

**UCOP HRIS Northern California Workshops
Day 2 Notes**

Attendees:

UCOP: Shelley Dommer, Patrick Collins, Chris Simon, Stan Kowalski, Patty Yamashita, Myron Okada
UCSC: Laura Mellegers, Nancy Degnan, Judith Martin-Hoyt
UCD: Diane Davies-Conley, Cindy Jones, Ron Purnell, Jamie Heckman, Marion Randall, Irene Horgan-Thompson, Peggy Younglove, June Taylor, Michele Platten, Ray Reveles, Wave Armijo, Elizabeth Ehnat, Bobbie Laskey, Linda Durst, Terri McKown, Michael Sheesley
UCSF: Catherine Pedersen, Susan Wright, Russell Fitzgerald, Diane Dillon, Peggy Bagala
UCB: David Scronce, Kathy Uyeno, Dorla Cantu, Ken Robin, Carol Dudley, Patti Owen
KPMG Consulting: Phil Encinio, Debby Lu

Vote Tally

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----|
| Employee history | 100 |
| Easy reporting and analysis | 59 |
| Data accuracy | 46 |
| Standard data definitions | 45 |
| Process improvement | 32 |
| Time and attendance | 26 |
| PPS/HR interface | 25 |
| One-time entry of data | 22 |
| Philosophical approach | 18 |
| Position control | 17 |

Thoughts From Yesterday

■ **Phil's summary:**

- Provide unlimited capacity to add fields
- Time sensitive response capacity
- Smart edits, linkage of information entered with policy that controls accuracy of data entered
- Need for organizational structure—position control, reporting relationships
- Expanded vision, strategic planning, succession planning—have information to enable decisionmakers to play with “what if” scenarios
- Analyze impact of decisions—administrative or policy
- Do workforce planning—types, classifications, organizational structure
- Policy instructions and triggers in a system so we don't make errors
- HR analytics, metrics, capacity for measurement

- Diane: I have a better understanding of the breadth of the issues that the system would cover. My normal job duties don't encompass personnel (I'm from Budget) so I have a much better understanding of issue that face campuses
- Cindy: Although I'm from Payroll, it was helpful to hear details about HR issues. I'm constantly amazed at the common themes across campuses—the same issues at Davis, I heard our counterparts having as well. It helps to know that and to have confirmation of that.
- Ron: I've an IT background, so it was useful to see what other campuses are doing. I run a shadow system that tracks employee history for faculty. It's good to see what the future might hold.
- David: There seemed to be a fair degree of agreement about data elements stuff, what was new was that people wanted to talk at the big picture level. This group knows that we need the data elements we discussed, and we don't need to spend a lot of time talking about them. IT and payroll folks now have enough understanding about why those data are essential for academic and staff personnel.
- Marion: I'm not sure why we're not talking about getting rid of PPS—it's a dinosaur that's been hanging on our neck for 20 years. We're not just trying to catch up, we're trying to get ahead, and how do we do that with the dinosaur? The academic stuff is missing in PPS—I know there are lots of initiatives in this effort. I'm concerned that Labor Relations is driving a lot of this. Not clear on the leadership of this project.
- Irene: Echo what Marion has said—concerned about the leadership of this. Nothing seems to come to fruition with respect to all the efforts in the past. We've done this three or four times already without asking what is the big picture? What's the philosophical discussion behind this—where are we going? Not just saying let's put a system together that lets us do what we do today. We're looking at a system to support how we need to be doing business differently in all areas of HR, payroll, academic personnel.
- Peggy: Coming from the Dean's Office, Division of Biological Sciences, I think most of our sections are pretty happy with information and decision support, and processing, so I almost came to this not realizing all the bigger picture issues, but those are starting to filter down to the Dean's Offices because we're getting requests for things that we've never had to do before. If we're looking for a system that we're just going to piggyback to PPS, so many of the issues we talked about yesterday won't be addressed. If we're only doing a part of the system, it won't meet our needs—just dive in and do the whole thing.
- June: I heard a sense of getting away from all the reasons we can't do a new system, to how can we make this happen, what can we do, how can we contribute to moving forward? I also see PPS going by the wayside in the process, maybe not totally, but through this process we can get to a new generation PPS that's more user-friendly and compatible with other systems we have. I think workgroup 4, which had a lot of representation from the academic side, spoke very well of what the needs are, not just in terms of collecting data, but also how that information could then be utilized in our recruitment and merit and promotions. So I think there is academic representation. I was encouraged to hear “how are we going to get there”
- Michele: What I'm concerned about, it's the leadership issue, which needs to be addressed. We do not have our philosophical assumptions here—I don't know if PPS stays or goes. I'm very concerned if we're just going to piggyback on PPS, because it doesn't meet our needs today, and it's sure not going to meet our needs 5 years from now. HR folks and staff at UC have always taken third or fourth place, and there are folks who've spent 20 years on this issue, spent 20 years with their hands tied not being able to do their jobs well. It has to be recognized that there've been people at campuses

