PeopleSoft Project
Student Administration Readiness Assessment
California State Polytechnic University Pomona

Draft: October 25, 2002

REVISION CONTROL

Document Title: California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Student Administration Readiness Assessment

Authors: Judith Lyon, Ph.D.

Date	By	Action	Pages
08/20/02	Judith Lyon	Prepared Initial Draft for Discussion at meeting on 8/23/02	All
09/23/02	Judith Lyon	Revised draft based upon feedback from review meeting of 9/17	All
10/25/02	Judith Lyon Rose Kukla	Updated to include Interview and Focus Group Schedule	

REVIEW/APPROVAL HISTORY

Date	By	Action	
09/25/02	Steering Committee	Review Executive Summary	
10/30/02	Steering Committee	Review Readiness Assessment Plan	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW 4
Introduction 4
Objectives of the Readiness Assessment 4
TIMELINE 5
Timeline Assumptions 5
DOCUMENTATION 6
Objectives 6
Document Checklist 6
INTERVIEWS 7
Objectives 7
Interview Guidelines 7
Executives 8
Project Leadership and Management 8
Steering Committee Members 8
Implementation Council Members 8
Core Team Members 9
Information Technology Professionals 9
Interview Question Master 9
Invited Interviewees 10
FOCUS GROUPS 11
Objectives 11
Focus Group Session Guidelines 11
Focus Group Invitees 12
DELIVERABLE 15
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW MATRIX 16
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW GUIDES 22
President and Executive Sponsors Interview Guide 22
Steering Committee Interview Guide 23
Project Management Team Interview Guide 24
Implementation Council, Functional Module Leads and Functional Leads 26
Information Technology Professionals Interview Guide 28
Help Desk Interview Guide 30
APPENDIX C: CONSULTANT BIOS 31

Overview

Introduction

As a prerequisite to receiving the baseline software, the CSU Chancellor's Office requires that each CSU campus use a third party to conduct a Readiness Assessment. The intent of the assessment is to assist each institution to attain at least a minimum level of readiness before it begins the implementation of the CMS baseline software. Readiness to begin the project is assessed in the following categories:

- Sponsorship
- Communication
- Project management
- Participation of functional areas
- Funding
- Technical environment and support

The purpose of this document is to outline a plan of action to conduct the Readiness Assessment for California State Polytechnic University, Pomona in preparation for implementing the CMS baseline version of the PeopleSoft Student Administration System. The consultants will collect information to make an assessment of readiness based upon the following methodologies:

- Review project documentation
- Interview project participants and sponsors
- Conduct focus groups with critical constituencies

Objectives of the Readiness Assessment

1. Determine if Pomona is sufficiently prepared to receive the baseline software so that the implementation will be successful.
2. Identify areas that need improvement before receipt of the software.
3. Increase communication about and support for the project by involving all stakeholders in the assessment process.

Timeline

ACTIVITY	PARTICIPANTS	START	FINISH
▪ Develop RA Plan	Cedar, PM	08/09	08/19
▪ Review RA Plan with Project Management Team	PM, PM	08/23	09/17
▪ Present Executive Summary to Steering Committee	Cedar, PM, SC	09/25	09/25
▪ Schedule Interview/Focus Groups	AA	09/23	10/31
▪ Prepare composite of documentation	PM	11/11	11/12
▪ Conduct Interviews/Focus Groups	Cedar, TBD	11/12	11/15
▪ Prepare Preliminary Report	Cedar	11/18	11/27
▪ Review Preliminary Report with PM Team	Cedar, PM	12/02	12/06
▪ Present Final Report and develop Campus Response	Cedar, SC, PM	12/11	12/11
▪ Prepare Final Readiness Assessment and Campus Response	Cedar, PM	12/12	12/17
▪ Submit Readiness Assessment Report and Response to CO	PM	12/18	12/18

Legend: PM-Project Management Team, SC-Steering Committee, AA-Administrative Assistant

Timeline Assumptions

Cedar consultants and Pomona SA project leaders jointly developed the timeline for completion of the Readiness Assessment. The timeline is based upon the following assumptions:

1. There are 30 interview time periods and nine focus group time periods.
2. There will be two Cedar consultants conducting the interviews and focus groups.
3. Both consultants will be involved in the interviews with the Project Management Team.
4. Once a preliminary version of the Report has been prepared, Cedar will review the report for clarification and accuracy with the Project Management Team. Cedar will revise the report, as necessary, for presentation to the Steering Committee.
5. Pomona will provide administrative support to schedule and support the process.

