**JOLIET JUNIOR COLLEGE
ILLINOIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT 525
1215 HOUBOLT ROAD
JOLIET, IL
ROOM A-3104
BOARD OF TRUSTEES WORKING MEETING
SUMMARY NOTES
February 15, 2023**

1.1 Chairman O'Connell called the meeting to order at 8:36 p.m.
Call
To
Order

1.2	Board of Trustees Present:	Maureen Broderick
Roll		James Budzinski
Call		Nancy Garcia Guillen
		Michelle Lee (left at 10:28 pm)
		Jake Mahalik
		Alicia Morales (virtual)
		Dan O'Connell

| | Student Trustee Present: | Josh Stamborski |

1.3   Review of Summary Notes

The workshop notes of February 1, 2023 were reviewed with no comments made.

2.1   Workday Status (continued)

Chairman O'Connell stated each trustee would first get 10 minutes to speak. If a second round of questions were needed after each trustee had a turn, each trustee would then get an additional 5 minutes. He asked Dr. Framer, Executive Vice President, to facilitate the discussion and Karyn Reczek, Assistant to the Board of Trustees, to keep the time.

Trustee Garcia Guillen stated that she appreciated that we have been able to all get together to figure out and understand the issues with Workday and she appreciated being able to take a look at how the process developed. Trustee Guillen would like to focus on solving the problems that have been discovered with Workday.

Trustee Mahalik said he appreciated the information that was provided to answer the board's questions relating to Workday. He said that getting a new ERP system should have focused on the success it would be for the students and staff but he feels that Workday was selected based on cost.

Jim Serr, Chief Information Officer, responded that they quantified the scoring matrix by dividing all of the points that were accumulated by each of the final two vendors. Jim Serr said that when you considered functionality along with cost and the financial viability of the system, the committee came up with a total cost per point. The process favored the selection of Workday.

Trustee Mahalik asked if Campus Management was the preferred choice by most of our employees, staff and students. Jim Serr responded that based on the scoring, Campus Management did come out higher on the number of points accumulated for functionality but when you considered the entire process, the best value method which is one of the methods that Gartner recommended that the college used to score this in an objective fashion. The functionality along with costs to come up with the total cost per point, favored Workday and the margin of the 10-year cost was a $3 million difference.

Trustee Mahalik asked when JJC purchases new equipment, does JJC check references with other colleges that have used it. If so, which colleges were checked and how did they score it and did any of these issues that JJC is having now come up in the conversation. Jim Serr responded that yes, the committee met with references for Campus Management and Workday. Jim Serr said that from a functionality standpoint, the sentiment of the committee and across the college probably favored Campus Management. They met with a college in Arizona which had gone live with HR and Finance functionality. The staff at the college in Arizona was very frustrated and exhausted with the implementation of Campus Management and this experience did influence the selection committee.

Trustee Mahalik asked if there were any references for Workday. Jim Serr said they did meet with Indian River State College as a Workday reference. Trustee Mahalik asked if the reference colleges also had implementation issues with student financial aid. Jim Serr said he did not recall any conversations relating to issues with student financial aid.

Student Trustee Stamborski asked to explain the acronyms being used. He asked what does ERP stand for and what does it do. Jim Serr explained it stands for enterprise resource planning and its purpose is to provides functionality for Human Resources, Finance, and the Student system. Josh then asked what is a SIS. Jim Serr explained that an SIS is the Student Information System and is responsible for all the core student capabilities and functionality needed to serve the student such as registrations, records, financial aid, academic foundations, courses and curriculum. Josh asked what is an RFP. Jim Serr responded that it stands for Request for Proposal which is a document that the college puts together for a solution the college needs that the public can use to respond. Josh asked what is an SAAS. Jim Serr responded SAAS is software as a service and that software operates outside of the college, in a data center or facility hosted by another company or in the cloud. Josh then asked what the difference between a cloud-based system vs. locally hosted. Jim Serr responded that cloud based is

hosted outside of the college. JJC has a data center with servers, hardware and software. Any solutions, technology or applications that JJC runs on premise, run out of the data center. Josh then asked what is a point solution. Jim Serr responded a point solution would be a niche application for a specific piece of functionality. For the purpose of an online learning system, we use a specific program that would be considered a third party, niche or a point solution. Josh asked why would JJC use a point solution over something like a broader solution like Workday. Jim Serr responded point solutions can provide greater functionality and capability than a broader system that has to provide a lot of functionality across different areas. Josh asked when JJC was developing the RFP for the ERP system, what was the criteria that was used. Jim Serr responded the criteria was essentially that JJC wanted one system that would provide the capabilities and functionality needed for Human Resources, Finance and for the Student system and within each of those areas, each had specific requirements. In the initial RFP, JJC identified 584 requirements across those three areas. Once we got into the objective scoring of the final two vendors, the number of requirements expanded from 584 to 1,375 requirements.

Student Trustee Stamborski asked to explain the scoring procedure that the committee used to determine which ERP was selected. Jerome Goudelock, the project manager, responded that number one was, what are the specifications devised by the functional area. Then those specifications were prioritized. The vendors were asked to respond whether they had the functionality or if there was a way to customize or configure their systems for that specific functionality which was separate from the RFP. This was done for the final two selections. Josh asked what was the make-up of the committee. Jim Serr responded that the committee was a cross functional committee with about twenty members. Academic Affairs co-chaired the committee along with myself (Jim Serr). Academic Affairs had five representatives, Student Development had five members including Student Accounts and Payments, IT had four members and there was representation from HR, Finance and Institutional Advancement.

Student Trustee Stamborski then asked what the issue currently is with Workday and why JJC can't move forward with the next phase. Jim Serr responded that JJC has four Spire cases or blockers. Workday has a formal process that JJC submits these blockers and ask Workday to evaluate. Workday then comes back to JJC with recommendations if this truly is a blocker or if there are workarounds or alternative solutions. Workday works in collaboration with our implementation partner, AVAAP, on these blockers. One of the four blockers is the nightly orchestration process which is a batch process that runs once a night. JJC would like that process to run more frequently or be able to schedule that process so when a student wants to look at their financial aid or student financial information that they can see that information in real time.

