

**JOLIET JUNIOR COLLEGE  
ILLINOIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT 525  
1215 HOUBOLT ROAD  
JOLIET, IL  
ROOM A-3104  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES WORKING MEETING  
SUMMARY NOTES  
February 1, 2023**

1.1.1 Chairman O’Connell called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.  
Call  
To  
Order

1.2 Board of Trustees Present: Maureen Broderick  
Roll James Budzinski  
Call Nancy Garcia Guillen  
Michelle Lee  
Jake Mahalik  
Alicia Morales  
Dan O’Connell

Student Trustee Present: Josh Stamborski

1.3 Review of Summary Notes

The workshop notes of August 24, 2022 were reviewed with no comments made.

2.1 Strategic Plan ‘22

Dr. Namuo briefly talked about the JJC Foundation Socks campaign. He said JJC is in a position to thrive, is poised to do big things as we continue to occupy a strong financial position. Dr. Namuo then turned the presentation over to Dr. Farmer who said our current strategic plan will sunset in July of this year. We have contracted with CampusWorks to serve as our partner as we build a new strategic plan. In May of 2022, we made a commitment that we would not move forward with our strategic plan until we hired a new President. Dr. Farmer said Dr. Namuo has set the stage for the strategic plan under the umbrella of growth as institutional growth is very important to him. He's provided clear examples on how he's moving forward as the President, as a visionary leader with 12 x 12 x 12 and online learning. Dr. Farmer then introduced Dr. Kierstyn Hunter and Sandy Holt from CampusWorks. CampusWorks will focus on the student experience for the planning. CampusWorks will develop a three-year strategic plan

covering 2024 to 2027. The current strategic plan expires June 30, 2023. The committee will include faculty, staff and administration. The plan will emphasis institutional growth, community engagement and student success. Dr. Hunter then presented a timeline for the strategic plan to launch in fall of 2023.

## 2.2 Three-year Financial Plan/budget Update

Dr. Namuo said we're poised to do some big things and have the resources to do so. However, we did not get to this point by accident. It's the sound fiscal management and standard practices that have been employed year over year over year that got us to this strong financial position and we intend to continue JJC's history of conservative projections and sound fiscal controls and management. Dr. Namuo then invited Karen Kissel, Vice President, Finance and Administration and Jeff Heap, Senior Director, Financial Services & Controller, Finance and Administrative Services to present the Financial Plan. Jeff gave an update on operating revenue. FY23 credit hours are trending under budget by 1,500 hours (\$175,000). The State revenue (credit hour and CTE) combined budget of \$8.9 million is expecting to be \$800,000 over budget. Property Taxes are expected to be slightly over budget. Interest income will be over budget due to the rise in rates. Jeff then went over operating expenses. Vacant Salaries are under budget due to openings. Adjunct and Faculty overloads are trending under budget by \$900k. Medical claims are trending over budget by \$800k. Contractual supplies, utilities and travel are trending under budget by \$1m. The contingency budget is intact. Revenue projections for FY24 are anticipating a \$6.3m increase in revenue for FY24. There will be no increase in tuition or fee rates. A 6.2% increase in property taxes would equal \$3.8m. Interest income budget is \$2.5m. Personnel is expected to increase as four unions are currently in union negotiations. Benefits projection are for a 6% health care cost increase. Materials, supplies and contractual services are projected at a 5% increase. Utilities are projected at 10% increase. A new line item called New Initiatives has been added to the new operating budget for \$1,000,000 for new ideas that come forward. Jeff Heap then gave revenue and expense assumption for FY24 – FY26. Karen Kissel then presented the budget calendar.

