



Minnesota
STATE COLLEGES
& UNIVERSITIES

**Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
Systems Development Steering Committee**

MEETING NOTES

February 5, 2008

12:30 PM – 3:30 PM

Conference Room 1802, UBS Building, St. Paul

NEXT MEETING: Date: March 4, 2008

Time: 12:30 PM – 3:30 PM

Location: Conference Room 1802, UBS, St. Paul

ATTENDEES:

Joanne Chabot, Jim Dillemath, Glen Guida, Art Lieble, John O'Brien, Dave Overby and Ken Ries

Via ITV: Deb Anderson, Les Bakke, Mark Malecek, Bryan Schneider and RaNae Thompson

1. **Review/Adjust Agenda:** Nothing added to the Agenda.

2. **General / Housekeeping – Glen Guida**

- Review/Approve Meeting Notes from Last Meeting - Minutes approved for posting on the website.

3. **EIC Process – Status Update – Jim Dillemath**

- SDSC Role(s) – Continued Discussion

Jim informed the group that the cross-functional advisory process is moving ahead. Linda Baer sent an email to all the vice chancellors, all of the unions and bargaining units asking for representatives from their channels. We are still waiting to hear back from MAPE and AFSCME and IFO. The first meeting will take place on February 26 and 27 at St Paul College. They will review the past funding and look at the projects being submitted to the EIC in March. Projects to be reviewed by the EIC Board have been narrowed down to 5 or 6 from each channel. Those that are less urgent will be put under “inactive”. Lack of resources remains the main concern.

IT Governance – No updates to report to the group due to very little discussion held about it. Ken reported that the CIO's had proposed several changes to the IT Governance model; however, the proposed revisions were not forwarded to Al in time for the WebEx CIO meeting yesterday. Ken briefed the group that the main issue with the proposed structure is that the role of the CIO group is not clearly illustrated in the chart. There is a direct link from each steering committee, including the CIO Council to the Leadership Council. However, the steering committees are not represented on the Leadership Council Technology Committee nor are the Leadership Technology Committee represented on the steering committees. John O'Brien commented that having a CIO serve in their group would make for a better communication. On a related issue, Ken also informed the group that the current board policy states that we have an IT roundtable which does not appear in the new governance model. Hence, the board policy would have to be revised to look at the new governance structure. Another idea is to take the IT roundtable and re-purpose that and bring it back as the organization that has cross-functional purpose. That would provide representation from CIO.

Ken requested to review the Governance issue again, after the CIO's input had been reviewed by Al.

John expressed his concern that if faculty is not part of the loop and if they are not aware of any approvals, what would they be steering?

Food for thought: Joanne stated that she doesn't want to put Ken Niemi in a position of approving something without knowing that the CIO group has a different view. She thinks that he has the right to know about it.

Cross-Functional Review Committee - Ken expressed support for the Cross Functional Review Committee. He sees it as a potential solution to help manage projects. However, he expressed concerns that there are not enough representation from ITS to provide adequate input into the proposed projects. He was assured that ITS has strong representation through Joanne Chabot, Kristi Tornquist, Bev Schuft and Mark Peterson.

- **Letter from Ken Ries on Resource Issue**

- The committee decided that a letter articulating resource issues would not be necessary.

4. Status of EIC and Operational Projects:

- **HR**

- **Issues** – Jim reported that the whole hiring process takes 10 to 12 weeks from the time of posting. In the Operations side, people were hired internally which looks like a vacancy has been filled but actually the headcount hasn't changed.

Staffing issues were also discussed at the LCTC meeting and they were told that staffing issue also applies to other department. Ken N. has been talking to Bill Tschida and they are looking at setting up some type of a committee involving CIO and others on how to resolve this. Looking at other alternatives, it was discussed that the tuition waiver should be reviewed. But this is a MAPE bargaining issue. Jim informed that Ken N. will work on setting up a committee with CIOs and others to discuss staffing issues and Bill Tschida who had indicated that staffing is not just an IT problem; they are having just as much problem hiring Finance people. Staffing issues are happening to all departments within MnSCU. Jim asked for volunteers to be a member of this committee.

Some IT positions in the campuses have higher pay rate and less workload. Joanne mentioned reviewing the classification and disparities in the job description. She also stated that maybe IT should secede from the various unions and create their own. Ken R mentioned that there is no information security classification in the union, which creates a barrier when hiring information security professionals. Joanne mentioned that one EIC project that is currently not going forward would create a database of PDs and classifications so that user could easily access shared information about positions at various levels.

- **Performance (How to Measure)**

- **Client / Server to Web** – Joanne gave a full report on the performance feedback of the application. The current status is that they are still working down a list of the defects. High profile issues that caused a major user problem have been resolved. Issues were categorized as follows:
 - Performance issues – addressed in the first couple of weeks.

- Time-Out issue (handler issue) – not an application issue but more of an issue related to the implementation of Oracle.
- Security issues
- Data anomalies – each institution has a lot of ability to be flexible to do things their own way. The system occasionally interacts with specific individuals.
- Enhancement issue – now that users are using it, they see things that they like to change. These things that are not in the original design and are considered enhancements.

For the most parts, institutions are pleased with the application. There are variations on how each one works depending on each institutional needs. People who are used to PeopleSoft or Sema 4 find this application very easy to use and are happy with it. However, Mankato is extremely not.

Joanne informed that two major issues are appropriate for this committee. These are Change Management and Communication Management. There is a breakdown in both areas. Communication between OOC and HR don't include the CIOs and therefore, HR issues are not communicated to them. Joanne advised Toni and Linda this has to change.