Student Trustee Stamborski asked what is AVAAP. Jim responded that is the name of Workday's implementation partner. Josh asked how do you determine blockers. Jerome Goudelock responded they are discovered at the time they occur in real time, in the build or configuration phase. JJC found that the workarounds that were suggested did not necessarily meet JJC's needs because it would either need additional help, support or resources to do some of these workarounds so JJC had to escalate to Workday these issues.

Trustee Lee asked Jim Serr if JJC hired Jerome Gouldelock in July of 2019 because of a Gartner assessment. Jim Serr said as part of Gardner's ERP readiness project with

JJC, in their comprehensive report, one of the recommendations was to hire an independent program manager. Dr. Mitchell decided to bring Jerome in early based on where we were at in the RFP committee relative to not coming to a consensus on a final decision. It was part of Gartner's final report that JJC hire Jerome. Trustee Lee asked if the reboot happened after we hired Jerome Goudelock. Jim Serr answered yes.

Jerome said the sequence was that there was one part that report which talked about hiring a program manager. The assessment summary where Gartner then looked at the readiness for JJC to move forward and identified certain areas. Jerome was asked to work critical areas that needed to be brought up to date prior to JJC moving forward and making a final decision.

Trustee Lee asked to explain the governance model. Jerome Goudelock answered that the governance model talks about the issues and how JJC runs the project. For example, what are all of the elements, all of the pieces that are part of a project and functional team. JJC would have someone from Financial Aid and the Student Financial area who were leads. The leads are the people responsible for the decisions. Trustee Lee asked if the governance model was built before JJC had chosen a system. Jerome responded that JJC built the governance model prior to selecting the system. Once JJC found the system, JJC would then have a governance model to be able to implement that system. If JJC ran into problems and issues, JJC would know how those issue would be handled and how to get the issues escalated through the proper channels.

Trustee Lee asked what is the business process. Jerome said the business process was to help certain areas document their current business processes. Regardless of which software was chosen, understanding your own business processes and how you currently do things, help that process move along faster. Trustee Lee asked why on the governance model it has a Workday manager. If JJC had not chosen Workday as a system yet, why was Workday on the governance model as if JJC was going to choose that system before the board had ever made the decision. Jerome responded that the document Trustee Lee is looking at is a snapshot of what a governance model looks like. Originally there was a framework and then as we moved forward, we filled in the blanks with the roles and people. Trustee Lee stated that she thought having Workday on the governance model created a bias and if this was just a snapshot of a governance model, why is Workday listed. Trustee Lee felt that it tells her that Jerome, who was chosen to help JJC choose a system, was biased from the beginning for Workday if it was added into that snapshot. Trustee Lee said if JJC still didn't choose a system and had not even got to the final tally, and yet, on the governance model, there's a Workday manager. JJC hired Jerome Goudelock to help JJC choose the best system, and I feel like you, Jerome, were biased very early on. Jerome said he understand the confusion. The snapshot was built after JJC had selected a vendor. The model is to depict what a model looks like and would be easier for people to understand the who, the what and the why. Trustee Lee said she wanted to see the governance model of what Jerome originally created to help JJC make these decisions, not the snapshot of the governance model from after the choice was made. Trustee Lee said she sees a red flag because Workday is on the governance model before JJC ever chose it.

Trustee Lee said her next issue with this whole process, is the fact that JJC started off with 584 key things that JJC needed for this system to work. And then when Jerome came in, JJC did a reboot and now JJC had 1,375 key things. Those original 584 were clearly the key things that JJC needed. Everything else, it didn't matter. In her opinion,

everything should have been based on the 584 key functionalities that JJC needed the system to do.

Trustee Lee said on the Gartner report, I don't even see Campus Management on it. Why was it not assessed. Jim Serr responded that is not the Gartner readiness report. That's the market guide for Higher Ed Student Information Systems. Trustee Lee asked why Campus Management was not assessed. Jim Serr responded that the data he provided is 2022 and Campus Management, six months after we made our decision, became Anthology. Trustee Lee said she doesn't see Anthology on the report. Trustee Lee said she would like Anthology to have a been assessed with the other companies that we were assessing in order to have a fair shot at looking at other systems.

Trustee Lee said she wanted talk about the whole grading system of the specifications. It was said Gartner was the one who recommended that JJC use one of the grading systems where they recommended high, medium and low scoring. Trustee Lee asked how the 1,375 key things were weighted because there was only a $15.00 or $19.00 difference in the two systems. For a $19.00 difference, JJC chose a system that was cheaper. Jerome Goudelock responded that there were 1,375 specifications and each one of those were identified by JJC. For each one, they allocated the importance of each. The most important would get ten points down to zero points. That was not anything that was shared outside of JJC. It was internal. That information, then would go out to the vendors for them to respond to their ability to provide the specifications. Based on those specifications, they were ranked based on the weighting that JJC had given them to provide the score for that particular specification. The vendor said either our software provides this out-of-the-box or the software does not provide that out-of-the-box but the vendor could configure it to do that, or it could be customize. There is a configuration where you open the system and you basically check certain things that you want. A customization is where code needs to be written to actually have the system do what it is you need. It is a little more work and a little more time when you do a customization. The last one is that the system just does not do that. All of those answers then were included into the contract that the vendor was answering these specifications correctly and if they didn't answer those correctly, JJC could go back the contract if there was an issue. Trustee Lee said she would like to see how the vendors questions were graded.

Trustee Budzinski asked how much weight was given to the financial statements of each of these firms. Jerome Gouldelock answered that it was winner take all of 420 points for each one of the five areas. Trustee Budzinski asked who interpreted the financial statements. Jerome answered that it was done by the CFO and the finance areas of JJC. Trustee Budzinski said looking at the financial statements of the two firm's liabilities, Workday had a lower liability. Trustee Budzinski asked how would that have been scored and what does liability of a company have to do with anything. The vendor could have gone out and bought a brand-new building or had a $200 million facility built that isn't generating revenue yet, but they are going to be penalize in this matrix for having a liability that the other firm doesn't have. The balance sheet was of two unequal companies. One dealt strictly with college and campuses with fixed budgets comparing it to a firm that deals with corporate America which has a much broader range of dollars to play with. Trustee Budzinski said these two worksheets bother him because if they were used in any way to determine the strength of either of those two companies or the solutions. Trustee Budzinski said to him, there is no value add to looking at any of these financial statements. The only thing JJC should have

looked at on a financial statement is, does this company seem viable to still be producing or supporting JJC in ten years? That's it. JJC shouldn't care if they bought a building and have a liability. JJC doesn't care if they charge corporate America more than they charge a college. JJC just hopes that we get the best price available. Trustee Budzinski said to him there was no value add in that portion of it.