## 2.3 Workday Status

Dr. Farmer invited Jim Serr, CIO, to give the Workday historical perspective presentation. Jim stated that the journey of Workday has been successful to this point as JJC is about 60% implemented with Workday. Jim explained that ERP stands for Enterprise Resource Planning. What that means for us here at the college is three core components, our finance system, our human resource system and our student system. JJC originally purchased and implemented Datatel Colleague (it is now called Ellucian Colleague), back in 1988 which did not evolve to meet the demands of the institution or the student's needs. There was a big struggle to get timely, accurate data out of the colleges systems, not only the core ERP but the integrated and associated third party applications. The 2016 to 2019 strategic plan had five goals that fell under the umbrella of student success. JJC has been a 10-year plus partner with Gartner, one of the world's largest and foremost technology research and advisory company. Gartner has done higher education research on student systems. Gartner's higher education research showed that by 2020, one-quarter to one-third of higher education institutions will have

committed to a student system replacement project. The President's Cabinet established a design team to construct and facilitate the RFP process, establish decision criteria, to communicate and make recommendation. The ERP modernization RFP proposal supported the strategic plan and supported student success. Ellucian as the incumbent partner was encouraged to propose as part of the RFP proposal. Workday invited JJC in 2015/16 to be part of their student strategic advisor program. The executive summary identified risks and modernization catalysts in 2017. In March of 2017, the ERP RFP committee was formed. In July 2018, the ERP Modernization RFP was released. Four software partners responded – Ellucian, Workday, Campus Management and Jenzabar. Two implementation partners responded – Navigator Management Partners (now AVAAP) and Collaborative Solutions. Gartner at that time recommended that JJC initiate planning and execution of the suggested mitigating activities. The ERP committee selected two software providers as finalists – Workday and Campus Management. There were vendor demos in the fall of 2018 & spring 2019. The ERP committee completed their work in May of 2019. The program manager selection process was March – June 2019. Jerome Goudelock was selected and started in July 2019 as the ERP Modernization Program manager based on Gartner Findings.

Jerome Goudelock then spoke that he was hired to review the Gartner Risk Assessment Report, and to reboot the selection process for the two remaining software vendors. Gartner's assessment summary identified four risk assessment areas - governance executive support, sourcing and vendor management, business processes and requirements and interfaces and integration. The project reboot began in August 2019 with the ERP selection presented to the board on October 9, 2019. The JJC selection process was based on quantitative, value driven and minimize costs and risks for JJC. The timeline for implementation consists of three main phases. 1) Platform, 2) Student Phase 1 and 3) Student Phase 2. Platform and Student Phase 1 and the TOSCC Union phases have gone live. There have been roadblocks and hurdles including the pandemic and staff turnovers. The staff turnover was significant resulting in a 20% loss of training and knowledge. A RAIDQ log (risks, actions, issues, decisions and questions) is kept to track all known items that may impact the project. AVAAP and the JJC project management team meet weekly to discuss items and determine next steps. There have been 527 Platform RAIDQ with 95% being closed. Jerome is the program, manager responsible for Platform, Student Phase 1 and Student Phase 2. JJC is the program manager responsible for Workday Prism and Workday Planning. Student Phase 2 started in late 2021. Student Phase 2 is three times in complexity and has cross functional requirements. There are over 100 JJC employees attending meetings and actively involved in the project. For Student Phase 2 there are 191 items with 62 still being open. Workday does not meet JJC's needs for Financial Aid as it is currently designed. There are four major issues – schedule nightly orchestration process, real time anticipated aid, multiple SAP policies for specific student groups and fractional units. JJC Executive Steering Committee has initiated meeting with Workday to discuss the four major issues. JJC has requested concessions from Workday which are pending. Workday's Financial Aid Module lacks the automation and functionality that exists within JJC Colleague ERP system. Workday gaps increase the amount of manual intervention for JJC employees. The path forward consists of escalating issues to Workday, determining alternative solutions and continuing testing and validation of data. Three options have been reviewed. 1) Stay on the current path to go live in 2023 with a cost of \$621,000; 2) extend the project by one year. Research and acquire a third-party financial aid system to replace Workday's financial aid system with a cost

of \$2,477,142.50; and 3) Extend the project until Workday has resolved major financial aid functional gaps with a cost of \$8,780,000. Other options considered include 1) financial aid remains in Colleague and all other functions in Workday; 2) New RFP to select a new ERP; 3) All student functionality stays in Colleague (current state) or 4) Migrating all functionality back to Colleague. The cabinet's recommendation is to extend the project by one year.

