ERP Group Facilitation Meeting Report

Date: August 3, 2018

Present: Donna Artho, Terry Blaylock, Ruth Chisum, Melissa Fadler, Steven Frey, David Hammonds, TJ Harris, Carlos Hernandez, Rose Kader, Judith Lewis, Brenda McRae, Scot Mertz, Chuck Mize, Tessy Rappe, Mary Robbins, Renee’ Starns, Dave Verghese, Charity Walker, Amanda Withers. Presenter/Facilitator: Dr. Dale Tibodeau

1. Judith Lewis – Introduction
   a. Dr. Lewis introduced Dr. Dale Tibodeau, D.Eng., P.E.

2. General Meeting - Expectations and Outcomes
   a. Each of you are subject matter experts within your functional areas. Please speak up and be heard. Everyone’s participation is essential to this efforts success.
   b. I want to keep our interactions “positive and constructive” as much as possible. We are trying to effectively solve problems together and we need everyone’s cooperation to do this. One way to do this is to try to be as “objective” as possible as we discuss things.
   c. We all need to be committed to seeing decisions we make through the end.
   d. I propose we use “brainstorming” as a way to generate new ideas and thoughts. We will need to follow some simple rules to do this effectively.
   e. I plan to use “process improvement” methodologies in my facilitation.
   f. If possible I would like to keep “value” as a topic in our conversations and use it to help guide our thinking and decisions.

3. Problem Validation
   a. Prior ERP Planning Group History – ERP Planning Group Purpose (Circa 2013)
      i. Create and maintain a strategic roadmap for the ERP system.
      ii. Plan and ensure alignment of daily actions with strategic initiatives through coordinated decision-making and prioritization of initiatives.
      iii. Participate in a system-wide decision-making process regarding ERP changes as representatives for your division making recommendations in best interest of campus.
   b. Questions
      i. Is your 2013 purpose still relevant? Or does it need to be updated/revised?
      ii. Is your scope wider than just ERP now? (Enterprise wide?)
      iii. Are you limited to just ERP systems or is your charter broader than that now?
      iv. Is your governance model working?
   c. Discussion
      i. In summary, the Group discussed the following items to start identifying the problem(s):
1. There is no clear understanding of what the purpose of the group is or what the group is to be doing/focusing on as it seems the scope has changed.

2. There is a need to better define what ERP means as “Banner” has become an umbrella for hundreds of different solutions/products.

3. There is a need for better communication between the functional areas (the department users) and IT. The functional areas have the subject matter expertise to communicate what they need. IT has the implementation expertise to help guide selection of solutions.

4. In past, the group was brought together to roll out Banner. Focus may need to change, embracing a wider role. Feeling that the group could give input but had no true authority.

5. There is a need to define the authority level the Group has (recommendation or decision making).

6. There is a need to look at the charter and expand the scope due to a backlog of projects. Need to determine what will bring value to the university based on the current University Mission/Vision/Values:
   a. Excellence in academics
   b. Effective in student success
   c. Efficient in operations
   d. Loyal to traditions
   e. Dedicated to innovations

4. Breakout Groups
Three (3) groups rotated through the following questions facilitated by Dr. Tibodeau, Dr. Lewis, and Brenda McRae to compile thoughts on each question.

   a. **What is still working well that they want to keep? (McRae)**
      i. Good mix of members: respectful, trusting, works well together, good communications between the groups, networking opportunities/relationships
      ii. Monthly Meetings – good frequency (for now)
         1. Monthly meetings (In-person and Skype options), emphasis on in-person
      iii. Good organization: call for agenda items, agenda, Facilitated, on task
      iv. Good momentum “on the cusp”
      v. Banner (practical)
      vi. Keep up with fast pace (ie events)
      vii. Ready for change
      viii. Add other areas
         1. Academic Affairs (ie AVP or Dean), Advancement, Student Affairs, ORSP, University Wide

   b. **What is not working well that they would like to change? (Tibodeau)**
      i. Scope – ERP too narrow and need definition of ERP
      ii. Prioritize competing applications (which project is done 1st, 2nd, etc.)
      iii. Committee doesn’t have overarching view of what is already available; Visibility as to what already exists (systems and platforms)
      iv. Need for overall encompassing governance model (Cabinet vs. other venues)
v. Refocus on what’s best for University not just departments (serve majority) and move away from niche implementations.

vi. Decision-making authority (who grants this?)

vii. Expectations of IT and/or Cabinet

viii. Big picture vs. too many details- committee needs to be at the “macro” level.