for years who want to but can't provide information. That cannot be forgotten, because that speaks to credibility, trust, and whether we're going to believe and be excited about and feel like we have a say in this. I want to be optimistic but my fear is that something will happen, it'll happen fast, and it won't be well-thought out without clear philosophical foundation.

- Ray: I'm optimistic something will be done because there's such a great need. If something is going to be done, there's going to have enormous ramifications to the campus folks—shadow systems, processes will face tremendous change. If it doesn't happen, there's going to be a lot of lost credibility. Then campuses will take more leadership—which will be backward. Either UCOP takes the leadership, or campuses will. PPS interface and piggybacking issue—I was involved in the implementation of the current payroll system, which was an enormous effort—it's a large scope effort. We can't just say that we're going to RFP and put it in in 6 months. It takes years. In terms of piggybacking on PPS, there's a chance that we'll make payroll problems worse by doing this approach.
- Wave: There are lots of campuses that have solved problems I'm looking at, but it's very difficult to build a network of colleagues at other locations and keep it going, so it's nice to have meetings like this. There are common themes. I'd like to see more guidance, whether from central source or networking with people who deal with the same issues at UC.
- Elizabeth: I enjoyed the diversity of answers and responses yesterday. There were things brought up yesterday that didn't occur to me because I don't deal with them in my daily work. The opportunity to connect those ideas was useful. The #1 issue on the top votes is my #1 issue, but there were other things I hadn't thought about. There are problems with PPS that won't go away if we develop something to work with PPS. I'm in charge of training employees to use PPS, and that hasn't been easy and it could be because of the way my campus decided to distribute PPS, so I'm disappointed that training didn't come up as a top 10 too, because whatever we do will involve a lot of training. Whatever we do has to be really coordinated among the campuses, that's part of the problem that we all do things a different way and talk a different language.
- Bobbie: One of the things that was missing yesterday was that we looked at big picture items, but we also needed to look at changing processes. How do we get academic senate buy-in for process change? How do we change policies and process to accommodate what we need? That's one of the biggest obstacles that I see to any changes in this system. I wish that maybe some of the Vice Chancellors had sat in this meeting and had heard what our priorities are. The turnover at the upper levels tends to create havoc, because changes happen so quickly, and needs change with every turnover we have at those upper levels. I second Elizabeth's notion that training needs to be a big issue. Anytime you change systems across campus, you need training programs in place prior to implementation and all campuses should be involved in training.
- Linda: From the IT side, I was tickled to see that \$64,000 question was standard data definitions and data integrity. These are core to doing reporting for everyone. I really enjoyed listening to the functional side and to hear more than one person say that we need to make the system provide policy guidance built-in, make it faster and easier for those who are entering data, because that will then breed better quality data, which will make my life easier.
- Terri: My concern is the lack of true central coordination of all the UC's. I've heard a lot of requests for better communication, and communication is key, especially in a huge project like this. Having a central portal that provides one point of contact so that all the UC's could connect into that to find out what's going and leverage other campus solutions would be really key. Have the inventory of all the tier 2, tier 3 systems, then your university could leverage them and save costs. What do we have that