Jim Serr then came back up to the podium to recap the presentation. Jim said this has been a six-year journey (2017 – 2023) of JJC's ERP and technology modernization efforts. He thanked the people involved in the project for stepping up, coming forward and assisting to get us over the finish line has been nothing short of exceptional. The process from start to finish has been comprehensive. We've shown resilience, grit, determination and a never quit attitude that it has allowed us to be successful. We're 60% live in the Workday environment. JJC has gone live on HR, finance, student phase one and things that we hadn't initially planned for such as Workday planning and Workday PRISM analytics. There's a reason why that you don't embark upon a modernization effort like this, but once every 34 years. Our ask at the at the February 15th meeting will be to extend the project by 12 months. The cost we have estimated is just shy of \$2.5 million. Dr. Farmer then opened the floor up to any questions.

Trustee Broderick: What was the road map and did you move to improve any of the improvements that Ellucian system recommended? Because I'm hearing that when you looked at the technology that was associated with Ellucian, you said it was too challenging. It was time to look at another ERP. I was sitting on that board the whole time and I don't remember hearing updates from Ellucian. And all of a sudden, we were, let's do a new ERP because we were tired of band aiding. Now I'm hearing from the users that we did not have Ellucian updates that we should have.

Jim Serr: It's probably a pretty nuanced question. Tough to probably get into all the details of that. Generally speaking, the lack of a road map from Colleague was they didn't have a clear road map on how they were going to modernize. The technology was very much legacy on-premise technology. We were required to run servers and software here in our data center. Their solution to evolve to the cloud was very unclear at that time. Their strategy for going to the cloud, again, this is going back to 2016-2017 was to lift the servers and software that we had in our data center and move it to an Ellucian owned data center that was essentially what their cloud delivery model of their solution was at that time. They gave us one customer reference of that solution at the time, which was Mercer. I believe they're out of Georgia near Atlanta. We were never able to contact anybody at Mercer that would talk to us about that solution. We had done a variety of updates to the Ellucian Colleague system over time. Some of those were failed implementations of new modules. Some of the new modules we did update from Ellucian and implemented those successfully. Holistically, there was a very unclear path on modernization of their technology. The legacy technology at their core, the database that they were using and evolving their technology and solution to the cloud.

Trustee Broderick: Was that due to us not having enough knowledge to do it or them not having enough instructional opportunities to provide to us?

Jim Serr: We're probably getting nuanced here, but it was basically they did not have a viable technology road map or solution at that time.

Trustee Morales: When you said JJC had received a \$2.1 million Title 3 grant and we couldn't figure out how to spend it or we were going back and forth on how to spend it?

Jim Serr: I think as you would expect, when you receive a grant like that, there's a lot of campus wide conversation about the best way to leverage all those grant dollars. That was part of what was happening with our student enrollment management plan. It was funding a high touch, high tech service for students. I think a lot of those dollars were spent in that area.

Dr. Farmer: That is correct. In fact, we used the Title 3 grant, which is a strengthening institution grant, a 2.1-million-dollar grant, to implement our guided academic pathway including updating our website. We invested a lot of money in our website. That was at a time when we moved forward with our academic advising redesign.

Trustee Morales: I thought you said that Ellucian did not host software that could maintain all the changes? The Colleague road map couldn't host certain software. But yet, many colleges across the country still use that software. We used it for 34 years. I'm really trying to think exactly how to move forward because I'm really unhappy right now.