ix. More communication from committee to IT and from IT to the committee

x. More transparency (definition of)

xi. Define ERP (Institutional understanding of what it means)

xii. Lack of formalized process in the committee

xiii. Consistency with other campus processes (see if other campus processes could be leveraged)

xiv. Organize & communicate large projects with more clarity (Cherwell is not a large project management tool)

xv. Be more realistic in setting expectations and use of resources

xvi. Ask better questions of IT to improve outcome

c. **What is missing that they think is important for their team to address? (Lewis)**

i. Clear description of the overall role of the committee

ii. Is the committee recommending or deciding for implementation

iii. How are end-users bringing new ideas to the committee

iv. Visibility into the IT queue of projects and inventory of services and IT resources

v. What is the structure/process for ideas to be submitted to the committee

vi. Technology Oversight Approval (TOA)/purchases don’t come to the committee

vii. Definition of “enterprise” project for consideration

viii. Define/approved governance process

ix. Subject Matter Expert (SME) subgroups that make recommendations to committee

x. Formalized appointment process w/terms

xi. Tie into goals & objectives

xii. Two-way communication (missing IT department impact)

xiii. Culture shift from “can’t” to “can”

1. Ruth gave the example of being told no first. There was no communication or follow-up when request was denied. Consider saying we’re not able to do this, but here is an alternative.

xiv. Bigger school attitude about where SHSU spends its IT resources (trying to do everything for everyone now)

xv. Who decides the priorities

xvi. Increase the automation of the meetings (reduce duration/frequency of meetings)

5. **Prioritization of Topics from Breakout Group**

The Committee was at a consensus to focus on the item from the “missing” and “not working” questions to determine the top 3—5 major issues. Each attendee was given 5 choices. The results are as follows:

a. Top-rated, 5 themes identified, with total “votes” per theme.

i. 11 - Clear description of the overall role of the committee

ii. 10 - Scope – ERP too narrow
iii. 10 - Overall encompassing governance model (very similar to theme:  
   6 - Define approve governance process)

iv. 9 - Visibility into the IT queue of projects
v. 9 - Do what’s best for university

These topics were further condensed into the following two main focus themes:
- Overall governance and scope of ERP too narrow
- Visibility into the IT queue of projects

b. Other topics of importance to the committee identified
   i. 4 - Expectations of IT and/or Cabinet
   ii. 3 - Bigger school attitude about where SHSU spends its IT resources (trying to do  
      everything for everyone now)
   iii. 1 - who decides the priorities
   iv. 1 - increase the automation of the meetings (reduce duration/frequency of  
      meetings)
   v. 1 - Visibility as to what already exists (systems and platforms)
   vi. 1 - More transparency (definition of)
   vii. 1 - Organize & communicate large projects with more clarity (Cherwell is not a  
      large project management tool)
   viii. 1 - SME subgroups that make recommendations to committee
   ix. 1 - Culture shift from “can’t” to “can”

6. Group Brainstorming
   The group brainstormed and discussed items that were highest priority to help define follow-up  
   actions for prep prior to next meeting.
   a. Rename - ie: Tech Steering & Governance Committee (services and resources)
   c. Priority Decisions are made by Committee
   d. Rolling Membership - Term Limits
   e. Focus to institutional goals/objectives
   f. Move visibility into IT resources and capabilities
   g. Set-up the committee correctly - charge from Cabinet or President
   h. Create a submissions/intake process – a representative presents their Business Case
   i. Strick Adherence to intake process
   j. What are the goals from Cabinet for this body
   k. Guidelines for requests received such as projects size. Not TOAs or renewals.
   l. Guidelines for available resources/consultants to implement IT projects when IT does not  
      have the resources.
   m. Time investment to committee is not much, even with subcommittees. Realistic that we  
      could make recommendations at a global level but need IT’s expertise.
   n. Set priorities – not how to work on (IT expertise) but what to work on (global level).
   o. Clear and visible decision tree with a record of all decisions for tracking and historical  
      purposes.
   p. “Enterprise” included in new committee name
   q. Need a historical/data repository for Committees actions and project data. Also one for  
      IT resources that can be used or are available to campus to use. (Portfolio)
r. Communication Plan – notify campus of this committee, processes, available services
s. Enterprise Wide – not necessarily hardware needs
t. Rely on IT to point out to us issues with current products and how it can affect other areas/departments – the impact to campus, both negative and positive.
u. Coordination to do positive things for campus and communicate it better.
v. Committee to have the perspective of making decisions that will keep campus heading in the right direction; however, Cabinet can impose will on priorities to be done.
w. Stand firm in not allowing areas to circumvent the process
x. Need to effectively communicate the process
y. Understand that a process will not prevent all those circumventing the process.
z. Keep in mind ERP doesn’t mean systems but an allocation or resources and planning and that needs to be in the charter, appropriate resources and project planning
aa. Group should feel empowered to make decisions in the best interest of the university and make known to cabinet when initiatives important to university success are constrained by available resources.
bb. Enterprise Resource Planning – name defines approach
cc. Customer service across the board for all initiatives.

7. Action Items
   a. Draft a new Charter
      i. Propose language that defines the Group: Definition/Vision/Mission/Scope
      ii. Define nature a projects or items that the Group will review
         1. IT Project sizing model/other factors applied to determine committee projects
         2. IT has internal Project Classification – Bring concept/information to committee
   b. Look at formalized processes
   c. Provide a report of this Facilitation meeting at the next scheduled meeting