we can leverage, that's not going to cost a lot, that can enhance our existing systems? Also, need to have standards in UC—there need to be central standards in place. That's the building, the foundation, the architectural drawings—how do we build without the central plan? It would benefit tremendously to have a true systems architect to help design a solution to PPS and start at the infrastructure level. We're starting at the application level but the infrastructure hasn't been designed. I think New Business Architecture and these efforts are phenomenal, but I'm concerned that there are some big picture components that haven't been addressed.

- Jamie: I work in HRIS and I think this is great that our needs are being looked at. I heard that we need to standardize, but we need flexibility. Let's sit together and talk about processes and come together and agree on things in our process that we can standardize, and put those in the system that we can standardize. I think coming together and sitting down and settling processes first before building the system is key. I don't know if replacing PPS is on the table, are we continuing to work around PPS? There are certain things that we'll never be able to fix in PPS. I don't know if the replacement question's being asked. Coordination and communication are real important.
- Susan: I come from a position of déjà vu... what I found interesting was the different ways campuses have gone to resolve these issues. In a whole host of iterations these issues have been raised for years. It's kind of perplexing for me, the approach of this project. I know when my colleagues and I started getting communication about coming to these meetings, my HRD didn't know anything about it, and our Vice Chancellor had heard vaguely about an initiative, and that just seems bizarre to me. You need campus leadership to make this happen, and that the VCs wouldn't have been integrally involved from the beginning of this project confuses me. Timing will be an issue—workforce and HRIS issues are really on the forefront of every campus leadership discussion—we're moving forward. We're about to test our online merit processing system. A whole campus committee is looking at HRIS issues, and we're asking for funding for additional initiatives, and if these initiatives satisfy the campuses, it'll be really difficult to generate leadership endorsement of a central project where we can't have complete control of the outcomes and we don't know it's going to focus on our exact needs. Timing is going to be key if we're going to be successful.
- Michael: I really enjoyed meeting all the people. I was struck by those shadow systems. One thing that we could do right now is reach out and have a focused effort, organized project, to get us to communicate about what we already have. The new merit system at UCSF. A serious project with VC support, let's start on that while we proceed on the overall project. There's a lot of solutions already paid for that we might be able to help us out and create some standards.
- Patty: I think my concern is that the university, in order to buy a package, would have to change the way we do business, and we're very slow to do that. We want things to happen rapidly, but we also know that it doesn't occur that way. If we changed the way we do business, that would probably eliminate some of the problems we have, and we could use any package off the shelf. But for campuses to retain autonomy, e.g., Davis has its own chart of accounts, we can't build a system flexible enough to accommodate the campuses' desires. We can't build enough flexibility to satisfy all locations, so you get a standard vanilla package where no one's happy, and that will always happen. The taxpayers have paid their money, can we try to work with what we have while having a long term goal of building something more successful.
- Kathy: My area is data collection for compensation, what I liked yesterday is that I was able to hear perspectives from a number of different areas, which reminded me that whatever system we build we need coordination and communication. We're going to have to include all sorts of people. You may collect information and you don't want it, but someone else needs.

