Campus Readiness Assessment Guidelines for Human Resources, Finance and Student Administration

Finalized 07/11/01

Last revised: 10/04/01

REVISION CONTROL

Document Title: Campus Readiness Assessment Guidelines: HR, FIS and SA

Author: CMS Senior Director

File Reference: Campus Readiness Assessment Guidelines 10042001.doc

Date	By	Action	Pages
04/23/01	Linda Horan	Reformatted document per new template	All
05/04/01	Marianne Dino	Added additional Student Administration specific assessment guidelines	All
05/11/01	Hilary Baker	Edits	All
06/14/01	Hilary Baker	Added notes regarding written question responses by consultants. Changed “prototype” to “baseline”	4
07/27/01	Hilary Baker	Added clarification that campus readiness assessment must be sent from campus President.	4
09/04/01	Jeanine Lussier	Corrected placement of “minimum” and “ideal” criteria for Help Desk and Training sections.	13-14
09/11/01	Hilary Baker	Added clarification regarding the readiness assessment process	4-5
10/04/01	Dina Moraitis	Updated document reference and web site location for gaining database access and support	5

Review/Approval History

Date	By	Action	
07/11/01	Hilary Baker	Approval acknowledged at SA Function Team meeting. No changes from previous finalized version.	

Table of Contents

Page

Scope of Work 4

Objective 4

Readiness Assessment Process 4

Incremental Assessments 6

Readiness Assessment Format 6

Readiness Assessment Guidelines 7

Rating Each Readiness Category 7

Sponsorship and Campus Commitment 7

Communication 8

Project Management 9

Campus Functional Area Participation 10

Funding 11

Information Technology Support 11

Network Readiness 12

Workstation Readiness 13

Help Desk Readiness 13

Training 14

Scope of Work

The CSU Chancellor's Office seeks an objective evaluation and recommendation on the readiness of each campus to begin the implementation of the PeopleSoft Finance, Human Resources, and Student Administration modules. Following the format and criteria provided in the following CMS Campus Readiness Assessment Guidelines, the written evaluation is expected to address the campus' strengths and weaknesses in each area, and to provide specific recommendations for additional preparation and/or commitment of resources that would further assist the campus in achieving an optimum state of readiness. In addition, the recommendations should include examples of the types of strategies the campus may employ to address the areas of weakness. The readiness assessment will include a response to each of the guideline questions plus a summary opinion from the objective third party as to whether it is reasonable and feasible for the campus to address any areas of weakness before receiving the baseline software that threatens its ability to meet the minimum standards for readiness.

Objective

The CMS Campus Readiness Assessment has two objectives: first, to provide the campuses with a process and tool for determining their level of preparedness to begin implementing the Human Resources, Finance, and/or Student modules of the PeopleSoft suite of administrative software; and second, to provide the Chancellor's Office with a third party evaluation of each campus' representation of their readiness. The pre/post readiness assessment interviews came out of lessons learned from the first wave readiness assessments. Some of these turned out to be rather superficial with the campuses not learning much they didn't already know. This is a way of using what we already know to give the consultants a head start. The "CSU CMS Campus Readiness Assessment Guidelines" have been adopted by the CMS Board to assure a consistent and comprehensive approach for all campuses.

Readiness Assessment Process

The CMS campus readiness assessment is designed to aid the campuses effort in planning for the implementation. The following section describes the process for the readiness assessment.

1. Campus will hire a 3rd party consultant to identify areas which there are opportunities to improve readiness along with recommended actions that the campus should implement. The review will be conducted by one of the eight approved CMS implementation consultants unless an alternative consultant is pre-approved by the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC).
2. Prior to campus beginning their readiness assessment, campus Project Director will coordinate a pre-readiness assessment interview with campus readiness assessment consultant and the EVC staff to be coordinated by the CMS Campus Liaison. The purpose of the pre-readiness assessment meeting is to inform consultants up front of known or suspected areas needing attention- -may be strengths or weaknesses so they don't have to go looking for things our experience has already revealed. If we know there are problem areas, why pay to have the consultant discover them.
3. The Readiness Assessment document will be sent in written form from the campus President to the EVC and copied to the Assistant Vice Chancellor and the CMS Senior Director. A machine-readable copy will also be sent to the CMS Senior Director. The report will include responses to the readiness assessment guideline questions plus a summary opinion from the objective third party. Questions should be individually listed followed by the answer.
4. The Executive Vice Chancellor's staff will review the Readiness Assessment response and prepare a letter from the EVC to send to the campus President. The letter will include a request for:

a. A written response describing how and when the campus plans to address the outstanding issues identified by the readiness assessment consultant.