Trustee Budzinski: I'm going to step back to asked about the road map. The comment was made that in 2017, Ellucian had no clear road map. So, at this point, I'm led to believe, because of that, we disqualified them as a solution. However, in this presentation here, and in the hours I spent going over all the processes. I have come nowhere near finding a road map for Workday that satisfies the needs of the college. How was that ever even considered when its road map doesn't exist? 2017 to now, we're almost six years into this. They don't have a working solution yet but we had one on campus that just needed to be upgraded. I'm really disturbed that we would even consider Workday at any point after everything I've seen. I don't want to go through every slide one by one. It's just slide after slide of details that tells me this was the wrong decision. The wrong decision. Nothing fancy other than, as a university or college, we are part of this decision even if we weren't here. Right now, we have something that's broke. I don't see it as viable. I don't think spending \$2500 a year to keep it going without concessions from Workday is the answer. We still do not have a road map from Workday. From what I'm gathering, the system is working as designed. It's not designed to work for us. Somebody mentioned going to a whole new ERP. It may be very, very costly but it may be necessary. On one of the slides that Jerome showed us, we looked at the mass exodus of people. I'd like to see how many of those people left because of the implementation failure of Workday. Did people leave because they had it? You go to work every day to a solution that doesn't work. Your job requirements stay the same and you're told to make it work. At some point you look for something better to do. I've been on board meetings where we looked at people that left and the answer was, maybe if we had paid them more. Maybe if we didn't try to force Workday onto their plate, it might have made a difference. I don't know what any exit interviews look like. I don't know what the matrixes were that we looked at or the cost that we looked at. The cost may have been cheaper. It was a cost of nonconformance. It doesn't do what we need it to do, period. There's no road map that says it's ever going to work. From what I understand, there is no clear-cut answer from Workday that they can resolve this. If it's working the way they intended it to and it's not working the way we need it. It's not the solution that we should be discussing tonight. I've made note after note that's very disturbing. We are talking about 10-year fixed pricing. That's

great, but we've had graduated implementation. Yet we were paying full price year one. Why did we pay for full price in year one when we were only using 60% of it for the first few years? Now we're at the point we can't implement it 100%, which we're still paying 100% for it. Yet we're going to pay more for it because there had to be somebody, in all of this, that said this will not work for us. I want to know why that person didn't stand up? Why those people didn't stand up? How after looking at all the data that I've seen, we chose this solution?

Jim Serr: I think what I could follow-up with is Workday has road maps for their entire product - HR, finance and student. As a follow up, we could certainly provide road maps.

Trustee Lee: You keep saying that this has been successful. It has not been a success in my opinion. I understand how hard everyone at this college has worked to implement the first two phases. I feel bad at all the hard work that has gone in and the employees that have worked so hard. I don't want to be down on them. I don't want to make them feel what they have done and what they have contributed is all for nothing. It's sad that this mistake has happened. To keep calling this a success sounds like you're feeding me blubber. It's not a success if we cannot implement it and we have to keep feeding money into it. We don't know if it's ever going to work because they may never be prepared to do the student services sides of things, then it's not a success. The question is not whether or not we needed to update our systems. The question that we are here to address today is whether or not we chose the right system to implement and how we came to that decision to implement the wrong system. Were all of the facts given to the board for them to make the correct decision on which system to vote for?

Jim Serr: The implementation has been successful. We are live on HR. We are live on finance. We are live on student recruiting and admissions. Last year we processed 21,000 applications in Workday. As part of phase one of our student system implementation, we implemented, modernized and simplified the colleges' budget planning process with Workday planning. We have phase two of Workday planning that will go live in the first week of March. To the credit of the finance team, they are doing a phenomenal job on that project that will allow us to model our workforce and labor costs as part of our budget process here at the college. We are leveraging our first use case for all of our historical worker data and prism analytics with a plan to leverage PRISM as part of our student phase two efforts. Trustee Lee, I appreciate the comments. I understand the frustration, but I would argue on those points that that the implementation has been successful and will continue to be successful as we go forward. We are in the early stages of this implementation. We have certainly learned a lot having gone through a lot with the pandemic and everything else and all the obstacles that we presented. But we have been successful to this point.

Dr. Farmer: I do have a recommendation because we have over 62 slides. Instead of us going slide by slide, what I would like to do is start off with Student Trustee Stamborski one more time. If you can ask all your questions and which page number on the PowerPoint that might be helpful.

Student Trustee Stamborski: By what metric do you define success? When you say the implementation has been a success, what does that actually mean?