Documentation

Objectives

1. Conduct an inventory of existing documentation that is required for the Readiness Assessment.
2. Identify any information that remains to be developed and formulate a plan of action to complete the necessary documentation.
3. Review the documents that have been prepared by Pomona to answer the related Readiness Assessment Guideline questions.

Document Checklist

The documents that Pomona will provide to Cedar are those recommended in the CMS Guidelines as listed below:

1. Project History
2. Project Manual (Charter)
3. Project Organizational Structure
4. Communication Plan
5. Project Budget and Financing Plan
6. Staffing and Backfill Plans
7. Training Plan
8. Project Workplans
9. Other documentation

Interviews

Objectives

1. Collect information pertaining to the Readiness Assessment questions.
2. Ascertain opinions pertaining to the Readiness Assessment questions, project challenges, opportunities, and measures of success.
3. Increase communication regarding the project.

Interview Guidelines

Overview of Interview

(10 minutes)

- Introductions/Backgrounds
- Objectives
- Review of Interview Guide
- Confirmation of process

Specific Questions

(45 minutes)

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

Summary

(5 minutes)

- Summarize feedback and solicit confirmation
- Ask interviewee if he/she has additional information/questions
- Discuss the follow-up process

As a follow-up to the interview, Cedar will send a write-up of the interview for validation by the interviewee. Once validated, the interview information is incorporated into a composite summary that is the basis for the readiness analysis and recommendations. The roles that we recommend for inclusion in the Readiness Assessment are as follows: (1) Executives, (2) Project Leadership and Management, (3) Steering Committee members, (4) Implementation Team /Functional Implementation Managers, (5) Core Team/Functional Module Leads/Foundation Leads, (6) Information Technology representatives, and (7) Training and Documentation specialists.

Executives

Objectives

1. Assure that executive sponsors are committed to and an advocate for the implementation project.
2. Determine if executive sponsors are willing to address and resolve policy issues related to the implementation project in a timely manner.
3. Assess the extent and effectiveness of communications about the project to executives.

Project Leadership and Management

Objectives

1. Assure that a project Charter and Project plan are in place and that procedures are established for on-going management of and communication regarding progress of the project.
2. Assure that there are documented processes to address policy, change management, staffing, other resource and communication issues.
3. Determine if all project parameter documents have been developed and communicated with appropriate audiences.

Steering Committee Members

Objectives

1. Assure that the Steering Committee has formalized a decision making process to address policy, resource and change management issues.
2. Determine if the Steering Committee members are able to devote time to guide and monitor the project throughout the implementation process and to identify what challenges they perceive may arise during the implementation.
3. Determine if the Steering Committee will be able to address and resolve cross-functional issues that may arise during the design and configuration of the Student Administration System.

Implementation Council Members

Objectives

1. Determine if the Implementation Council has reviewed and/or participated in formulating the project strategy, goals, objectives, organization, roles and responsibilities and related project parameters.
2. Determine if key business processes are understood and documented.
3. Determine if the Implementation Council members are able to devote sufficient time to the project throughout the implementation process.

Core Team Members

Objectives

1. Determine if the Core Team has reviewed and/or participated in formulating the project strategy, goals, objectives, organization, roles and responsibilities and related project parameters.
2. Determine if Core Team members are knowledgeable about and have documented key business processes.
3. Determine receptivity to change in business processes.

Information Technology Professionals

Objectives

1. Assure that interface requirements with legacy and/or feeder systems are understood.
2. Assure that database administration support for migration is available.
3. Assure that network and desktop environments to be supported are understood, planned for, and budgeted.
4. Assure that Help Desk plans, staffing and software support are adequate.

Interview Question Master

To obtain all of the information and opinions necessary to complete the Readiness Assessment, we have prepared an Interview matrix to identify the most appropriate source(s) of information and opinions. The matrix includes source documents and those individuals and groups who are involved in or impacted by the project. The Project Management Category includes the Project Director, Business Process Project Manager, SA Implementation Manager and End User Assistance Manager. The Functional Category includes the Implementation Council, Functional Module Leads and Foundation Leads. The Technical Category includes those persons responsible for Information Technology, Networking, Workstations, and Help Desk. From this master, Cedar prepares Interview Guides for each role. The matrix and interview guides are included in Appendix A and B.