- Dorla: There still seems to be that everything is driven by collective bargaining, so I would hope that that focus will change before anything happens. Need to change emphasis so we could be looking toward what we can do for all of our staff. There are many initiatives going on at Berkeley campus and hope this can all be coordinated.
- Ken: Concern about leadership—how can we get with our VC’s so all of a campus can speak with one voice. Are we bottom up or top down? A system project can’t work without top leadership from UCOP and campuses, so there has to be buy-in through the chancellors and vice chancellors or we’ll be spinning our wheels for a very long time. It’s a consensus organization and you can’t get that from the bottom up.
- Russell: Whether PPS goes away or not will have a significant impact on the campus satellite systems. From my perspective, there’s been a real vacuum of leadership from UCOP for not being able to provide data for our business operations from PPS, ever. So the campuses have worked to implement solutions; this project is on a collision course with our systems. If there’s not a method to permit the satellite systems to exist and not threaten our business operations, then there’s a serious problem. I’m encouraged about the interest but skeptical about the result if this affects business needs. I was heavily involved in the UCSF merger/de-merger. It would be great to have a “best solutions” page on the UCOP web site. IT resources at campuses represent a wonderful solution. Utilize existing staff in IS units in campuses for a common project.
- Carol: It’s a shame that we don’t have representation from VC’s here today because it’d be beneficial for them to hear what we have to say. Partnership would be really tremendous. If we could have that across all the campuses, it’d be really helpful. There’s willingness, but we also need leadership for partnership to occur. I was amazed in our group that UCOP doesn’t know about all the systems that exist at all the campuses, and that’s a missing link—what exists and what can we use? It all seems to be there in different formats. Let’s not reinvent the wheel. I totally agree that PPS is cumbersome and doesn’t help us if we’re trying to envision a new world, why are we forced to drag along a system that doesn’t work? That’ll only promote the old way of tying our hands and asking us to get work done. I really think PPS is an old, archaic system that needs to be addressed and we can’t move towards the 21st century with that hanging around our neck. It’s clear we do need a process improvement, because it’s obvious that all campuses are stressed, and without leadership that’s going to continue and get worse. The fact that there’s no VC’s here doesn’t say a lot for leadership.
- Patti: I was involved with new PPS, PwC report, Employee Systems Task Force, but I’m also looking at the fact that I’m involved in an implementation that involves a front end to PPS. As more and more bargaining issues come up, we’re putting more and more into a system that’s already broken. I’ve already seen collisions between policies and how things need to be coded in PPS to meet other needs. I was really disappointed with the PwC report that payroll was a third item beyond other things, and a lot of effort was going to improve PPS front ends without really looking at the fundamental problem. I have very mixed feelings about leadership. HR is finally getting its due and has been ignored too long. Though there’s finally been a partnership between IR&C and the administration, my VCs both for business and academic, haven’t even mentioned this project to me. What’s going at the cabinet level at OP? Is it continuing to be in silos on the administrative side? I’m concerned that departments are going to have to do all that work to create all the history, yet most of the needs are at the highest level; our departments are already burdened for them, and we don’t want to increase their workload just to meet needs at higher level of administration.
- Diane: I tend to agree that communication and leadership is an issue. As an example, academic personnel directors met a month ago, and we invited Bill Campbell, who came to the meeting and

said, I don't know why I'm here, and we had to explain to him the role of academic personnel in the UC system. It's a hard way to do business. It's important to get the academic senate on board—when the senate gets involved, they create what your process is for academic personnel. Top leadership needs to work with the senate if you want to make headway with academic personnel.