Jim Serr: HR and finance and payroll benefits, all of the HR human resource functions, recruiting of employees, onboarding of employees, all of the functionality within HR. We went live July 1, 2021. From day one, we have paid all of our employees on time and accurately as part of our implementation of HR. We also went live on July 1, 2021 of our finance system. All of the college finances, all of our procurement activities are running through Workday with automated workflows and reporting. All have been live for a year and a half. We went live with student recruiting and admissions and have processed over 21,000 applications in 2022 through Workday as well as part of our student phase one implementation. We have many metrics beyond that we could provide on a business process by business process basis as well. On those metrics and the fact that we've gone live, I would say that those are measures of success in a program and a project of this scale and complexity.

Student Trustee Stamborski: On that note, we were talking about retention. You were giving a lot of numbers based upon hitting goal posts. That tells us that the project itself is moving forward. But if the employees don't like it or are kicking and screaming to those goal posts, I'm not sure if I would define that as success. Do the employees actually like Workday as a system?

Jim Serr: We have surveyed employees. I know Judy Connelly and the HR team are very happy with the improvements that we've seen relative to our implementation of Workday on the HR side. We've seen a lot of improvements and increase in our ability to process more efficiently on the HR side. We did a survey of the HR finance, all of the staff associated with platform phase one, I'd have to go back and look at the survey results. We would need to come back and survey now a year and a half to two years down the road of being live. We could do another survey of staff to get their level of satisfaction with the system at this time. When you go live with a program, and a project of this size and scope, when you do it through a pandemic, all of the effort, energy and focus is on the implementation and to go live. We are really in the second or third inning of a nine-inning baseball game when it comes to the maturity, the acclimate of the solution, of the technology, of the proficiency of our staff, of what our investment can do for us holistically across the college. That takes time. Along with that in parallel, we've seen a lot of staff transition. That is not directly related to the implementation of Workday. There's a lot of global factors. The pandemic, of course, we've seen transition of staff across the globe and organizations of all sizes where people realize that they want more flexibility in their work life balance. We've seen some of that certainly here at the college as well. I think Judy provided some information to the board relative to some of the folks that exited it and were asked direct questions relative or not to whether it was due to Workday or not. I think that was a relatively low number.

Student Trustee Stamborski: You are correct in the fact, that there's been a lot of turnover. If it's a possibility that Workday pushed some of those numbers, I think it would be a good idea to get concurrent numbers on how the staff feels about Workday both in the past and for now and compare them. It's entirely possible that previously employees would have liked it and then as they move forward, they realized it's a flawed system. There could be a movement there and it's a difficult system. I'm well aware that it is difficult to learn a brand-new system, but those numbers are still important. And if you could provide those to the board, that would be appreciated.

Jim Ser: I have one more reaction to some of your comments which are great comments. I think you if you take Workday out of the equation, any ERP implementation of this size, my expectation would be that staff are not going to be satisfied. It is incredibly difficult and complex and there is the exhaustion of the staff. Doing an implementation of this size during normal operating conditions is a massive undertaking, but doing this ERP implementation on top of the pandemic was exhausting for staff across this entire organization. Myself, my peers here on the cabinet, people on the project, we've seen it across every corner of this institution. Folks were certainly exhausted for a lot of reasons.

Student Trustee Stamborski: I totally agree with you. I don't disagree with anything you said. But if we were to do like a one to ten survey and we went from an eight to a six, it's one thing. If we went from like an eight to a two, that's another thing. That's why it would probably be good for us to look at the data. I think the data needs to speak for itself. Another question is the point-based system that you use to determine that Workday was the correct decision? Can you explain to me how the point-based system came to be or how you determined that was the correct method?

Jerome Goudelock: JJC had already gone through the RFP process to select two vendors. A lot of information had gone into the RFP. What came out of the Gartner finding was to look at this from functionality and from a cost perspective. I came in to take the Gartner components and move forward. It was how can you come up with a method that you could come up with a score. At that time budget was very cost conscious and how much the organization would pay for the software at the time. We came up with that kind of value proposition to make sure that we go through that process. We're looking at it from that functionality and how much will it cost for each piece of functionality that you get. That was the thinking behind that.

Student Trustee Stamborski: Were there any other methods that you were tossing around at the time that this method was chosen?