Invited Interviewees

Interviewee	Title
Tom Adamski	Director of Applications
Mike Berman	Vice President of Instructional & Information Technology
George Bradshaw	Director of Admissions & Outreach
Debra Brum	Associate Vice President of Faculty Affairs
Bob Charles	Executive Director of Academic Resources
Stephanie Doda	Executive Director of Projects
Pat Farris	Vice President of Administrative Affairs
Ron Fremont	Associate Vice President for University Relations
Carol Heins-Gonzales	Support Manager of Projects
Elhami Ibrahim	Associate Vice President of Academic Programs
Ray Inge	Assoc Vice President of Human Resource Services & Risk Programs
Brian Jenkins	Director of Accounting Services
Rochelle Kellner	Director of Student Services College of Business Administration
Rose Kukla	Registrar
Darwin Labordo	Associate Vice President of Finance & Administrative Services
Chris McAlary	Associate Vice President of Facilities Planning & Management
Pam McQuesten	Assoc Vice President of Instructional Technology & Academic Computi
Tomás Morales	Vice President of Student Affairs
Eduardo Ochoa	Dean of College of Business Administration
Jane Ollenburger	Vice President of Academic Affairs
Manuel Pilonieta	Interim Associate Vice President of Enterprise Computing
George Proctor	Assistant Professor of Architecture
Melanie Saracco	Director of Financial Aid
Jane Self	Interim Director of Payroll
Don Straney	Dean of College of Science
Bob Suzuki	President
Lynn Turner	Associate Dean of College of Business Administration

Focus Groups

Objectives

1. Identify and prioritize the challenges that are anticipated to impact the implementation process.
2. Identify and prioritize the opportunities and benefits that will result from the project.
3. Propose measurements of project success.

Focus Group Session Guidelines

Introductions and Overview

(10 minutes)

Introductions

1. Consultants introduce themselves.
2. Ask each participant to introduce him/herself by providing the following information:
    a. Current role and responsibilities.
    b. Previous professional experience.
    c. Previous implementation experience.
    d. Familiarity with the PeopleSoft project.
    e. Anticipated contribution to the project.

Review Objectives of the Focus Group

1. Identify and prioritize the challenges that may be encountered during the implementation and their root causes.
2. Identify and prioritize potential opportunities.
3. Propose and prioritize measurements of success.

Explain Methodology

1. Emphasize that this is an interactive session that is meant to be a discussion.
2. Note that the consultants' roles will be to facilitate and record the session.
3. The consultants then will ask participants to share their perceptions of project challenges, opportunities and measurements of success.
4. Describe the follow-up process.

Implementation Challenges

(20 minutes)

Ask participants to share what challenges they perceive may affect the implementation. Examples of challenges:

- The level of understanding as to the possible impact of the systems on student-related processes.
- Attitude toward making changes to their processes.

- Their workload.
- Level of commitment and participation in the project.
- Concerns about learning the new technology.

Implementation Opportunities/Benefits

(15 minutes)

Ask participants to share what opportunities they perceive may result from the implementation. Examples of opportunities:

- Increase professional capabilities through acquisition of new software skills.
- Provide more efficient services to students as a result of new software functionality and streamlined processes.
- Improved ease of reporting.

Measurements of Success

(10 minutes)

Ask participants to share what criteria should be used to measure the success of the project. Examples of criteria are as follows:

- Increased services to students.
- Streamlined processes.
- Quick access to information.
- On time and within budget.

Summary and Evaluation

(5 minutes)

- Summarize feedback and solicit confirmation.
- Ask interviewee if he/she has additional information/questions.
- Discuss the follow-up process.
- Ask participants to evaluate the session.

Focus Group Invitees

Faculty

1. Harriett Lord
2. Joe Block
3. Peter Clark
4. Felix Barreto
5. Glenda Brock
6. Taun Kapoor
7. Art Parker
8. Barry Soroka
9. David Lord
10. Eric McLaughlin
11. Claudia Pinter-Lucke
12. Steve Bryant

13. Gary Cretser
14. Len Troncale
15. Liliane Fucaloro
16. Kathleen Hayden
17. Dan Hostetler
18. Judy Miles

Students

1. Orientation Leaders
2. April Hudson
3. Rose Lee
4. John Whyte
5. Pathfinders
6. Matt Whitmer
7. ASI Students

Financial Services

1. Al Viteri
2. Sheryl Cincush
3. Albert Sims
4. Charlene Hernandez
5. Kathryn Barbosa
6. Linda Wheeler
7. Amy Cher
8. Sheryl Adams
9. Carla Perez