b. A written response identifying the detailed campus implementation milestone dates as outlined in the CMS Campus Implementation Measurable Milestones Document.

c. A written confirmation of the campus deployment dates as documented in the Campus Deployment Timelines Document to ensure appropriate SOSS and HOSS resources are available to support the campus implementation. Requests for changes to the campus deployment dates must be made in writing to the CMS Campus Liaison. The EVC staff will review the request for date changes for HOSS and SOSS support implications and the CMS Campus Liaison will respond back to the campus within 10 working days. The EVC must approve the campus implementation plan dates prior to the campuses receiving the baseline software.

d. Campus Project Director to help the CMS Campus Liaison coordinate a post-readiness assessment interview between the campus readiness assessment consultant and the EVC staff.

e. Establish weekly meetings between the campus CMS team and the CMS Campus Liaison to review the outstanding campus issues, implementation milestone dates and help desk tickets regarding CMS Baseline.

f. A monthly status graph report to the Executive Vice Chancellor, copied to the Assistant Vice Chancellor, CMS Senior Director and CMS Campus Liaison showing the campus actual completion dates as compared with the estimated outstanding issue resolution dates and the CMS campus implementation milestone dates. The report will be due at the end of each month and will follow the same format as is used throughout the CMS project to monitor against project milestones. The first campus report will be due the end of the same month as the database instances are provided to the campus.

The EVC review process will take between 2 to 4 weeks depending on the content and quality of the readiness assessment document. Campuses can expedite this review process by providing the responses to the above steps 4a, 4b and 4c at the same time as the readiness assessment document.

5. Following the completion of the readiness assessment, the Campus Project Director will help the CMS Campus Liaison coordinate a post-readiness assessment interview between the campus readiness assessment consultant and the EVC staff. The purpose of the post-readiness assessment meeting is to verify or clarify the areas initially identified in the pre-readiness assessment meeting. Also, it is to alert the Chancellor's office as to areas where it could be helpful to the campus. It also gives one more touch point for quality control of the consultants.
6. Once the readiness assessment process is completed; campus can receive database support by referencing the *CMS Pre-Production Database Environments* document as posted to the SOSS section of the CMSWeb.

Incremental Assessments

Campuses may elect to perform the readiness assessment for the modules separately or in combination based on the campus implementation strategy. The assessment will clearly identify which modules are being reviewed. If a prior assessment has been performed, the campus and consultants can rely on the prior findings. However, inasmuch as the scope and size of the Student Administration module implementation is significantly larger than the Human Resources and Financials modules, a re-examination of these prior assessments must be undertaken to ensure that the campus understands and acknowledges the increased complexity and increased demands that will be required to ensure a successful outcome. Incremental assessments should include a statement of prior recommendations and the current status of their resolution.

Readiness Assessment Format

The written assessment will address each category of readiness criteria as it relates to the campus' ability to begin implementing the Human Resources, Finance, and/or Student modules. The assessment process must include the following activities covering the modules being requested at this time by the campus:

- Review the results and current status of issues from prior completed Readiness Assessments if applicable.
- Review campus planning documentation including organization charts, workplans and budgets;
- Interviews with campus President, Executive Sponsor(s),
- Interviews or group meetings with the Project Director, project team leaders and staff from functional departments in finance, human resources, student services, academic affairs, and information technology, and
- Focus groups or meetings with representatives of critical constituent groups including faculty, Academic Senate leadership, Deans and college level administrative staff.