Jerome Goudelock: There were several other methods that you could have gone through. The question then becomes time and how much time do we have to hit that window in order to try to start in 2020? This was one that we thought we could reboot again, without having to start all over and collect new information. To start from where we had that 500 plus specifications. Increase those so that we could get that done in a very short period of time and then taking that into account and having the weight put on it by each department would come back giving us that weighted component of each one of those to come back with the number. That was the scenario we went through at that point. Again, based on the Gartner recommendation that was given.

Student Trustee Stamborski: Would you say that some time frames need to be seeded within our operating capacity. Would you say that this process was in any way rushed? Because you said time was a major factor. That's why I'm asking.

Jerome Goudelock: When you say rushed, I'd say it a different way. It was an aggressive timeline that we had. With any project, when you map out your timeline or what you're trying to do from an objective perspective, it's trying to make sure that you can hit certain points along the way. Those milestones to keep everything moving forward. We were working with things like board meetings that we had to schedule in between. That kind of guides you into that process. We knew that the project was an



aggressive project of this size and scope to implement and again, trying to keep your cost as low as possible.

Student Trustee Stamborski: That makes sense. As you extend the project longer, you're going to drive up costs and you have to keep it within the board meetings. There are certain time frames that you have to seed it in. However, would extra time proven beneficial in this circumstance?

Jerome Goude-lock: At the time, I didn't think so. When I came in you had already been in an RFP for almost a year, which is a long time for an RFP of this size. There was a lot of energy and effort from the collective JJC team on the original committee. Again, I came in as more of someone impartial. I didn't even see that information. I just came in with kind of the blinders on to get to that next step to say how can we evaluate these from an objective perspective. What you're looking at is an objective way of actually taking two products and looking at them from a perspective of those function specifications and the price per point.

Student Trustee Stamborski: It sounds from what you're saying is that was the option that we went to because it was the quickest. You said that time was a major factor and you had to choose something. Were you searching around for other potential avenues or was this the one that you knew going in?

Jerome Goude-lock: This was one recommended by Gartner that we implemented. I came in to implement the Gartner findings. What you find in those Gartner findings is essentially what I came in to do.

Student Trustee Stamborski: I was looking at the point-based system and a couple things popped out at me. A 10 or 7 on the point-based system indicates that these are mission critical items. These are things that we need for the College to function. 5 and 3 are things that are either necessary or kind of nice to have. A 1 was nice to have but not at all necessary. The problem I was looking at the system is, you could have two 5s that are things that are nice to have and have a missing mission critical item on there. Looking at that point based system. There's a big flaw. You can miss a lot of mission critical items because of that 10 based system. On a scale of 1 to 10, that's how we determine the point-based system. You could have a lot of 5s and not a lot of 10's and do much better on that system than if you had a few 10s. You would come off with a lot of nice stuff that you don't need versus not a lot of stuff that you actually do need. Do you kind of see what I'm saying?

Jerome Goude-lock: The process was those specifications. I didn't create the specifications. They came from each department. They created the list of items. The ranking that you're speaking of the 10, 7, 5 that was basically the priority giving to us from that department. The thought was that the departments know those critical items. They are providing their weighting based upon the criticality of each of those items.

Student Trustee Stamborski: The 10-point based system is the flawed part. Not the way that the departments determine what is mission critical and what is not mission critical.

Dr. Farmer: I believe Dr. Namuo would like to make a comment.

Dr. Namuo: I've got two things for the board to consider. I'm sensing some fatigue in the room and that's completely understandable. But at the same time, I want to honor all

of your interests and your concerns. I've got a couple of things for the trustees to consider. The first would be a second work session. Essentially, a continuation of this exact thing. All we would do is put a pause in it and come back either to connect at the February 15<sup>th</sup> board meeting or another date soon. The second thing I'd like to offer, and I know we're not taking board action today. I guess I'd be seeking consensus. So as many of you know, my background is in technology. I have had some conversations with many of you in terms of this entire project and how it's going, to move forward. There is a tool available to project managers and those involved in the software development life cycle, systems analysis and design. That tool is called independent validation and verification. It's called IV&V. For those of you in the general contracting world, it's similar to commissioning, or if you're purchasing a property, you want to verify that it is what the person selling it to you claims. This IV& V process, there are maybe a handful of companies that do this. What it essentially is, is a third party not connected to JJC, Workday, AVAAP or Gartner. It's not connected to the project at all. A completely independent look at the state of Workday and how we got to where we are. I could provide more information if we do agree to do a follow up work session. This independent verification and validation process is a very powerful tool. Those two things I want to offer to the trustees to consider and perhaps develop consensus around.