- Peggy: I'm glad we went to the bigger issues and big picture—questioning UCOP leadership, front end to PPS, infrastructure to support all this. In 1987, the top vote was employee history, it still is today, which is a pathetic story. Realistically, this is a long term project, looking at processes, building a futuristic infrastructure to support this; so for the short term, we should take a look at the satellite systems, be practical and use what's already developed.
- Lara: It was nice to hear a lot of common themes and common problems. I thought we'd e more representing our individual campuses, but there's a lot of commonality. PPS is a dinosaur and not only does it not work for us, we're going to have increasing problems finding staff to run the system. It's interesting to know that so many campuses have created systems that are working.
- Judith: I'm a comp manager at UCSC, and I wasn't here yesterday, but congrats the contingent from Davis, which henceforth I'll be calling the "force from Davis." One of the key things for HRIS is the interfaces with other systems – financial, payroll, title code—that need to occur. I've been held hostage by certain systems and the time has to end where we're held hostage or controlled by the system so we can't implement policy. I'd like to take the word cannot and put a slash on it. We need to consider implementation and training has always been left to the campuses to do on their own—I'm all for as much standardization of definitions, systems, as we can possibly achieve. Otherwise we'll never make it to the 22nd century. Since I missed yesterday, ease of implementation, flexibility, standardization are key. Whatever system we have, we don't want to be faced with a lot of complicated upgrades.
- Nancy: we have to figure out a way to explain to the academic senate what's in it for them.
- Chris: I was pleased to see the vote results, and standard data definitions, and training. I enjoyed yesterday very much and was pleasantly surprised where we came with so much agreement; but I have a feeling that as soon as we have one data standard, all hell's going to break loose, and that's going to be very tough. Another simmering item is deep suspicion of OP at some of the campuses, what's really important, then, is to really build collaboration between OP and campuses. Literally getting OP people out to the campuses and get us involved in the data definitions to try and get rid of this distrust.
- Catherine: collaboration and commonality and getting buy-in is going to be a very difficult task. I'm somewhat skeptical that we'll see this in our lifetimes. The one committee that rings very close to my heart is the one on data...the mere fact we've created systems that we can't get data out of is very scary. Everybody needs data, we know there's data in there, we can't get it out, but we'll try to do something. Training doesn't occur after implementation. We need people continually engaged in giving us feedback on what we have and how to make it better. It continually needs to be in the forefront.
- Michael: I think we can't fail, we're at a different place now. We've got legal obligations that have to get met. However we do it, that much has to get done. We're going to continue to write systemwide contracts that will continue to undermine PPS. We're at a little bit different place than last few times.
- Myron: in addition to the fact that university's been required to respond to unions, the other significant force is the legislature. The legislature is asking us to produce all kinds of legislative

reports, and it's just a fact of life that the university is a political animal and needs to be responsive to the legislature. Beyond that, we need to do a better job both informing campuses and letting campuses know what's coming down the line in terms of legislative mandates. We need to do a better job so campuses aren't caught in a vacuum having to produce data yesterday in order to respond to Sacramento.

■ **Phil's summary:**

- People who are decisionmakers on campuses and OP have vague, bare knowledge about this project. That's an issue that needs to be addressed first of all. We let something happen without getting a buy-in or keeping them informed about issues and problems. The fact that it exists and we're this late in the game suggests responsibility in a lot of different places. OP needs to be blamed for not doing more to fix PPS. Campuses need to be blamed for not making decisionmakers resolve PPS issues.
- Good capture by this time of data requirements
- Striking commonalities across campuses
- Academic interests need to be accommodated and need buy-in for success
- PPS is a dinosaur; but still needed. Solution not possible/workable if it's a big bang. No great implementation can succeed at UC in a big bang effort. Burden for carrying implementation is not at the top, but the least powerful.
- Who's leading this effort? Is this top down or bottom up?
- Requirement of the philosophic drive—what are we trying to solve? Why does it matter? To whom? What's the impact?
- Needs are being met, there are several initiatives all over the place, but on the backs of individual departments and campuses.
- There are many possible partial solutions to the pain, but there isn't good communication and networking to share these solutions.
- Why don't we have vice chancellors here?
- Unions driving us? Whatever it takes. If we can exploit that, it would be a good thing. But if it's the focus, that's the problem.
- Craving for optimism, but a ton of skepticism. Leadership has to acknowledge that and do something about that.
- Has to be recognition of the effort required to implement whatever's decided. There has to be a lot of communication about this effort. Day to day work doesn't stop because we add a new initiative.
- Sharing information is difficult—this should be a quick fix. There should be a way to facilitate information exchange, partnerships, communication.
- PPS is difficult—do we live with and enhance PPS or scrap it? It's a fundamental policy decision. Considering the big bang aversion, it wouldn't be possible or practical to throw out PPS without something to pick up the slack. PPS will need to run in parallel for a while, but that's implementation strategy as opposed to a policy choice.