The report will include an executive summary and will be formatted to follow the categories as provided in the Readiness Assessment Guidelines. The following documentation should be provided to the third party reviewer and at the request of the Chancellor's office may be included in the final report:

- Campus Project History
- Results from prior Readiness Assessment, if applicable, and summary current status
- Campus Project Manual including scope, goals and decision making procedures
- Campus Project Organizational structure including Project Sponsor, Steering Committee and Project Team members and definition of project team roles and responsibilities
- Communications Plan
- Project Budget and Financing Plan
- Staffing and Backfill Plans
- Training Plan
- Project Workplans
- List of interviewees

The report should present the reviewers findings in each of the categories. Areas noted as potential weaknesses must include a discussion of the potential impact of the issues on the success of the implementation of the PeopleSoft system. The reviewer must also prepare a set of recommendations that offer potential strategies for addressing areas noted as a weakness. Finally, the Executive Summary must include the reviewer's overall assessment of the capability and feasibility of the campus addressing its areas of weakness in time for the receipt of the system baseline software.

Readiness Assessment Guidelines

The following areas have been identified as crucial to the successful implementation of the PeopleSoft Finance, Human Resources and Student modules:

- Sponsorship and Campus Commitment
- Communication
- Project Management
- Campus Functional Area Participation
- Funding
- Information Technology Support
- Network Readiness
- Workstation Readiness
- Help Desk
- Training

A series of questions is posed for each of these categories to elicit information that will help gauge strengths and weaknesses in terms of the degree of readiness to take on the implementation tasks. Each question should be addressed in the assessment report.

Rating Each Readiness Category

The Readiness Assessment Guidelines include "minimum to start" and "ideal" statements to illustrate levels of preparedness for each readiness category.

Sponsorship and Campus Commitment

Guideline Questions

- Who is the project executive sponsor?
- Who are the members of the sponsor team?
- Are key functional areas represented at an executive level?
- How frequently do they meet/communicate about the project?
- Is there an effective decision-making process in place for resolving bottleneck policy and organizational issues?
- How well does the sponsor team understand the PeopleSoft institutional benefits and limitations versus the systems that will be replaced?
- What is the commitment to the full suite of software?
- What is the level of understanding and commitment to the project by critical constituents (e.g. Academic Senate Leadership, Deans, key administrators, opinion makers, etc.)?

- What is the level of commitment by the sponsors and critical constituents to review policies and practices and to support necessary change?

Minimum to Start Criteria

- An executive sponsor from the top leadership of the campus with the authority, time, and commitment to create a team and drive the project;
- Funding is committed.

Ideal

- A sponsorship team of senior management is in place well in advance of implementation;
- Representation includes both academic and administrative leadership.
- There is continuity in leadership;
- The PeopleSoft products are understood;
- Project goals have buy-in among all key constituencies;
- An effective mechanism is in pace for the timely review of policies and practices;
- A decision process is formalized.

Communication

Guideline Questions

- How well understood are the goals of the CMS project at different functional levels on the campus?
- Has a "case for action" been articulated for the campus?
- Have the key constituencies (faculty, staff, students, etc.) been identified?
- Do campus constituents have reasonable expectations as to the project's benefits?
- Is there a communication plan in place to keep them informed?
- Does the communication plan adequately address sponsorship and support for necessary change?
- How frequent is communication regarding the project?
- Is there a plan for coordination between all of the project teams, both functional and technical?

Minimum to Start Criteria

- Senior management is communicating regularly; they recognize the importance of consistent and frequent communication with campus community.

Ideal

- All campus constituencies are familiar with the short-term and long-term project goals;
- A plan for frequent communication is in place including special needs of decision communication;
- Communications positively support necessary change;
- Coordination between areas is already occurring.

Project Management

Guideline Questions

- Is there experienced project management dedicated?
- How comprehensive is the project plan and schedule?
- Does the project plan include adequate contingencies?
- Have the HRMS, finance, and student implementation plans been coordinated and integrated?
- Does the plan include a strategy for the rollout of the new system to campus users?
- Are the project teams assembled with adequate representation from all functional areas including academic departments?
- Are the roles of project team members defined appropriately?
- Have strategies been developed to maximize retention of project team members?
- Are CSU guidelines for software modifications understood?
- Do the teams have clear decision-making authority?
- Is there a communication plan to keep all project teams up-to-date?
- Is there Database administration expertise dedicated?
- Are the needs of the legacy/feeder systems understood?
- Is there adequate programming/analytical support committed to support data conversion?
- What is the level of familiarity with prototyping issues?
- Does the plan include adequate resources to perform full system configuration for student?
- Is a mechanism in place for timely resolution of identified policy or procedure issues?
- Does the project management team have prior PeopleSoft or other ERP experience?
- Has not only short-term implementation funding been identified, but has potential funding for production cost increases been identified on a long-term basis?
- Are common business rules for the campus in place or achievable?
- Are sufficient change control procedures in place?
- What resources are available for communication to the campus?
- Will the campus be substituting any PeopleSoft functionality or modules with non-PeopleSoft 3rd party products? If so, explain why?