Trustee Budzinski asked if Indian River College was live in all phases of functionality when they were used as a reference. Jim Serr responded that they were fully live on HR, Finance and Student at that time. Trustee Budzinski asked if Student phase two was functional. Jim Serr responded yes. Trustee Budzinski asked if JJC ever saw Student phase two working on any campus. Jim Serr responded that he did not remember the state of their financial aid at the time. Trustee Budzinski asked if the Student Aid portion of Workday was tested. Jim Serr responded he could not recall back in 2019 what the state of Indian River's Financial Aid was at that time. Jim Budzinski asked if JJC didn't know it wasn't working for them. Jim Serr responded he would need to go back and try to find the videos of calls to take a look. Jim Budzinski asked if JJC had any other references where all phases were tested and functional at a campus. Jim Serr responded that there are other colleges on Workday that are running all three phases – HR, Finance and full Student with Financial Aid. Trustee Budzinski asked if they have the problems JJC has. Jim Serr said JJC would be the first Workday school in Illinois on the Financial Aid component. The other schools that are running Financial Aid are outside of Illinois. We have conferred with some of those over the course of the implementation and gained insight from them as well. There are schools that are fully functional on Student, including Financial Aid. Trustee Budzinski asked if they are running with the live updates. Jim Serr responded yes. Trustee Budzinski asked why JJC doesn't have that implementation working. Jim Serr responded JJC's requirements on Financial Aid are the four blockers that JJC has and came to a collective decision late last year to developed three strategies. 1) would be the 12-month extension; 2) is to go live on time and add additional human resources and staff to support the go live; and 3) is to have a longer term until Workday can deliver all the functionality that JJC needs. Those are the blockers that are on financial aid and some of the other things that we've talked about that has prevented us from going live at this time.

Trustee Budzinski asked when did JJC know there were issues with Student phase two. Jerome Gouldelock responded the first notice was from financial aid was July of last year. He started the process of understanding if there were other options that JJC could take in order to come up with workarounds working with AVAAP to determine what those workarounds could be and then documenting those workarounds then going back to JJC to find that those were not acceptable at the time. The next step was to go to the Spire process which is the escalation process through Workday to request a fix for these four blockers that JJC sent to Workday. Trustee Budzinski asked when did JJC initiate the Spire process. Jerome responded they were created in September.

Trustee Budzinski asked if JJC recognized a problem in July, why did we not go to the vendor until September. Why was JJC trying to come up with the workaround on our own when we're not writers of the software. Jerome Goudelock responded that they were working with the implementation partner, AVAAP, who also works with Workday. It's not that we were waiting. We were trying to find solutions. There is a lot of issues that come up on a day-to-day basis that we were trying to find solutions to move forward.

6

Trustee Budzinski asked if when JJC came across a blocker, why is it two months before we go back to the software writers with a problem that isn't working. I understand looking for a workaround, we have to do the business of the college. However, why do we wait two months to go back to a vendor for a solution that isn't working and why is it the expectation that when we have a failed solution for us on campus to come up with the workaround. Jerome responded that in some cases, it's not just the workaround. It is, can we change the business process taking into account all of the different variables that are going into it to come up with a solution. Some of these solutions are communications we can put in to change management activities where we educate people on the process. There are ways of creating reports or customizing or configuring the system. Each one of those needs to go through those steps for us to then determine or exhaust the process to show we have done everything we can with our implementation vendor and then go to Workday as a next step.

Trustee Budzinski said he is still struggling with why we didn't go back to the vendor. Why does JJC have to jump through a whole process to then have to go back and say we're paying for this. It doesn't work. That's still a struggle for me on all aspects. I wrote software for seven years for a major company. I have an idea on how this works. I don't think we need to wait two months to solve a problem to then go back to the vendor. Jim Serr responded he didn't think JJC waited two months and there were regular cadence weekly meetings where these issues came up on a regular basis. There were weekly project management meetings that Workday participated in as well as the implementation partner. Issues were identified immediately and conversations began immediately on resolutions working directly with our implementation partner. Workday is very integrated from a delivery assurance standpoint. They know what the issues are. They know what we're working on. They're helping us coming up with workarounds. They are talking to other customers and colleges that have gone through similar things and providing guidance all the way throughout. Jim Serr said he didn't think JJC waited two months at all. These conversations were happening regularly. In fact, we came to the August board meeting where Jerome did a presentation to the board where it was highlighted with some of those issues in that presentation. There were regular conversations. We were taking initiative. We were taking action, making sure it was being escalated appropriately. Workday has a very formalized process for Spires and how they get submitted and approved. We were very much involved in that from minute one. Jim Serr said he did want to give his perspective on Campus Management. One of the big concerns that he had was about their long-term viability was their debt ratio was 96%. They are a highly leveraged company, a $100 million company at the time with net income of about one million dollars but the debt ratio was 96%. He was very much concerned about their long-term viability as a company. Once JJC made their decision, within six months, Anthology acquired the assets of Campus Management.

Trustee Budzinski said going back to the Spire created in September, was there any response. When JJC creates an action request for software, does Workday respond to it. Does JJC get a timeline. Does JJC get a critical status on it. Does JJC have a response from Workday. Are they even working on it as the writer of the software or accepted it as a problem to work on or is it just this is how it works. Software out-of-the-box was mentioned. This did not work out-of-the-box. Do we have a list of all the things Workday came back to us with and said no, these do not work out-of-the-box. Jerome

Goudelock responded yes. Those were part of the specifications that have been looked at and are subsequent to the discussions we've been having here. Trustee Budzinski asked if JJC went through them prior to choosing a vendor. Jerome responded yes.