- Need academic buy-in.
- Training is crucial
- Lack of centralization—need local autonomy, but it would be good if there were centralization of something, perhaps standards, so we can speak the same language and understand each other, while giving campuses tools for their own culture
- Utilize internal best practices. This is a quick fix
- Can UC change? What does it take to get UC to decide that something that we want is something in its best interest?
- How do we get top down support? Should this issue not be driven from the bottom up? Staff concerns are respected, so collectively, staff needs and issues need to be elevated to the decisionmakers. Decisions about initiatives to get us into a NBA will not be made by chancellors or VCs, they'll be ratified by them; but the energy for pushing initiatives up is going to have to be developed by the people who are most affected by the problems.
- Need process improvements.
- Need feedback on what works and doesn't work, continuously.
- Pressure from unions and legislature.

■ General Discussion

- Leadership, communication, needs being met out of the hides of people, need support from academic side, need to exploit local solutions, be careful we don't have a collision between UCOP and campus initiatives, don't forget the human side/workload/training/regard.
- Judith: I don't think needs are being met—we're doing it by crisis management; I feel very inadequate in my role because I'm not able to respond to campus management when they need to know something. I don't feel needs are being met from UCSC's perspective. Then again, do we know what leadership wants, what their needs are? Is there a systematic assessment of what leadership needs?
- What was the tone or emphasis in Southern campuses? Data requirements are relatively easy to identify, but we hoped there'd be a bigger examination of big picture issues. There are campuses that are haves and have-nots, and that's a huge issue.
- If this discussion can't move from reactive mode into a proactive mode for doing the right thing as a major employer in the state of California, then we're in big trouble. This project cannot be done in a completely consensus driven way.
- David: we have to change our notion of the purpose of our leaders. Our role is to inform our leaders and informing their decisions, to use what they ask us for as a diagnostic of what they need even if they can't articulate their needs themselves. They have a less detailed picture because it's a broader picture, and that cannot be helped. That has to do with their role in the organization. We have to bring them the meaningful details and reach enough agreement together so they can trust the information we're bringing them. I think when we do that, in a consistent and coherent, and concise way, we'll discover that we have the leaders that we need.
- Terri: upper management doesn't care that we have a workflow, and the motivator for executives is pain or pleasure principles—embarrassment motivates, so does money. What does it cost every

university to connect the dots from not doing this? What's the workload cost, and then you total that up and that'll make the VC's take notice.

- Marion: what does leadership mean to me? We are part of the solution but I also think that OP/campus relationship isn't clear in terms of who's leading whom? Some level of definition needs to be dictated by OP (e.g., legislative stuff). They're just as confused as we are. How much do you go on your own as a campus vs. as a system?