Reporting

1. Lino Barro
2. Cathy Bates
3. Glendy Yeh
4. Chris Coleman
5. Betty Wu
6. Christine Thomas

Student Services Directors

1. Rod Short
2. Jennifer Shufer
3. Dorothy Fleck
4. Leticia Guzman
5. Catherine Schmidt
6. Rebecca Gutierrez Keeton
7. Dan Bridges

Technology

1. Karin Schott
2. Irene Callaci
3. Abel Zamora
4. Muriel Young
5. Dave Lyons
6. May Tang
7. Rich Leonard
8. Joy Compton

Student Records

1. Nancy Hendricks
2. Janene Decker
3. Marcia Smith
4. Delia Leon
5. Walda Wells
6. Cindy Chatfield
7. Nancy Condosta
8. Lucy Carreras
9. JoAnn Piergallini

Admissions & Outreach

1. Ru Kramp-Gil
2. Maria Rivera
3. Anita Bochman
4. Pachune Herrod
5. Dan Aseltine
6. Dena Bennett
7. Rose Way

Financial Aid

1. Bob Hughes
2. Diana Minor
3. David Le Claire
4. Rosemary Springer
5. Lupe Acosta
6. Terri Gallegos

Deliverable

Cedar prepares a Readiness Assessment Report that is organized according to each category of assessment in the Readiness Assessment Guidelines. Each section includes a checklist on the CMS criteria, strengths, areas of improvement and recommendations. An example is presented below. The document also includes a summarized response to each specific question in the Readiness Assessment Guidelines and a section on Insights as gained from the Focus Groups.

CMS Criteria for Communication

Minimum to Start

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

Ideal

- ? All 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.

Readiness Rating

In the Communication category, XXX meets the one minimum to start criterion and three of the four ideal criteria.

Strengths

Areas for Attention

Recommendations

Cedar reviews the preliminary Report with the SA Implementation Chair. Cedar incorporates the changes into a final document that Cedar presents to and discusses with the Steering Committee. At this review session, Cedar will facilitate a discussion to develop the campus response. The Readiness Assessment and Campus Response will be interrelated for submission to the Chancellor's Office.

Appendix A: Interview Matrix

QUESTIONS BY CATEGORY	EXECUTIVE SPONSORSHIP	OVERSIGHT	PROJECT MGMT	FUNCTIONAL	TECH
Sponsorship					
1. Who is the project executive sponsor?			X		
2. Who are the members of the sponsor team?			X		
3. Are key functional areas represented at an executive level?			X		
4. How frequently do they meet/communicate about the project?			X		
5. Is there an effective decision-making process in place for resolving bottleneck policy and organizational issues?	X	X	X		
6. How well does the sponsor team understand the PeopleSoft institutional benefits and limitations versus the systems that will be replaced?	X	X	X		
7. What is the level of understanding and commitment to the project by critical constituents?	X	X		X	
8. What is the level of commitment by the sponsors and critical constituents to review policies and practices and to support necessary change?	X	X			
9. Is there continuity in leadership?	X	X			
Communication					
10. How well understood are the short-term and long-term goals of the CMS project at different functional levels?				X	
11. Has a "case for action" been articulated?	X	X	X	X	
12. Have the key constituencies been identified?			X	X	
13. Do Pomona constituents have reasonable expectations as to the project's benefits?	X	X	X	X	
14. Is there a communication plan in place to keep them informed?			X	X	
15. How frequent is communication regarding the project?	X	X	X	X	X
16. Does the Communication Plan adequately address sponsorship and support for necessary change?	X	X	X	X	
17. Does senior management recognize the importance of consistent and frequent Communication with the Pomona community?	X	X	X		
18. Is there a plan for coordination between all of the project teams, both functional and technical?			X	X	
19. Is coordination among areas already occurring?			X	X	X
Project Management					
20. Is there experienced project management dedicated?		X	X		