Trustee Morales said thank you so much for the presentation and this opportunity to ask questions. At the previous board meeting, Dr. Namuo mentioned that our governor is increasing the Monetary Award Program, the MAP grant for the state of Illinois, which means that there definitely are high need families out there that need these grants. Everything starts in Financial Aid. A student can register for 12 or 15 credit hours, but if they don't receive the grant, and they are a high need student, they have financial needs, they do not receive that Pell or MAP grant or that scholarship, they can kiss away the registration part of the process because everything starts with finances. We all have to make decisions on whether or not we can pay for things. JJC needs a system that can track when students add or drop classes or when JJC needs to refund money back to either the student or to the state. The student is going to be successful only if they are going to stay and continue only if they can afford it. If we don't have a system that is ready or not student focused, then JJC is not focused on the success of our students. When JJC was initially bringing in different vendors, I was very concerned about the cost because this was a huge investment. I attended meetings in person to make sure that staff was represented and that they were asking questions. I specifically sat in the Financial Aid meeting because that was who I worked with side by side. These people asked a lot of great questions and they were made assurances that everything was going to work out. And it hasn't. I wasn't trying to micromanage the college. I was simply there to make sure that we had a process and that everybody's voice was heard. And now, needless to say, I am very disappointed that we're even having to have these discussions. The trustees are here as stewards of the people that elected us to manage the budget. We need some solid answers. The system is not meeting our needs.

Jim Serr asked if Jerome Goudelock could say a few words on the Financial Aid functionality. Jerome said per our Financial Aid team, it's been very clear that they had concerns with where and what the system could do and the workarounds. Although we had workarounds that we could implement, there were still concerns that would potentially create other issues. The option two request was to essentially give JJC a year to look for a third-party or point system for financial aid. The Student Development and the Financial Aid teams have gone out and started looking at some of the best Financial Aid systems. We are hoping to take the time to see if a third-party system would work for JJC and if not, give us the time to then make sure that we could put in manual processes and also work to continue working with Workday to find solutions to the problems that JJC has.

Trustee Broderick said when she was at a conference, she talked to a lot of people about Workday and she wanted to make sure that the statements that she heard from Jim Serr are Jerome Gouldelock are correct. She said that Indian River said they did not go live with Student and they are very remiss in the situation. Indian River decided not to be considered a referral for the system. There were two referrals that Janice Reedus confirmed that both said the Student side was not working at all. She did not know why JJC went forward with it. All you did was come out with a negative towards Campus Management. Trustee Broderick asked to give the trustees the reasons. If Workday got two negative referrals, why did JJC go with Workday. She said she went to the direct person that took the referrals and did the responses for the referrals. She asked did you

8

not know that there were two negative referrals in the research that was done for Workday?

Jim Serr responded he was in the meeting with Indian River State College. He said he thought Indian River was very honest with the committee and doesn't remember that experience being negative.

Trustee Broderick said that Janice Reedus said the two referrals that were given did not include Student. Jim Serr responded that Indian River was using Student at that time. Trustee Broderick responded she was told they were not. In the ERP, it says 95% of it is focused on Student. What was the reason for going to an ERP. Trustee Broderick asked what was the main focus that identified going to a new system. Was it HR. Was it Finance. Was it Student.

Jim Serr responded that campus conversations on this topic started back in 2015. Two main factors for those conversations were 1) a $2.1 million Title 3 Grant. There was a lot of conversations happening across the college about the struggle to get data out of our systems; and 2) The other thing that was going on was the 2016 - 2019 strategic plan. It was very much focused on improving access to data and improving JJC's systems as part of the strategic plan.

Trustee Broderick asked what generated JJC to go to a new ERP. Was it the Student block. Was it the HR block or the Finance. If the RFP is showing 95% student need, why did we not look at the Student part. Jim Serr responded that it was all three of those components. JJC was looking to have all that in one ERP system. At the time, cloud solutions and point solutions were emerging in the marketplace. JJC was starting to have to acquire more point solutions and third-party solutions that lived in the cloud and connect them back to Ellucian which was starting to become an outdated technology. The environment was getting more costly, more complex and more difficult to find staff and resources to support that technology and a lack of a clear direction on where Ellucian was going to modernize the system. JJC asked in the RFP for all three components - HR, Finance and Student. Being in higher education, serving our students is the most important thing that we do here at the college.

Trustee Broderick said in the ERP, every page of it reflects the Student module. That was the key component why it seemed to be moving from Ellucian to a new ERP system. Did you throw out Ellucian due to the fact that it didn't have a road map. Jim Serr responded he did not throw out Ellucian. It was a committee decision to not move Ellucian forward based on their presentation and proposal.

Trustee Broderick responded she understands that there was nothing that was concrete in Workday's proposal for the Student module. Is that correct. Jim Serr said that was not true. Jim Serr responded that Workday responded to the proposal and met JJC's requirements. Workday answered the 1,375 requirements and told us exactly what they could do, what they couldn't do, what was coming in the future product development around all three elements - HR, Finance and Student.

Trustee Broderick asked why JJC didn't put the Student module in first. Anthology and Ellucian said the first module they would put in would be the Student module. If we don't have a product to meet the needs for our students, we're not meeting our needs for them. HR didn't need it. Payroll didn't need it. Everybody else said to me at the national seminar said that you put the Student piece in first. JJC could have backed out

if the Student piece didn't work. We're stuck with this thing for 15 million. I'm really upset because I have talked to so many community colleges at the legislative meeting and a lot of colleges out there that are having problems.

Jim Serr responded that Workday's methodology is to implement HR and Finance first because it is core to a lot of the elements that need to be connected to the Student system. That is their methodology for implementation. Trustee Broderick said that is the methodology that you accepted and the committee accepted and it was a poor decision.

Trustee Broderick then asked Jerome Goudelock if he had a certification in Workday, Ellucian or Campus Management which is now Anthology. Jerome Goudelock responded no. He has a program manager certificate. Once JJC selected Workday, as program manager, he had to take a Workday test to then be able to get access to start as part of the project management team. Trustee Broderick asked if he had that before or after JJC hired him. Jerome responded he did not have it before. Trustee Broderick said in looking at your resume, I don't see any higher education and I don't see any Workday implementation in higher education. Jerome responded his resume showed Sync Solutions which had higher education. Trustee Broderick responded that City Colleges of Chicago was old. It was in 2016 when you were with PeopleSoft, which is now Oracle. I'm not seeing any Workday implementation. Jerome responded that he was not hired for Workday. He was hired to be a program manager to implement the solution that JJC selected.