Opportunities

UC Berkeley PeopleSoft Implementation: David Scronce

- Tradeoffs and realities of doing this type of project: came to Berkeley a year ago as the project was re-starting. Given a few broad parameters: 1) keeping PPS, 2) implementing PeopleSoft HRMS. There wasn't a lot of clarity about what would stay in which system and which would be integrated. Didn't roll out PPS online at Berkeley, so was completely paper-based. Had some large satellite systems at academic personnel, colleges, departments. Workload was a huge issue at Berkeley, also recruitment and retention. Ultimately decided to retain PPS for timekeeping and payroll generation; HRMS would be the system of record for all HR actions including academic personnel actions. Magical interface between HRMS and PPS. Not doing automated time and labor in HRMS. Always giving explanations about what's HRMS and PPS. Still planning interface; looked at Davis Medical System's interface—using an earlier version of HRMS and different size of population, so Berkeley's will be different (nightly vs. weekly at DMC). Spend a lot of time (50%) talking about the interface: from HRMS to PPS; TCS into HRMS; how to manage local salary plans and classification structures in HRMS and yet keep pace with centrally managed salary plans for unions and academics. Different owners for that data. From HRMS to PPS: unidirectional interface. Payroll sees HRMS as a glorious front end to PPS because they don't see the other features of HRMS. It could seem a nice, web-based front end to automate the path. But there's much more in future rollout. There wouldn't have the same impact if you're already in a distributed environment; ex/ UCR has already deployed online PPS, so their objectives may be different than Berkeley's scope. When so much of the focus was on the interface, they've had to completely learn PPS. Would still be talking about payroll even without integration because he would have to explain PeopleSoft payroll and how it meets PPS needs. I don't think there's a wrong choice in solutions—we will have a more complex environment that will cost more to maintain because we have a IT team for PPS and IT team for HRMS; we'd rather have that cost.
- Both HRMS and PPS are changing all the time. HRMS has bug fixes and enhancements coming out on a weekly basis. This is going to be true of any large system. Any system that's used on a regular basis changes on a regular basis. It's a living thing if you're using it—it will change. We will not get away from maintenance, the need to do enhancements. Our business will continue to change, and we'll have to reflect that in the new system. We'll get newer tools and technologies that'll be easier to use; we'll have a wider circle of people who know how to use the tools. We may get a system that's so widely used that there'll be so many enhancements that we can use.
- I'm pleased with what we'll doing—there are problems—but there's not a magic solution out there for UC. Everything'll take work. If we're realistic, take an incremental approach, and be strategic about what we do in what increments. How we rationalize that is the challenge. We're trying to think

about what OP will need also, and how PPS will feed CPS. We're also thinking about possible needs of other locations.

- Berkeley is the ultimate inclusion model. As a campus, we have the free speech thing down, now we have to honor the diversity of opinion and somehow work on that.
- To paraphrase Emily Dickinson, instead of getting to heaven at last, she's going all along. That has to be our goal as a group.

JOG satellite systems survey: people had not seen it. Website needs to be updated with a list of shadow systems and contact names. Recommend that folks get in touch with JOG members. Also recommend to send a message to JOG members to disseminate the survey. Should've gone out to HRD's, comp managers, academic personnel, graduate students—central IT does not control these systems. Survey instrument should also be loaded on the website.

HRIS Opportunities to Evaluate the Process to Support Activities

From earlier workshops, here are some business opportunities identified in the area of HR systems and process:

- Eliminate secondary systems of record containing duplicate data, often requiring duplicate data entry
- Develop a self reporting employee development system to track employees' training classes and certifications system-wide, which will allow for better use of resources and succession planning
- Take a comprehensive look at how the BELI is assigned and give it some internal consistency and understandable rules in order to streamline the automatic process of determining who is eligible for benefits
- Automate approval routing using online personnel transaction forms and workflow
- Create a position system to retain duties of positions and job descriptions
- Clarify and make consistent the definitions of eligibility for collective bargaining
 - A) define using either employee data or appointment data
 - B) definition of supervisor/confidential employee/student employee
 - C) clarify systems definition and identification of supervisors
- Develop a system-wide grievance management system.

What are additional business opportunities?

- What is an employee, particularly for BELI? Need a simplified account of that way of running the policy for very long.
- Position management and position control doesn't necessarily mean the state funded positions; won't get a comprehensive list of positions and job descriptions if you drive it from the budget side.
- Need to look at the consultation process—discussions are being held at the OP level and decisions being made without consultation with campuses. Or even within OP, decisions could be made in silos.

- Shouldn't allow HR policy changes without showing how the system will be changed to implement the policy.
- Strategic workforce planning—a new group was recently formed in OP specifically for workforce planning.

Need to do something about renegotiating labor contracts on a yearly basis. There's no way we can have consultation every year. That's a policy decision—we need at least 2 year, 3 year agreements. We can't keep up with the needs of the system if we're redoing contracts every year.

