell, ctcLink College Advisor
- Shelley McDermott, OCIO Expert PM
- Janelle Runyon, ctcLink Project Communications Manager
- Sherry Nelson, ctcLink Project Communications Coordinator
- Sandy Main, SBCTC Application Services Director

## Welcome, Introduction of Members and Guests

Christy and Tim welcomed members and guests to the meeting.

## Approval of Draft Meeting Minutes

Approval of the May 3, 2022 meeting minutes deferred to May 31 meeting due to lack of quorum.

## DG6-C Go-Live Recap

### Conversion Weekend

Christy said she was amazed by the work of the functional, support, technical, and conversion teams for this final go-live conversion. There were very few items in the Sunday, May 8, go/no go decision meeting. Security was good and very few cleanup items were called out.

### Post Go-Live Support Update

Dani said implementation went extremely well, even after the concerns about Bates. Things are going well overall in Support. It's always quiet initially, but then things ramp up. There have been requests for additional Faculty Workload and Student Financials training and this is the first time they were able to offer support for prior DGs, too, because new staff increased their bandwidth.

## ctcLink Program Status

Christy gave an update on project status. See [ctcLink Project Status Report \(April 25 - May 6, 2022\)](#) for details. Overall, the ctcLink Project continues to report a yellow status, but in the next report, overall status and colleges will be green across the board. As of today, we have deployed all the colleges and are focusing now on shutdown activities. There is about a month worth of work to do final presentations and project shutdown, but everything is reasonable, so there's no risk. The RTM and the 250 items not implemented or partially implemented is the main outstanding area. The May 31 meeting will include the April budget and the June 14 meeting will include the May budget.

Christy said, overall, the colleges are all live and that is cause for celebration. She said it was nice to hear the speakers during today's ctcLink Celebration. Folks listening in on Zoom likely heard a few new, funny stories. And she was reminded of several things that made her blush. But it was a great event and she is just thrilled, like so many others, that all 34 colleges are live.

## ctcLink Project Closeout Activities: Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM)

Christy said the main area still outstanding is the RTM and 250 items (about 10% of the original scope) not implemented or partially implemented. See [May 17, 2022 Steering Committee Presentation](#).

### ctcLink Requirements Not Implemented by Pillar (250 of 2,488)

- Finance - 84
- PBCS - 82
- HCM - 54
- Student Financials - 11
- CS Core - 8
- Financial Aid - 8
- 25Live - 3

### HCM Pillar (54)

- Human Resources - 21
- Benefits - 18
- Payroll - 4
- Time & Labor - 5
- Talent Management - 6

### Finance Pillar (84)

- Accounts Payable - 4
- Accounts Receivable - 5
- Cash Management - 6
- Contracts - 2
- General Ledger - 8
- Grants - 8
- Commitment Control (KK) - 1
- Project Costing - 17
- Purchasing - 19
- Treasury - 14

Christy said while she is not worried about PBCS (because that work has already been transferred to SBCTC IT), the Finance and HCM pillar numbers are concerning. She asked the Steering Committee for help and direction on how it would prefer to review the detail on May 31.

Tim said he had spoken with Choi and Kurt earlier and also spent time last week going line-by-line through the spreadsheets with Pat Daniels, Highline PM. He said when you get down to the row level, it's very in-the-weeds and is a struggle to follow. For example, if we say we're missing four Accounts Payable items, it can be misleading; because three of these could be a throw-away items and one might be critical.

There were some items Tim thought, "Yes, we could use that functionality." So he hesitates to just say, "This is only 84 things, so let's throw them all out."

Tim said the Steering Committee is not in the right place to do the row-by-row analysis, evaluation, and to make functional-level calls. He wondered if there is way to package this as a hand-off to the new IT PMO with direction to do the necessary line-by-line review, alongside the other work they will be doing to prioritize enhancement requests and other things already in the queue.

Tim wondered if we can legitimately allow the project to descope, but do it in a way there is a commitment from the PMO to pick up the detail work.

Choi said from a practical standpoint, these are getting descoped out of the Project because there is no more Project. He agreed the committee should gather the items and take formal action as a technical descope with the understanding the items go to the next-level process for prioritization.

Christy said there were items the team and colleges together requested be descoped (apparently during workshops or other meetings), but these were never formalized. There's a category where colleges requested functionality not be implemented, or which they plan to never use.

### Categories

- Items colleges wanted to descope
- Project teams/leads didn't know it was in scope
- Future needs

### Terminology

Dani suggested the committee use a word other than "descoped." There were times when colleges

would say, “We don't want that,” but if they didn't understand the capabilities and were fearful of allowing the system to work as designed, as we move forward and are better able to use ctcLink, folks may come back and say, “Yes, we do want that.”

Note: In after-meeting online discussions, “Scope of 250/2488 Project Requirements” was the preferred term.

## Discussion

Paul Giebel said he, too, was concerned by the numbers, but the fact that colleges have not been complaining about a huge piece of functionality that they didn't get makes him less concerned. He understands Dani's perspective about not using the terminology “descope,” because colleges may not have known what they really wanted based on how little they knew. Paul thinks going through all of these and looking at them, in conjunction with the other things the colleges want done makes perfect sense. He just doesn't think the Project or Steering Committee should unilaterally say we're not going to do them and thinks somebody needs to do a secondary review.

Tim said the consideration is that some of the lines in the spreadsheet said, “Descoped in remediation per ticket number x,” which indicates it was a negotiation with Spokane and Tacoma. But not everybody else was necessarily involved in the conversation at the time. Christy said some items were probably descoped from Remediation, but not from ctcLink, so that was a misinterpretation.

Grant said that if we can agree to it technically, he thinks we may have to descope items to close the project cleanly, but will move those items into the overall enhancement list to review all the outstanding items.

Tim said we have a little bit of time to get feedback from OCIO's office to make sure we're doing this right. He asked Grant if the Steering Committee could get something in writing that says this list of items will be put into the queue with everything else that the new PMO will be evaluating.

Dani said she wants us to be careful in the language, because we're going to put 250 items in for review, but this doesn't necessarily mean all those things will be implemented.

Tim said if the committee just brushed aside 10% of the requirements aside with a vote, that wouldn't feel right. While it was a long time ago, the system spent a lot of time working on those requirements.

## Next Steps and To-Do's Before May 31 meeting

The Steering Committee needs to make a general decision regarding the Project scope, but won't make specific line-item decisions which require more specific functional/SME input.

In after-meeting discussion, “Scope Transfer” was the preferred terminology.

1. Christy will follow up with Rich Tomsinski and Shelley McDermott at OCIO to make sure there are no concerns about the Scope Transfer and to get their guidance
2. Small group will meet to develop plan for the overall approach and present to 5/31 meeting.
  - a. Grant, Tim, Choi, Dani, Tara and Christy (others?) will meet to discuss ASAP.
  - b. Grant will provide language for a motion for consideration that this list of 250 items will be put into the queue with everything else for the new PMO to evaluate and prioritize.

## Other Business

Christy said a small team is working on Project Closeout activities through mid-June. She will make a couple of slides for the May 31 meeting.

## Agenda Items for Future Meetings

- 5/31/2022: April budget, Lessons Learned Report, Closeout Items, Project Scope Transfer
- 6/14/2022: May budget, Final Steering Committee, cELC Meeting Recap, TSB Meeting Recap and Final Project Shutdown Status