Joanne explained that the high level of unrealistic expectation placed on the conversion project should be reduced. Given that the application involves 37 institutions, there will be unexpected performance issues. Despite thorough testing, design and development of a new application cannot be perfected. Joanne stated that to completely re-write an application for 17000 employees and having only 77 defects is considered a very good defect margin (0.4%).

Art stated that business users don't always understand the application that makes it difficult for them to switch.

Joanne stated that she still doesn't know if all of the users are operating the equipment that they needed to use this web-based application. This is something that could be relayed to her by the CIO.

Glen asked if there is a way to introduce a matrix to measure a system's performance; to keep track of problems that users encounter and measure what that particular segment of the application is costing.

Ken mentioned that he discussed the issue with Pine's HR staff. He stated that the new interface changes the workflow which, on top of performance issues, decreases the efficiency of the system. Several functions are taking HR staff longer to do on the new system. Joanne agreed saying HR users are under immense time pressure to get things done and they are not prepared mentally for this new system. There are immense learning curve and technology change challenges that they have to deal with. CIOs were asked to take on the responsibility of figuring out how to handle this. Joanne stated that the next roll-out would be Accounting and they have a much bigger group of users than HR.

Glen informed the group that training sessions were conducted for users prior to the roll-out and perhaps there was not enough emphasis on the importance of the

training at that time. Deb commented that training sessions were limited to a small number of people. Training should have been required for all users. RaNae confirmed that HR did a train-the-trainee approach and that may not be the best way to handle the training. She also mentioned that at the time of the training, some state university data was not available for use in the training so it was only the community colleges and technical colleges that had a training environment that seemed close to what they would see in their home institution.

Core Migration (Seamless and Oracle) - RaNae's reported that her group will visit every campus and assign 7-8 campuses per business analyst to provide support to address any issues that might come up. This includes meeting with cross-functional group to talk about upcoming projects and change management. These are all currently underway. Art stated that Donna asked them to do a one-hr demo seminar twice a year to do the same thing.

Joanne mentioned the some HR records are duplicates and that Oracle database migration project will sort that out.

- **Database Migration**

- **Relationship to CAP Project** –All institutions must migrate to the oracle replicated database via the CAP server prior to a full cutover of the ISRS application to oracle.
- **Implementation Date** – Joanne informed the group that the Rdb/Oracle roll-out date was delayed to mid-June and that she wanted to gather from the campus CIOs suggestions on what they think would be a suitable date for the conversion. She asked Ken if he would like to be the liaison between the CIO group and Joanne's in deciding on the most logical date. Joanne stated that she has an impression that some CIOs seemed to prefer that a date is simply given to them instead.

Ken Niemi from an earlier meeting with Joanne expressed a concern about the conversion – what if the conversion fails? How difficult is it to roll it back? Once the application with an oracle database has been put into production, and has been running for a period of time, there could/would be a potential for data loss or minimally a painful recovery process. It was pointed out that the HR application already relies on Oracle as its primary database. Although there is an existing project migrating Accounting client-server to J2EE, that module would only be implemented after all of ISRS has migrated to oracle.

- **Others**

- **Business Cases** - Ken stated his concern about the pace of the projects that are going through the system and the expectations set on those. It is not just an HR issue; it is because of all resource issues. Too many projects in progress and none of them completed. He commented that with the cross-functional review committee, they might be able to help in identifying which projects should move forward ahead of the others. Some EIC projects are dependent on another operations project and these would need to be prioritized.

John expressed a prioritizing concern about the level of importance and impact of a project. Jim stated that one channel might consider some projects as their top 5 but

if the cross functional review committee doesn't agree, it might get cancelled. The main concern is that the review committee might think that a project is doable internally but it actually is not.

Jim explained that after a business case is approved, it will go into more detailed planning and development then it will go back to EIC for another review and approval process.

- **Quality Assurance Initiatives** – Glen stated that we will all do a better job if we have the opportunity to put more emphasis on QA – more so than we have done with, for example, HR. We will be putting more emphasis in this area using contractor resources and shortly thereafter permanent staff dedicated to QA. We will conduct performance testing and measure the effectiveness of a new application. Joanne suggested including the CIOs in the testing panel or other institutions that would like to participate in the project. Those who wanted to join can let Glen know. Support analyst group has been very effective. To be effective, what should we do? Glen stated that test plans can be done jointly or independently set up at campus levels.

Art suggested Walt Magnussen of Texas A&M as a good resource in test plans. He is currently the best videoconferencing expert in the world and they have the biggest testing center in the US. Joanne agreed that it would be good to know other company's best practices and what they have done. One challenge that Joanne sees right now is how to get some participation by CIO so that whatever it will accomplish would add value to the overall system.

Joanne listed the three expectations from this meeting:

- CIOs → Submit suitable dates for the Oracle conversion
- Committee → Suggest how to better manage or improve communication between management and the campuses – how to communicate change processes at campus levels
- Committee → Get volunteers to work with the committee in the QA project (Get engaged now in Accounting)

Ken suggested establishing a cross-functional group (ITS, HR, CIO) to evaluate the successes and failures of the HR rollout. Joanne stated that application issues have to be recreated in a test environment to enable the analysts to establish if it is a system issue or user issue. This is a difficult thing to do.

- **Leadership Council** - Art asked if this Committee has ever met with the EIC or Leadership Council and if it would be possible to have a joint meeting with them. Joanne informed that it has not happened before except when the IT roundtable was in existence. She agreed that a joint meeting with the Leadership Council would be a good idea. Glen states that there were concerns that the communication channel between technology committee and the sub-committees of the leadership council is not open. Joanne wanted to be on the records that she called the meetings of this group and of other groups.

- **Resources**
No discussion.

Next Meeting – March 4, 2008

Agenda Items: to be gathered from the group.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:53 PM.

Meeting notes submitted by Sonia Go, sonia.go@csu.mnscu.edu.