QUESTIONS BY CATEGORY	EXECUTIVE SPONSORSHIP	OVERSIGHT	PROJECT MGMT	FUNCTIONAL	TECH
21. How comprehensive is the project plan and schedule?			X		
22. Does the project plan include adequate contingencies?			X		
23. Does the plan include a strategy for the rollout of the new system to Pomona users?			X	X	
24. Are the project teams assembled with adequate representation from all functional areas?			X	X	
25. Are the roles of project team members defined appropriately?			X	X	
26. Have strategies been developed to maximize retention of project team members?		X	X		
27. Are CSU guidelines for software modifications understood?			X	X	X
28. Do the teams have clear decision-making authority?			X	X	
29. Is there database administration expertise dedicated?					X
30. Are the needs of the legacy/feeder systems understood?				X	X
31. Is there adequate programming/analytical support committed to support data conversion?					X
32. What is the level of familiarity with prototyping issues?				X	X
33. Is a mechanism in place for timely resolution of identified policy or procedure issues?	X	X	X	X	
34. Does the project management team have prior PeopleSoft or other ERP experience?			X	X	X
35. Are common business rules for the Pomona in place or achievable?				X	
36. Are sufficient change control procedures in place?			X		X
37. What resources are available for communication to the Pomona?			X		
38. Will the campus be substituting any PeopleSoft functionality or modules with non-PeopleSoft 3rd party products? If so, explain why?			X		X
Functional Area Participation					
39. Are all functional areas required to participate in implementation identified and informed?			X	X	
40. Have the end-users been identified?			X	X	
41. Have sufficient key staff required to participate been identified?			X	X	X
42. Are the business units ready/able to dedicate these key staff?				X	
43. Is there a plan for cross-training and/or backfilling staff?			X	X	
44. Is there a plan in place for preparing end users to use the new system?			X	X	

Questions by Category	Executive Sponsorship	Oversight	Project Mgmt	Functional	Tech
45. Does the plan include supporting the business process and job redesign required within user departments?			X	X	
46. Do functional team members have a solid understanding of the business processes and policies?				X	
47. How well documented are the business policies and processes?				X	
48. Are the function teams open to the consideration of policies or practices to take maximum advantage of the software?				X	
49. How ready are the units to do "fit/gap" analysis?				X	
50. Is there agreement on level of decentralization and an understanding of related security issues at the end-user point?				X	X
51. How many hours per week are the functional team members assigned to the project?			X	X	
52. Are they expected to also handle their current jobs?			X	X	
53. How much PeopleSoft experience do they have? If none, how much implementation experience with ERP?				X	
54. Are there sufficient numbers of functional resources assigned to the project?			X	X	
55. Is the team composed of both functional experts and also managers who are empowered to make decisions?			X	X	
56. 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?			X		
Funding					
57. Is a comprehensive funding plan/project budget in place (including financing possibilities)?			X		
58. Has funding for the project's initial years been secured?			X		
59. Is the project budget linked to the project plan?			X		
60. Does it include resource needs of departments supporting the project, (i.e. back-filling in IT and functional areas)?			X		
61. Does it include resources required to support training of end-users?			X		
62. What level of detail is addressed in the project budget?			X		
63. What ongoing operational needs have been addressed?			X		
64. Has potential funding for production cost increases been identified on a long-term basis?			X		

Questions by Category	Executive Sponsorship	Oversight	Project Mgmt	Functional	Tech
65. Have existing vendor contract issues been resolved?			X		
Information Technology Support					
66. Is the IT staff receptive to this project?					X
67. Does the IT staff understand the PeopleSoft requirements?					X
68. 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.)					X
69. Is the campus hardware environment aligned with the CMS technical architecture? If not, are there plans in place to do so?					X
70. Is there adequate planning for coordination between technical and functional areas?				X	X
71. Is coordination and planning between IT and project team already in place?				X	X
72. Does remote access need to be addressed?					X
73. Are there sufficient resources to not only implement the system, but also maintain it in production?					X
74. Are there sufficient resources to prepare written system documentation for the system, develop reference materials and maintain those materials?				X	X
75. Is there a transition plan for legacy system support for both software/hardware and staffing?					X
Network Readiness					
76. Have end-user locations, roles (e.g. power user Vs casual user) and associated networking needs (LAN Vs WEB) been identified?					X
77. Is campus backbone adequate? Is campus 4CNET access bandwidth sufficient?					X
78. Do campus LAN's have sufficient bandwidth?					X
79. Is network security adequate?					X
80. Is network support staff familiar with PeopleSoft requirements?					X
81. Can network support staff handle increased trouble calls and traffic problems?					X
82. Has question of remote access been addressed.					X
83. Has a network assessment, including a survey of end-user workstations, been conducted or considered?					X
Workstation Readiness					
84. Has a desktop equipment survey been conducted?					X
85. Is there a plan in place to equip end-users?					X
86. What "client" standard operating					X