Minimum to Start Criteria

- A qualified project manager is in place;
- Database administration and programming/analytical support is committed;
- Project manager experienced in large-scale system implementation is full-time, and/or outside consulting with same expertise is committed;
- Fulltime database administrator familiar with legacy systems and PeopleSoft;
- Detailed project plan is in place;
- Guidelines for modifications are clear;

- Functional teams assembled with skill sets from each specific area (e.g. general accounting, purchasing, accounts payable for Finance module, as well as department staff for decentralized implementation);
- Mechanism for policy and practice review is in place.

Campus Functional Area Participation

Guideline Questions

- Are all functional areas required to participate in implementation identified and informed?
- Have the end-users been identified?
- Has sufficient key staff required to participate been identified?
- Are the business units ready/able to dedicate these key staff?
- Is there a plan for cross-training and/or backfilling staff?
- Is there a plan in place for preparing end users to use the new system?
- Does the plan include supporting the process and job redesign required within user departments?
- Do functional team members have a solid understanding of the business processes and policies?
- Are the function teams open to the reconsideration of policies or practices to take maximum advantage of the opportunities or approaches resident in PeopleSoft?
- How well documented are the business policies and processes?
- How ready are the units to do "fit/gap" analysis?
- Is there agreement on level of decentralization and an understanding of related security issues at the end-user point?
- How many hours per week are they assigned full time to the project?
- Are they expected to also handle their current jobs?
- How much PeopleSoft experience do they have? If none, how much implementation experience with ERP?
- Are there sufficient numbers of functional resources assigned to the project?
- Is the team composed of both functional experts and also managers who are empowered to make decisions?
- Is there a project room where the team can work together? Is there room for not only the staff, but also the consultants? Do sufficient workstations and data access lines exist for everyone?

Minimum to Start Criteria

- Functional management is fully informed and supportive of project;
- Resources are available to create and support functional teams;
- Key staff has been identified.

Ideal

- Functional teams are in place at sufficient FTE and are familiar with PeopleSoft products;

- Back-filling and cross-training is in place;
- Current practices documentation and/or process-mapping is complete;
- Staff is well informed and receptive to business process change as well as new software.

Funding

Guideline Questions

- Is a comprehensive funding plan/project budget in place (including financing possibilities)?
- Has funding for the project's initial years been secured?
- Is the project budget linked to the project plan?
- Does it include resource needs of departments supporting the project, (i.e. back-filling in IT and functional areas)?
- Does it include resources required to support training of end-users?
- What level of detail is addressed in the project budget?
- What ongoing operational needs have been addressed?
- Have existing vendor contract issues been resolved?
- Has the campus adequately addressed resource requirements for student due to the different baseline/implementation approach strategy?

Minimum to Start Criteria

- Executive commitment to funding is in place.

Ideal

- <u>Multi-year</u> funding plan with resources allocated addresses project needs, supporting department needs, and on-going operational requirements;
- Funding plan adequately differentiates the different requirements and implementation strategies for HR, Finance, and Student.
- Any existing vendor contract issues are resolved.

Information Technology Support

Guideline Questions

- Are the project requirements for IT support known? (Legacy and/or feeder system interfaces, data conversion, database administration, security, new 3rd party tool support, Web support, data warehouse support etc.)
- What desktop environments will be supported?
- Is the campus hardware environment aligned with the CMS technical architecture? If not, are there plans in place to do so?
- Is there adequate planning for coordination between technical and functional areas?
- Does remote access need to be addressed?
- Is there a transition plan for legacy system support for both software/hardware and staffing?

- Are there sufficient resources to not only implement the system, but also maintain it in production?
- Are there sufficient resources to prepare written system documentation for the system, develop reference materials and maintain those materials?