Trustee Broderick asked Jerome did you recommend Workday to JJC. Jerome responded no, I did not. Workday was selected as a result of the specifications. He presented the specification and the outcome.

Dr. Farmer said she just wanted to take a moment because she recognized that Vice Chair Broderick is upset. She said we talked about the importance of being respectful to each other and she understands that Trustee Broderick is very passionate about this particular topic. Dr. Farmer asked Trustee Broderick to be respectful in her tone and in her delivery, because she wants to make sure that Jim and Jerome clearly understand her questions and when she gets worked up and frustrated, sometimes the questions are not very clear.

Trustee Broderick said that in 2019, five of the current board members approved Workday. We went by trust. Now that I am looking at credentials and I'm sorry, Jerome, JJC is paying you a lot of money. I don't see the background for Workday. You got it afterwards and I'm looking for that to see where you came in to help JJC work with Workday. In my life, we have to have people that are experienced before we can hire them.

Trustee Broderick asked how does Workday's consumer customer base break down by segment, four-year, two-year or four-year private colleges. How many two-year public colleges are live on Student and Financial Aid system. Fully live with every bit of it. Jim Serr responded if he needed to provide further breakdown of each segment, he would have to do that as a follow up as he does not have that information.

Trustee Broderick said committing to and implementing are two different things. Are there schools declaring themselves live on the Student Information System with just a sliver of admissions functionality and a part of registration. Trustee Broderick said that

Jim Serr deemed Workday a success. We are sure there are other schools in the same boat where they have to say that they are live, but really are not. Indian River is an example of that. I spoke to them. I'm asking you to be specific with the board because success does not mean one module. It means full implementation of the whole product. Systems built into modules have certain components. If the components passes then it's a pass. It's not a success. If they fail, that's a pass or a fail that's used. When you get to each of the modules and you complete all of the implementation, then the implementation is a success. Many schools have stopped their implementation after Finance and HR for two reasons. One, the staff is exhausted and two, there's no complete SIS (student information system) but several have gone out to RFP for an SIS. Ohio State is probably the most visible of the Workday customers to stop the implementation. Do we have any opportunities to go back out for an RFP for a student section?

Jim Serr said his response to that would be that the board approved the IV&V (Independent Verification & Validation) this evening and he would expect that as part of that engagement that they could offer an opinion on that topic to the board. Jim said his own perspective and opinion on that topic is that it would be exponentially more costly and more disruptive.

Trustee Broderick said JJC has already incurred additional costs for Ellucian and AVAAP. How do you equivocate saying that would have been more expensive to go out for another system because this current system doesn't have it. Jim Serr responded that JJC has not incurred any additional cost with AVAAP. All the costs, so far, have been approved by the board and the contracts that have been presented at this point. Trustee Broderick said there are additional costs because Workday was not completed in the timeframe it should have been. There will be additional costs from AVAAP, who's contract expires in September 2023. Does the board want to move forward to approve the extension of doing something with AVAAP that's almost 1.9 million when it is Workday that's caused the delays or do I blame JJC. The cost of Ellusion still on premise and AAVAP are additional costs that need to be added which makes Workday much more expensive then Campus Management, now Anthology, would have been.

Trustee Mahalik asked what the additional workaround are costing for everything that Workday is not capable to do. What are the additional costs for all other software needed in order to fill the gaps and holes for Workday. Jim Serr responded that what has been presented as far as the options relative to those four Spire cases, option one was approximately $600,000. That was just one of the options considered. Trustee Mahalik asked if there any additional cost at this moment. Jim Serr responded no. Trustee Mahalik then asked if Workday will be successful for JJC at some point. Jim Serr responded his personal opinion was that he does feel that Workday will continue to ramp up the pace of their product development. They certainly have heard and understand the concerns and the gaps on the Student product side, especially with some of the issues that JJC is having. JJC is not alone as a college with some of those issues and concerns. Workday is paying attention and listening. Workday is taking action in hiring additional product developers to help continue to move the development of the Student system along. JJC is getting ready for the fourth major release of the Workday platform in March and on average Workday is delivering 350 new updates to the Student system as part of those major releases. Jim Serr said he does think that the product will continue to evolve at a faster pace and that Workday will continue to work to shore up the gaps that exist. Jim Ser said he thinks at some point that Workday will

exceed JJC's demand for functionality in the Student product. JJC is early. There are 32 higher education customers live on the Student system. Workday has 100 colleges committed to the Student platform as well. Workday is winning a lot of the new deals. Jim Serr said that 78% of the new cloud focus deals, Workday is winning those deals. I think we will see more investment at a faster pace. And I think ultimately that we can call the entire program successful and not just the individual modules that JJC has gone live with at this point. I want to qualify that by saying that's just my informed opinion at this time based on what I know is happening in the marketplace.

Trustee Mahalik said the one thing that we keep on going back to is JJC said in the beginning it wanted an all in one system and obviously this is not all in one system. Workday doesn't reimburse us for the workarounds. It is very disappointing and again I apologize to the campus community if we chose this based on price rather than functionality.

Student Trustee Stamborski said he wanted to clarify the reason he went over the acronyms is because not only are we talking to each other but we're also talking to the people in the audience. We're letting them know what's going on and people that are watching the stream. He wanted to make it absolutely clear, build from the ground up, what we all agree on at this point and then move our way up to get to the disagreement. Keeping everybody on the same page was the goal of bringing up the SIS and the acronyms. This is not an all in one system. Student Trustee Stamborski asked when the committee was meeting, was there any pretense that this was a finished product. There was the HR portion, the Student portion, and the Financial portion. Did JJC think that it was a finished product at the time?