Questions by Category	Executive Sponsorship	Oversight	Project Mgmt	Functional	Tech
environments (SOE) must be supported?					
87. Has question of Macintosh access been addressed					X
88. Are workstation/LAN support resources trained and in place to support workstation hardware/software upgrades and installs?					X
89. Are support resources identified and trained?					X
Help Desk Readiness					
90. What Help Desk functions are currently in place?					X
91. Is there a plan for supporting additional PeopleSoft load?					X
92. Is there a plan for training Help Desk staff so that they can respond to Level 1 calls regarding PeopleSoft software?					X
93. Is there a plan for supporting functional or business process questions?					X
94. Is there adequate coordination between the campus Help Desk staff, Pomona functional and technical support staff, and SOSS/HOSS Help Desk Staff?					X
95. Are Problem Management Procedures in place?			X		
96. Does the campus have Help Desk support software currently implemented or plans to do so?					X
Training					
97. What exposure/training in PeopleSoft has taken place?				X	X
98. What exposure/training to 3rd party tools such as data Conversion, report management, performance monitoring/tuning has taken place?					X
99. What exposure/training to software testing techniques has taken place?					X
100. Are there plans for training of: end-users, IT staff, Help Desk staff?					X
101. Do the plans identify the scope of training required, training topics and training methods?					X
102. Has adequate space to support classroom training been identified?					X
103. Is on-going training included in operational plans?					X
104. For decentralized implementation, are there existing training modules and/or plans for training in business processes?				X	X
105. Do end users require any basic PC training (e.g., Windows, Office)? Is such training being offered?				X	X
106. Are report requirements clear; and have end-users been involved in their design?				X	X

QUESTIONS BY CATEGORY	EXECUTIVE SPONSORSHIP	OVERSIGHT	PROJECT MGMT	FUNCTIONAL	TECH
107. Are their sufficient training resources available in terms of both personnel and facilities?				X	X
108. Is there a plan for timely training of the implementation team?				X	X

Appendix B: Interview Guides

President and Executive Sponsors Interview Guide

Objectives of Interview

- Assure that executive sponsors are committed to and advocates for the implementation project for the Student Administration System.
- Determine if executive sponsors are willing to address and resolve policy issues related to the implementation project in a timely manner.
- Assure that the executive sponsors receive relevant, frequent communication regarding the project.

Questions for Discussion

1. Is there an effective decision-making process in place for resolving bottleneck policy and organizational issues?
2. How well does the sponsor team understand the PeopleSoft institutional benefits and limitations versus the systems that will be replaced?
3. What is the level of commitment by the sponsors and critical constituents to review policies and practices and to support necessary change?
4. Is there continuity in leadership?
5. Has a "case for action" been articulated for the campus?
6. How effective is communication regarding the project? How frequent?
7. Is a comprehensive funding plan/project budget in place (including financing possibilities)?
8. What do you think are the most significant challenges to achieve a successful implementation or adoption of the new SA system?
9. What opportunities do you anticipate will be available as a result of a successful implementation?
10. What factors are critical to the ultimate success of the project for end users and Pomona as an organization?
11. Do you have any additional comments, observations, or concerns about the University’s readiness to begin this project?

Steering Committee Interview Guide

Objectives

- Assure that the Steering Committee has formalized a decision making process to address policy, resource and change management issues.
- Determine if the Steering Committee members are able to devote time to guide and monitor the project throughout the implementation process and to identify what challenges they perceive may arise during the implementation.
- Determine if the Steering Committee will be able to address and resolve cross-functional issues that may arise during the design and configuration of the Student Administration System.

Questions for Discussion

1. Is there an effective decision-making process in place for resolving bottleneck policy and organizational issues?
2. How well understood are the PeopleSoft institutional benefits and limitations versus the systems that will be replaced?
3. What is the level of commitment by the sponsors and critical constituents to review policies and practices and to support necessary change?
4. Has a "case for action" been articulated for the campus?
5. How effective is communication regarding the project? How frequent?
6. Is there support among the executive sponsors and senior management for necessary change?
7. Have strategies been developed to maximize retention of project team members?
8. Do the teams have clear decision-making authority?
9. Have strategies been developed to maximize retention of project team members?
10. What do you think are the most significant challenges to achieve a successful implementation or adoption of the new SA system?
11. What opportunities do you anticipate will be available as a result of a successful implementation?
12. Do you have any additional comments, observations, or concerns about your university’s readiness to begin this project?