Chairman O'Connell then asked the board for a consensus to hold another follow-up workshop.

Trustee Broderick: Do take into account that on the 15th this should not be an item on the agenda until these things are worked out. We would hold off on this item for the agenda.

Trustee Budzinski: In fairness to the money that's being asked for, we would like to see that \$2,500 or \$2.5 million split into the line items. What each value represents so we can vote on each one independently and have discussion that affects each one. There's going to be some follow up in that meeting and I don't want to have to vote yes or no on 2 1/2 million. I want to be able to break it down by line action item.

Dr Namuo asked for a consensus around an additional follow up work session which the board members agreed to. He also asked for a consensus around IV&V which the board members also agreed upon.

Trustee Morales: We didn't do that in the beginning. We never did that?

Attorney Buck: I think Gartner was brought in to assess and to guide us. I think what Dr. Namuo is talking about is something different than that, which is now on the back end.

Trustee Broderick: Right, we brought in Gartner, but they didn't bring in Gartner the Magic Quadrant to utilize which is another faction of Gartner. This would have given us a better scope of things.

Attorney Buck: I'm saying, at the time, that was what was needed at the time to tell us what we needed and how to get there.

Trustee Budzinski: It's two different measurements. This measurement isn't the process. This measurement is the solution. What we want is to measure the solution. How we got to it.

Dr. Namuo: I will lean on my network in regards to the IV&V. I'm feeling consensus from the board. I will pursue that and then I will have a definitive answer at the follow up work session in terms of cost and timeline. But my sense based on conversations with my colleagues who are in a very similar situation across different states, and as many of you noted, none of them are here in Illinois. Nonetheless, there is some information out there. I commit to bringing that to the follow up work session.

Trustee Broderick: I think as a follow up to Josh's comments, there was a survey that was done that was 85% showing the implementation was not a success. This is not a success. We need to have the stakeholders that are involved do a survey. All of the stakeholders, which includes us as stakeholders, the administration, the students, anyone that's involved with this system. We need a stakeholder survey.

Trustee Lee: I have so many questions. I'm confused, I thought that Jerome was hired because we needed help with Workday and because he was specific in knowing how to use Workday.

Chairman O'Connell: Let's get to the point where we get these questions answered at this next meeting.

Trustee Broderick: I think for justice to all of us, we do have a lot of questions that we need to answer for the five of us. I don't remember half of it. I don't even remember some of the things I was looking at. The scope document or the statement of work. I don't remember seeing any of those.

Trustee Morales: I remember Dr. Farmer and Jim, saying we are on target for this. Payroll's gone live. All of these other things that you all had access to, that you all had knowledge of, was not shared with us. And we as board members, we trust you. We trust you that you are the experts. That you're doing your job, that you're going to communicate it and that you are going to trust us. I don't feel we were trusted. I feel misled. I feel very misled. Well, and I don't want another meeting, honestly, but will.

Chairman O'Connell: I feel that we have to have another meeting and we have to go through this process.

Trustee Broderick: Jerome, to follow up to what Trustee Morales said, I kept drilling you on all of those things. I don't think that we were shared enough information when I kept asking where we were at with the progress. That is really bothering me a lot.

Dr. Namuo: The timeline for the IV&V is typically a three-month process. We will have to do an RFP on it. We will follow our procurement process because it will most likely be over \$25,000.

Trustee Morales: The staff turnover, I don't think it's all because of Workday. I think it's a combination of the perfect storm. It is getting a new president, the uncertainty of staff that work here. When you have employees that have been on the same system for 34 years, a lot of people don't like change no matter what it is. It's the great resignation everyone's looking for the bigger, better deal right now.