Minimum to Start Criteria

- Legacy/and or feeder system interface requirements are known;
- Database administration support for migration is available;
- Desktop environment(s) to be supported are understood;
- IT staff are familiar with PeopleSoft requirements;
- Coordination and planning between IT and project team is in place.

Ideal

- IT staff fully understand PeopleSoft requirements and receptive to project;
- Required IT resources are available and funding is committed.

Network Readiness

Guideline Questions

- Have end-user locations, roles (e.g. power user Vs casual user) and associated networking needs (LAN Vs WEB) been identified?
- Is campus backbone adequate? Is campus 4CNET access bandwidth sufficient?
- Do campus LAN's have sufficient bandwidth?
- Have bandwidth requirements between feeder systems and the CMS system been identified?
- Is network security adequate?
- Can Network support staff handle increased trouble calls and traffic problems?
- Has question of remote access been addressed?
- Has a network assessment been considered/conducted?
- Workstation Readiness

Minimum to Start Criteria

- Plan in place to survey end-user locations;
- Bandwidth requirements are known and campus backbone and LAN's meet these minimum requirements.

Ideal

- End user locations and roles identified;
- Campus 4CNET access, backbone and LAN’s exceed bandwidth requirements;
- Network support staff is familiar with PeopleSoft requirements and are ready to handle increased load.

Workstation Readiness

Guideline Questions

- Has a desktop equipment survey been conducted?
- Have user roles been identified in order to determine appropriate desktop requirements based on the software version being implemented?
- Is there a plan in place to equip end-users?
- What "client" standard operating environments (SOE) must be supported?
- Has question of Macintosh access been addressed for 7.x implementations?
- Are workstation/LAN support resources trained and in place to support workstation hardware/software upgrades and installs?

Minimum to Start Criteria

- Plan in place to survey end-user requirements and equip end users;
- Client SOEs have been determined.

Ideal

- End user locations surveyed;
- User roles identified;
- End user equipment augmentation in progress;
- Support resources identified and trained.

Help Desk Readiness

Guideline Questions

- What Help Desk functions are currently in place?
- Is there a plan for supporting additional PeopleSoft load?
- Is there a plan for training Help Desk staff so that they can respond to Level 1 calls regarding PeopleSoft software?
- Is there a plan for supporting functional or business process questions?
- Is there adequate coordination between the campus Help Desk staff, campus functional and technical support staff, and SOSS/HOSS Help Desk Staff?
- Are Problem Management Procedures in place?
- Does the campus have Help Desk support software currently implemented or plans to do so?

Minimum to Start Criteria

- Dedicated Help Desk staff currently in place with commitment to augment to support PeopleSoft load;
- Plans in place to implement Help Desk support software.

Ideal

- Augmentation plans for current Help Staff are in place;
- Help Desk support software is in use;

- Problem Management procedures are in place;
- Plan developed for PeopleSoft Training for Help Desk Staff;
- Plan for coordination with campus entities and HOSS/SOSS staff.

Training

Guideline Questions

- What exposure/training in PeopleSoft has taken place?
- What exposure/training to 3rd party tools such as data conversion, report management, performance monitoring/tuning has taken place?
- What exposure/training to software testing techniques has taken place?
- Are there plans for training of: end-users, IT staff, Help Desk staff?
- Do the plans identify the scope of training required, training topics and training methods?
- Has adequate space to support classroom training been identified?
- Is on-going training included in operational plans?
- For decentralized implementation, are there existing training modules and/or plans for training in business processes?
- Do end users require any basic PC training (e.g., Windows, Office)? Is such training being offered?
- Are report requirements clear; and have end-users been involved in their design?
- Are their sufficient training resources available in terms of both personnel and facilities?
- Will all the training be timely for, not only end-users, but also those who may need it earlier for implementation or to serve on the implementation team?

Minimum to Start Criteria

- Training requirements have been identified and a plan with commitment of resources is in place.

Ideal

- Both business and technical staff are already familiar with PeopleSoft;
- Training sessions are currently available in business processes (if necessary) 3rd party tools and software testing;
- Plans are in place to provide PeopleSoft training for end-users either through PeopleSoft or “train-the-trainer” model.