Jim Serr responded that there is no perfect system. There is no all in one system. We've talked a lot here about point solutions and third-party applications. There is no perfect system whether it's Workday, Ellucian or Anthology or a range of others that might be out there. There isn't a perfect system. The committee was very aware and I think the college community was aware of that because JJC had gone through a range of demonstrations by the vendors. The committee was aware at the time of where the Workday Student product was at. There was a lot of good dialogue, discussions and debate on that topic at that time. We kind of knew what the state of the maturity was. We knew that the Student module of Workday was their newest piece of their enterprise resource planning or ERP system. At that time, we felt in 2019, ahead of making that decision, by the time JJC went live three years down the road, that it would be a much different, more fully featured student system than what we saw back in 2019.

Student Trustee Stambroski asked if JJC bought a promise because that is what he is hearing, that JJC bought a promise and his understanding is most of the stuff isn't in the road map that we wanted it to be. My understanding is, we bought into a promise and there's no contractual obligation for them to give us any compensation back for unfulfilled services that we expected. Is that what occurred. Jim Serr responded that out of the 1,375 requirements, JJC is down to a very small percentage. Jim Serr said he would disagree on the comment that JJC bought a promise.

Student Trustee Stamborski said in terms of the operational capacity of the college, if we were to try and move forward with the system, it stops us. If the understanding was that this would be a finished product and operational by that time, I would say that we

12

did buy a promise. Do you understand where I'm coming from. Jim Serr responded he understood the statement.

Student Trustee Stamborski said of the blockers that were identified, did that play into the committee's decision to come to this conclusion, to go with Workday. I would imagine that some of these blockers were a lot bigger than others and they were probably identified pretty early on. How did the committee deal with these big issue/big ticket blockers.

Jerome Gouldelock responded he wanted to clarify the committee. There was the RFP committee which was done and JJC was in implementation. We are talking the functional leads or the subject matter experts from each area, when you speak of the committee at this point in time. We find these issues and they are identified as RAIDQ items. RAIDQ, meaning (risk, action items, issues, decisions and questions). We are trying to track all of those as they're coming in and then we start working on prioritizing those with our vendor to determine if they are show stoppers, or are there workarounds. In some cases, we are able to come up with a good solution. For example, residency. Is a person a resident within the district or out of the district. That is something that our implementation vendor AVAAP was able to create a workaround for JJC and make an automated process. We go through those stages to find if there are things that we can do to implement and automate the system. For those that don't, those are the ones we start an escalation process. That is the escalation process that we go through to make sure that everything's being documented and going through the right steps. The cases are being issued and we are following those cases to get a response from Workday. In this case, Workday came and gave a presentation and their feedback on each one of those.

Student Trustee Stamborski asked if there were some blockers that were identified early in the process. Did we plan out point solutions or third parties and did JJC plan that out in advance knowing some of it wasn't going be here and we understand that so we partnered with third parties. Jerome Goudelock answered yes. One that occurred was Nelnet for the cashiering side of the house. That is one of those point solutions we were aware of early on and we actually went through another formal RFP process to find a solution for that. And Nelnet was chosen as a separate RFP solution that was delivered.

Trustee Lee asked if Jim Serr and Jerome Goudelock could explain the magic quadrant for cloud HCM suites for 1,000 plus employee enterprise from Gartner. What is it. Jim Serr explained that the Magic Quadrant report is for enterprises with 1,000 plus employees and it is not a higher education specific document. Trustee Lee asked what was this document used for. Jim Serr responded that the document was not used for anything. It was provided as an example of a Magic Quadrant document based on Trustee Broderick's reference at the last couple of meetings. There was another comprehensive Gartner document that is the ERP readiness assessment

Trustee Lee said she would like to reiterate that the whole point of JJC doing the ERP was so that JJC would have one cohesive system and wouldn't have a bunch of third-party applications. The reason that JJC was moving to another system was so JJC had everything all inclusive. Jim Serr responded that the desire of the committee at the time, set a guiding principle to have as much in one ERP system as we possibly could around HR, Finance and Student.

Trustee Lee said that there was a board presentation in 2019, when she was not on the board, that showed that the reason that JJC was going to a new ERP stating that the new ERP purpose was to streamline everything and not have third party vendors. The document says a third-party implementation partners performs approximately 80% of Workday HCM deployments. That's just for one section, they had over 80% that was needed for implementation partners. This is on the Gartner report. Trustee Lee then read from the report that said HCM is available, hosted in a public cloud managed by Workday or in a public cloud managed by an AWS. The latter is a recent approach and currently represents only a small percentage of customers. Workday supports API technology with graph QL API technology expected to be supported in 2023. This is a promise. A third-party implementation partner performs approximately 80% of Workday HCM deployments. Even if this was only for a part of Workday, Workday clearly was at 80% needing a third-party implementation. Jim Serr asked to clarify her statement. Jim said what that statement means is that Workday leverages an implementation partner network to do their installs of the software. That's what the statement means. AVAAP is a certified Workday implementation partner.

Trustee Lee said that, AVAAP who we have had to hire other people to help, because they don't answer us quickly enough. JJC's security levels of 1-2, severity levels of 1,2,3 & 4 they are supposed to have a rebound time of getting back to JJC in 30 minutes to an hour to four hours for different relatable things. Jim Serr said that is Workday and not AVAAP.

Trustee Lee said the cautions on the report state Workday does not deliver outsourcing services as part of Benefits Administration, leading clients to engage third-party service providers for such services. Furthermore, Gartner has observed less evidence of investment and benefits administration when compared with other leading vendors. For total operating cost and value, Workday remains one of the most expensive options in the market for cloud HCM suites. Furthermore, to unlock certain values such as reporting analytics, workforce planning or employee experience, additional modules must be purchased. How many modules did JJC purchase. That should be added to the budget if JJC had to purchase other modules. This makes Workday an expensive option, one that not everyone will want to pay for. We knew that Workday was expensive. Gartner even told us that Workday was expensive, yet when it was presented to the board, it was presented as it was not going to be one of the expensive options. And now you have come back to the board needing more money, which is why we are here talking about the whole subject. And so basically what it's coming down to is, do we dump more money into a system that may never work for JJC because it may never do what JJC needs it to do for Financial Aid. That is why we are here today. We really hope that it works in the future. The bottom line is, we bought a promise and we have no contractual way to hold Workday to make sure that this system ends up working for what JJC needs it to do for Financial Aid or for Students. The system is not working for everything JJC needs it to, and it sounds like from every information that I've read, we knew that.