Trustee Broderick: Can we still have a comparison? I didn't see that in the presentation of the costs of what was stated at the beginning and where Workday is now. It seems

like it's extremely higher than what the other presentations would have been with all the stuff that's been added. Where are we at with cost vs what was stated, we would be.

Trustee Lee: Can we have a projection of what, if they don't fix the problem in this next year, and we give them the \$2.5 million, what else? How much more money they're going to need to make this happen?

Trustee Broderick: Are we still eligible to see that survey that showed the failure with the last implementation? The survey that showed 85% not happy with the implementation. You said there were several surveys that were done. The last survey, I think we all should be able to see.

Dr. Namuo: Representatives from Workday are coming here on February 9th. The head of the Services Division and the head of the Development Division. That was one of my commitments to exert as much influence as possible to ensure the successful implementation. They are coming to visit me.

Trustee Broderick: They have been listened to our meetings.

Jim Serr: To clarify, Dr. Farmer and Dr. Namuo one point. The two and a half million dollars. There are five or six items there. Trustee Budzinski asked the question about the itemization of those and we are happy to provide that. The two and a half million dollars is not going to Workday. I just want to make sure that that we're clear about that.

Trustee Lee: It is still Workday related though, correct?

Jim Serr: It is related to the project certainly yes.

Trustee Broderick: A lot of it was AVAAP if I'm not mistaken.

Jim Serr: The AVAAP implementation cost for the extension is about 1.25 million of the two and a half.

Trustee Lee: From that what I just saw, we've already extended this due to COVID. How many times have we extended this project?

Jim Serr: There was one time for the pandemic and then one time for the staff turnover.

Trustee Mahalik: One last question. Did they extend the contract due to the extensions? Due to this unforeseen finish date. Did they extend it due to the COVID and everything else? We had the deadline of three or two years going live and being complete. Did they ever extend any more additional time in order to do the implementation?

Jim Serr: No. We made a conscious decision based on the pandemic the first time to extend by three months. Then due to staff transition to extend another three months, which aligned with the start of our fiscal year from a HR and finance standpoint. Those were decisions that that we made.

Trustee Mahalik: That wasn't added on to the original implementation deadline? The go live date when everything should be completed. The first three months and the second three months was not added on?

Jim Serr: No, there was not a second extension beyond those. Those change orders were done within the scope of the budget approved by the board.

Trustee Broderick: In regards to the item that we're talking about, that was on the last board meeting. What's the SLA time for AVAAP? SLA (servicing level agreement). What's our servicing level agreement with them? It should be stated 24/7, what?

Jim Serr: It depends on what the issue is.

Trustee Broderick: There's an issue. Because after talking to all my IT people, it should be standard either 24/7/4 or 24/7/2. That needs to be addressed.

Jim Serr: The Workday contract is we essentially get 24 by 7 by 365. 24 by 7 by 365 is year-round.

Trustee Broderick: 24 by 7 by 4 is the hour time that they come back to us. We've heard that because of AVAAP we had to go with the babysitter for HR because they didn't get back to us.

Jim Serr: I think you're talking about AVAAP's AMS post Go live support. We can follow up with the exact SLA times, but again depending on the nature of the ticket that we issue, AVAAP usually comes back to us to say it's going to take an hour to resolve that ticket or four hours to resolve that ticket. It's a little bit different than the support that we get from Workday on the product and the technology. There's a little bit of a nuance.

Trustee Broderick: If we're paying for support staff to be there, we should have a definitive on what we're paying them almost \$1,000,000 for. That's what's on the contract that's due September of 2023. I'm asking that because if it's going to be on the agenda, we need to know that.

Dr. Namuo: Trustee Broderick, that's a great question. That is exactly something that IV&V would look at. The third party would look at that.

It was then agreed that the meeting would adjourn and be continued at a future workshop session.

3. Board Business  
None

4. Closed Session  
None

5. Adjournment  
Trustee Lee moved, seconded by Trustee Broderick that the meeting adjourn at 9:11 p.m. A voice vote was taken and carried unanimously.