Project Management Team Interview Guide

Objectives of Interview

- Assure that a Project Charter and Project Plan are in place and that procedures are established for on-going management of and communication regarding progress of the project.
- Assure that there are documented processes to address policy, change management, staffing, other resource and communication issues.
- Determine if all project parameter documents have been developed and communicated with appropriate audiences.

Questions for Discussion

1. Has a "case for action" been articulated for the campus?
2. Have the key constituencies been identified?
3. How effective is communication regarding the project? How frequent?
4. Does the communication plan adequately address sponsorship and support for necessary change?
5. Is the project budget linked to the project plan?
6. Has potential funding for production cost increases been identified on a long-term basis?
7. Have existing vendor contract issues been resolved?
8. Is there a plan for coordination between all of the project teams, both functional and technical?
9. How comprehensive is the project plan and schedule?
10. Does the project plan include adequate contingencies?
11. Has the implementation plan for SA been coordinated and integrated with Financials and HR?
12. Does the plan include a strategy for the roll-out of the new system to campus users?
13. Does the project management team have prior PeopleSoft or other ERP experience?
14. Is there a plan for cross-training and/or backfilling staff?
15. Are the project teams assembled with adequate representation from all functional areas?
16. Are they expected to also handle their current jobs?
17. Do the teams have clear decision-making authority?
18. Have strategies been developed to maximize retention of project team members?
19. Is there agreement on level of decentralization and an understanding of related security issues at the end-user point?
20. Are report requirements clear; and have end-users been involved in their design?

21. Are common business rules for the campus in place or achievable?
22. Will the campus be substituting any PeopleSoft functionality or modules with non-PeopleSoft 3rd party products? If so, explain why.
23. What exposure/training in PeopleSoft has taken place?
24. What exposure/training to 3rd party tools such as data conversion, report management, performance monitoring/tuning has taken place?
25. What exposure/training to software testing techniques has taken place?
26. Are there plans for training of end users, IT staff, Help Desk staff?
27. Do the plans identify the scope of training required, training topics and training methods?
28. Is on-going training included in operational plans?
29. For decentralized implementation, are there existing training modules and/or plans for training in business processes?
30. Do end users require any basic PC training (e.g., Windows, Office)? Is such training being offered?
31. Are report requirements clear; and have end-users been involved in their design?
32. Are their sufficient training resources available in terms of both personnel and facilities?

Implementation Council, Functional Module Leads and FoundationLeads

Objectives of Interview

- Assure that functional management is fully informed and supportive of the project.
- Assure that key staff has been identified and adequate resources are available to create and support functional teams.
- Determine if key business processes are understood and documented.

Questions for Discussion

1. Is there a clear, effective decision-making process in place for resolving bottleneck policy and organizational issues?
2. What is the level of understanding and commitment to the project by critical constituents?
3. How well understood are the short-term and long-term goals of the CMS project at different functional levels on campus?
4. Has a "case for action" been articulated for the campus?
5. Have the key constituencies been identified?
6. Do campus constituents have reasonable expectations as to the project's benefits?
7. How effective is communication regarding the project? How frequent?
8. Is coordination among various functional and technical areas already occurring?
9. Are the project teams assembled with adequate representation from all functional areas?
10. Are the roles of project team members defined appropriately?
11. Are CSU guidelines for software modifications understood?
12. Do the teams have clear decision-making authority?
13. Are the needs of the legacy/feeder systems understood?
14. What is the level of familiarity with prototyping issues?
15. Are common business rules for the campus in place or achievable?
16. Are all functional areas required to participate in implementation identified and informed?
17. Have the end-users been identified in your functional area?
18. Are the business units ready/able to dedicate these key staff?
19. Do functional team members have a solid understanding of current business processes and policies?
20. How well documented are the business policies and processes?
21. Is there support for reconsideration of campus policies or practices and job redesign within your functional area?