Trustee Morales said Financial Aid is a whole separate beast in and of itself. It is very difficult to keep up with all of the changes from the Department of Education. Earlier, Jerome mentioned you had to look at processes. You need an expert that knows and understands the needs of the Financial Aid department and Workday has to be able to meet these needs and be flexible to accommodate any changes that come. If the student can't pay, we don't have students. If we don't have students, we don't need

anything else. We don't need a software system. It has to be able to accommodate the Financial Aid system. From the packaging of grants, tiering these grants and scholarships and loans, subsidized, unsubsidized, to when students drop classes and add classes. This should have been one of the first areas considered. I think people knew that the Financial Aid needs were not going to be met. The Finance department is different from Financial Aid or the Human Resource department or even Registration.

Jim Serr responded that JJC has a phenomenal Financial Aid team and we have a phenomenal director of Financial Aid who has been instrumental in unit testing and end to end testing and documenting these issues in a ton of details. They have done an incredible job of testing the system, providing input, identifying issues, escalating all of those things. I think the college should feel great that they have the expertise in the Financial Aid department.

Trustee Broderick said she has been speaking with many of the people on the committee when Jim Serr was the co-chair. She said you (Jim Serr) sold Workday as an all in one system to the committee, did you not? Jim Serr responded he did not sell anything to the committee. He was one member of a 20ish person committee. Trustee Broderick said according to the committee, they said that you sold it to them as one system. That was your position on Workday saying that it was a perfect system then and it's not now, really, is hypocritical. Jim Serr responded that he didn't say it was a perfect system then and his is not saying it's a perfect system now.

Trustee Broderick said when you came to the board, you (Jim Serr) told us we needed one system and this was going to be the magic system that was going to make it better than Ellucian. Jim Serr said that was the goal and was the guiding principles that the committee developed in the RFP at that time. In his presentations to the Board of Trustees at that time, he did not make a recommendation for Workday. We were going through a process of evaluation at that time.

Trustee Broderick said when it came to the selection, you (Jim Serr) made a commitment to the board, that this was the exact company, the true resource that we needed. I'm saying that is my statement. I'm looking at Workday information that you provided to us that says it has got an SLA of 24/7/365, Workday doesn't do it. Then I asked what is the SLA for AVAAP and Navistar. There's no SLA based service. And I understand we have something that's outstanding since October that hasn't been rectified. In my mind, if we didn't have something written into the agreement, we should never have done any business with them. SLA is important. Your people need to know how soon they're going to get a response back.

Dr. Farmer said Vice Chair you did a very fine job of documenting the questions and we responded to them. I'm recommend that we stay focused to the questions.

Jim Serr responded that the support JJC gets from Workday from the technology and the solution is 24 by 7 by 365. Those issues are identified by severity level and each of those severity levels has a response time as low as 30 minutes. That is Workday on the technology and the platform. AVAAP is a post go live consultative support service. It is not SLA based. It is based on JJC's configuration of Workday. JJC submits tickets or cases to AVAAP and each of those cases are evaluated for what needs to happen and then AVAAP commits to the amount of time to configure a new business process and

fix the issue based on the problem. It could be an hour response time, it could be eight hours, it could be multiple days depending on what the nature of the case is.

Trustee Broderick said JJC has one that's out for four months. That's unacceptable to me. Absolutely unacceptable. Jim Serr responded that we have addressed many of those cases that have been submitted that have fallen outside of a reasonable time frame based on JJC's needs. We've addressed those directly with AVAAP personnel. Trustee Broderick asked why didn't you bring those back to us to know about it? We are supposed to be approving in January the extension of AVAAP. At this point, I want nothing to do with AVAAP, because if they are sluggish in responding to our needs, they don't meet our needs.

Trustee Broderick said using a third party like Ferrilli, or CampusWorks would have ensured the process and be reflected of the school's requirements and institutional goals. It would also have ensured a decision matrix that was proven and balanced. If JJC had only surveyed our peers of colleges with over 10K enrollment, I think we would have had knowledge from those two companies that are aces and are certified in Workday, Ellucian and Anthology. They could have shown us the best things to look at and developed a good RFP. My position is, that the RFP was not a good and true RFP. I think that we kept Workday in when Workday should have been thrown out because it did not have the Student Financial needs. Can Workday handle the four-week interim session and dual credit. Jim (Serr), you answered yes when speaking to the chair. However, apparently, you are too busy with Workday for this to be put into place and we're losing enrollment because of it. I don't understand why, if you said yes, why aren't you having somebody working on the four-week interim where we could have more enrollment.

Jerome Goudelock responded the module is not live at this point in time. If you go back to the schedule, JJC would not really be live with the entire system until later this year which was the original plan. The question is, can Workday handle four-week interim sessions and dual credit and the answer is yes if those sessions fall within the ICCB semester. There are some discussions that are happening where there are courses that may go across semesters. If they are within the semester, the answer is yes.

Trustee Broderick asked why do we have the excuse that we are too busy with Workday to work on enrollment issues. Jerome Goudelock responded when you say too busy on Workday, it is not a Workday related issue. It may be related to the current system. Trustee Broderick said it is a Workday issue because we are too swamped with Workday and we don't have enough support from AVAAP. JJC needs enrollments which is our key issue. That is why we are all here. Why is it not implemented if it's an IT issue. We are following the ICCB mandated semesters. Jim Serr responded we are not live on Workday. We can't implement this functionality and Workday without implementing the rest of the Student system. Trustee Broderick you should have not said yes. I would have liked to have known that we weren't ready to go because Workday wasn't ready.

Trustee Broderick said typical SAS agreements are five or seven years with ten as an exception in rare cases. This duration is so vendor favorable, they typically make concessions in order to secure the long term. Don't we believe that an annual escalator is 7 to 10% in higher education unless we're on a one-year agreement. We are not on a one-year agreement. Typical escalators are 2 to 4% or less depending on the duration of

the initial term. Why did JJC go out so long and what are the escalations going be in year 11. Jerome Goudelock said this was based on what JJC was looking at through this process. We were looking at the useful life of the software. That's where the 10 years came from. Trustee Broderick said that she is listening and talking to other vendors. They are telling me it should be three to five years, no more than seven. We went 10. Was the methodology of going ten based on your decision or the committee's decision. Who made the decision to go for 10 years. Jerome Goudelock said it was based on the information from a Gartner document on the recommendation of useful life.