22. How ready are the units to do "fit/gap" analysis?
23. Is there agreement on level of decentralization and an understanding of related security issues at the end-user point?
24. How much PeopleSoft experience do you have? If none, how much implementation experience with ERP?
25. Is there adequate planning for coordination between technical and functional areas?
26. Is coordination and planning between IT and project team already in place?
27. What exposure/training in PeopleSoft has taken place?
28. Do end users require any basic PC training (e.g., Windows, Office)? Is such training being offered?
29. Are report requirements clear; and have end-users been involved in their design?
30. Is there support for business process and job redesign within your functional area?

Information Technology Professionals Interview Guide

Objectives of Interview

- Assure that interface requirements with legacy and/or feeder systems are understood.
- Assure that database administration support for migration is available.
- Assure that network and desktop environments to be supported are understood, planned for, and budgeted.
- Assure that Help Desk plans, staffing and software support are adequate.

Questions for Discussion

1. Is the IT staff receptive to this project?
2. Does the IT staff understand the PeopleSoft requirements?
3. 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.)
4. Is the campus hardware environment aligned with the CMS technical architecture? If not, are there plans in place to do so?
5. Is there adequate planning for coordination between technical and functional areas?
6. Is coordination and planning between IT and project team already in place?
7. Does remote access need to be addressed?
8. Are there sufficient resources to not only implement the system, but also maintain it in production?
9. Are there sufficient resources to prepare written system documentation for the system, develop reference materials and maintain those materials?
10. Is there a transition plan for legacy system support for both software/hardware and staffing?
11. Have end user locations, roles (e.g. power user versus casual user) and associated networking needs (LAN versus WEB) been identified?
12. Is campus backbone adequate? Is campus 4CNET access bandwidth sufficient?
13. Do campus LAN’s have sufficient bandwidth?
14. Is network security adequate?
15. Is network support staff familiar with PeopleSoft requirements?
16. Can network support staff handle increased trouble calls and traffic problems?
17. Has a network assessment, including a survey of end-user workstations, been conducted or considered?
18. Has a desktop equipment survey been conducted?
19. Is there a plan in place to equip end-users?

20. What “client” standard operating environments (SOE) must be supported?
21. Has question of Macintosh access been addressed?
22. Are workstation/LAN support resources trained and in place to support workstation hardware/software upgrades and installs?
23. Are support resources identified and trained?

Help Desk Interview Guide

Objectives of Interview

- Assure that a help desk plan has been developed and appropriate resources are dedicated.
- Determine if Help Desk staff are or will be involved in training.
- Determine if appropriate Help Desk software is planned for or in place.

Questions for Discussion

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

Appendix C: Consultant Bios

Judith Lyon, Ph.D.

Judith Lyon has been involved in higher education for over 30 years, working in institutions of diverse types and in the corporate environment with a focus upon higher education. She has served as a faculty member, advisor, department chair, director of computer services, senior planning analyst, assistant dean for budget planning, executive assistant to the president, and vice president for planning and development. Dr. Lyon has worked in a multi-campus land grant research university, two large community colleges, and a four-year state university. She was on the Board and was president EDUCAUSE. Judith also has experience in the corporate environment, working for three software companies, including PeopleSoft, and a big five consulting firm. In these corporations, Dr. Lyon worked as a vice president for business development, senior partner, senior vice president for marketing and professional services and managing partner. Currently, she is Managing Principal of the Higher Education Consulting Practice for Cedar Enterprise Solutions. She has conducted Readiness Assessments at the following institutions: The California State University, Chancellor's Office; Humboldt State University, California State University, Long Beach; and Case Western Reserve University. She also has provided management consulting services to California State University, Hayward; California State Polytechnic University, Pomona and California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo. She received her B.S. and M.Ed. from the University of Utah and Ph.D. from the Pennsylvania State University.

Tim Biel, Ph.D.

Timothy Biel has over 20 years combined experience in the fields of educational publishing, technical communications, and higher education. He has directed award-winning creative and editorial teams for educational publishers as well as a technical communications team for a software development firm in the higher education industry. In addition, Dr. Biel fulfilled both faculty and senior administration duties during his 10+ years with colleges and universities. As Curriculum Director for Cornerstone, Tarrant County College's nationally-recognized honors program, he has staffed, scheduled, and taught honors courses, conducted faculty training, served as public liaison, recruited students, and organized and led admission and scholarship selection procedures. He has completed Readiness Assessment for The California State University, Chancellor's Office; San Jose State University; and Case Western Reserve University. He holds a Ph.D. from Washington State University and BA, Rocky Mountain College.