Trustee Broderick said CampusWorks or Ferrilli are two experts. Why didn't we look at talking to them instead of this one. Jerome Goudelock answered that he could not answer that question. He was asked to follow the Gartner recommendations and implement those recommendations. Trustee Broderick said as the project manager, would you not have brought in Ferrilli or CampusWorks. Jerome Gouldelock responded that would not have been his job.

Trustee Broderick asked if it would have been Jim Serr's or the committees' job. Jim Serr responded that it was not under consideration at that time. The reason why JJC went to 10 years is we wanted to fix that cost for as long as we possibly could and negotiate aggressively with Workday, which we did for that 10-year period. We wanted a cost certainty for the college over a longer period of time for an ERP investment. Although Gartner's best practice is a 10-year useful life. JJC was on Ellucian for 34 years. This is a 20-25-year investment and commitment at a minimum.

Trustee Broderick said most public institutions process is to purposely separate the functional requirement evaluation from the cost evaluation. They select a preferred vendor based on functional fit and commence with price negotiation. This seems to be a very common practice. If JJC did not contract for Student with Workday, then what was the cost considered in the final rubric. Were the fees considered apples to apples and when was the second rubric developed. Was it the same questions that were asked and was it prior to the start of the process or was this after the survey results and fees and form were collected on the first. At what stage in the process was the decision rubric developed and by whom. Was the model from another college, Gartner or another industry consultant. How were the questions formed and determined to make the rubric. Jerome Goudelock responded they had the questions again and expanded the questions from the 500 plus to the 1,300.

Trustee Broderick said rubric one had 500 questions. Rubric two had 1,300 questions. Based on the point system, it was what determined the cost factor. Rubric one had Campus Management in first place. Rubric two had Workday in first position. That's where the point system came in for the cost evaluation, not for functionality, for cost and it was based on the points of rubric two versus rubric one. Jerome Goudelock responded in rubric one, the 500 questions were part of the RFP process when the RFP went out. Rubric two, the 1,300 points was part of the specifications that we set out to the vendors to respond to. They are two separate things. When you look at the points, the 1,300 points was the first scoring. The second piece was then the financial ratios. That was when the two came together with the total points.

Trustee Broderick asked did rubric one support Campus Management. Jerome Goudelock responded that rubric one with the 500 questions was part of the RFP and did not go through the same process that he went through with the 1,300, which was

inclusive of the 500. We built upon the 500 to build the 1,350. Both vendors received the exact same questions on the same date.

Trustee Broderick asked if Campus Management did not answer enough or did Workday answered more. Jerome Gouldelock responded that both answered the question either yes, we can do it out-of-the-box or it's a configuration or a customization. And if so, how long. Depending on the answers, we looked at the weighting that each of the functional areas gave each one of those specifications and that weighting along with their answer is how the point was created.

Trustee Broderick asked if it was based on functionality or did you base it on cost. Jerome Goudelock said the specifications are all based on functionality. While that was going on, negotiations were going on with both vendors to ask them for a 10-year cost. Both vendors were asked to give their best and final offer. That was a process that was going on in parallel as we were grading and scoring that information. Once we receive that best and final offer from each vendor, that number is what we then use to divide into the points to come up with the price per point.

Trustee Broderick asked if Campus Management was in first position at any time with the rubrics. Jerome Gouldelock responded if you think of it as a formula, we took all the pieces and then use the formula to divide that price into the total points. That is how we came up with the end result. If you look at it from a specification perspective that is where you would have seen that one vendor higher than Workday based on specifications.

Trustee Broderick asked why didn't JJC consider going back and talking to Campus Management about the costs if they had the functionality. We know Workday did not have the functionality in the Student portion. Jerome Goudelock responded that he can not speak to that piece of it. I know that there were discussions and negotiations on price going on. The price information was then taken into account for the rubric. The rubric, the specifications with the ratios divided into the cost was the process.

Trustee Broderick asked who developed the questions for the rubric. Jerome responded that the specifications were created by the functional team. Each functional area, whether it was Procurement, Expense or Financial Aid, each created their own. Trustee Broderick asked if they got to see the results of this. Jerome responded yes, those results were then sent back out.

Dr. Namuo said that we have heard a lot today and all of your feedback will inform our path forward. He thanked the board for their support of the IV&V (independent verification and validation) process. CampusWorks is a famously vendor agnostic which has helped them gain quite a reputation in the higher education industry. As an administration, we are actively considering many options just so we are prepared. When the final report comes out from CampusWorks, we are prepared to create an action item that aligns with that recommendation. A lot is going to ride on the IV&V. In regards to SIS, in March, the board will have an action item to continue JJC's relationship with Colleague. As a result of postponing the implementation of Workday, phase two, we need a SIS to continue to operate the way it's operating right now. In regards to all of the options, they all include a working SIS and currently Colleague is our vendor.

Trustee Broderick asked if JJC will be going back to talk to Workday about paying for that since JJC is forced to do that. That is a consideration that I think this board should be looking at Workday to pay for as it is a problem due to the fact JJC is not fully implemented with Workday in the SIS area.

Dr. Namuo responded that based on his conversations with Workday, they are open to concessions. He said anything further would have to be taken into closed session.

Jim Serr said he knows these are hard conversations and he is with the board on the frustrations around the extension and the considerations of going forward strategies. He is very much empathetic to all of the board's perspectives. Our focus is to make sure that we can serve our students first and foremost in the best possible way that we can. A lot of us here at the college do that in a very indirect fashion. But we know that everything we do here is to serve our students. We are going to continue to keep our focus there as we go forward.

3. Board Business
    None

4. Closed Session
    None

5. Adjournment
    Trustee Broderick moved, seconded by Trustee Garcia Guillen that the meeting adjourn at 10:46 p.m. A voice vote was taken and carried unanimously.