Bill Campbell: UCOP's new CIO

Joined UC on September 15th last year. When I arrived last fall one of the first documents that I went over was the New Business Architecture and I was struck by its scope and really felt it wasn't so much an architecture as it was a vision document. If we're going to get everybody pulling in the same direction, we really need to have a shared vision. Normally after the vision comes a strategic plan, master plan, campaign plan. Then derivative from that is the architecture, as one of the key components. Architecture can be subdivided into three major areas (i.e., Zachman methodology): 1) operational architecture, which has everything to do with the users; 2) technical architecture, which becomes the blueprint or framework or standards upon which we will design and build the solution; 3) systems architecture, which identifies the stuff, things, components. Usually in the IT world it's an end to end systems architecture from end user devices and utilities and services and infrastructure on the other end. In between those, you have the connectivity, the data transport infrastructure. Our NBA, to the extent that it is an architecture document, is really focused on the operational architecture. When we take it the next step into breaking it out into HRIS, e-procurement, finance, and other systems, then we get into the business of how do we set this systems architecture up and to what standards are we building?

Integration: vertically and horizontally. Vertically, we have to ensure that the players within a functional area are connected. Horizontally, we need to be connected with finance, training, with all of the other things that are out there.

10 days after my arrival, Joe Mullinex chaired his first COVCA meeting and Steve Relyea gave an eloquent presentation of what this NBA was all about and why it was important—Tidal Wave II, 60,000+ new students in the current decade, we couldn't expand in a linear fashion to accommodate all of those new people. We had to find ways to make the curve slope and be able to service more people without adding significantly to the administrative infrastructure. At that meeting, Joe Mullinex was very sensitive to scope and magnitude and it was pretty clear that nobody wanted to make the front page of the Chronicle with cost overrun, schedule breach, and the system doesn't work. He wanted to ensure that as we approached implementation, that we did it in a way that was manageable, in bite-sized chunks, that we were vetting and validating as we went forward that what we were doing made sense. His top priority was the area of e-procurement, and I think that's because the Regents were providing heat, and second because there were models that showed that there were clear returns on investment.

Everybody agreed that e-procurement needed to be the first things done. Steve Relyea talked about the importance of the portal and the enabling infrastructure to make this whole things happen, and he was given the lead to continue to collaborate across the University to build out the prototype portal which hopefully would evolve into a standard piece of our architecture to make things easy and intuitive for our people to use, and which incorporated JITT.

As the meeting went on, Judy Boyette spoke very passionately about the problems that she faces and this whole community faces in being able to answer questions from Sacramento that came either from the legislature or the unions, and to modernize HR processes. At the end of the day, there was a decision that those three areas would be the three lead vectors within the NBA's campaign plan.

As mentioned, Steve Rellyea had the lead for the portal, and we formed a technical group of the IT people across the university to put together this technical piece, the technical infrastructure. For e-procurement and HRIS, Joel set up two steering committees and he chaired them himself. The steering committees met over the next several months and one of the key things they did was to review products that potentially would be available as packaged solutions to meet e-procurement and HRIS needs. There were six or so vendors that came and gave e-procurement presentations. There were 3 for HRIS: PeopleSoft, SAP, and Oracle. At the same time, the South campuses were talking about a web front end on the current systems, put a data warehouse on the back end, and do things internally and not run the risk of getting a package solution that would have to be highly customized. In my mind, that brought up an issue that I'd like to describe for a minute.

I have a strong bias toward the use of packaged products for the following reasons: first, if you can find the packaged product that's in widespread use, then end user training becomes easy—for example, Microsoft Office. Secondly, if you have one of these products in widespread use, you have a continuing stream of enhancements because the industry developing the system needs to have these enhancements to sell the product, so you can virtually count on things to grow and evolve and expand with increased functionality over time. With the type of functionality that no organization to afford to invest in on its own. The third compelling feature to me about ERP solutions, is that as long as you don't customize it, you license it, and someone else is responsible for maintaining it, and when it doesn't work, you get leverage on the people who own this thing. On the other side of the ledger, if you bring in an ERP solution and it has to horizontally integrate with other things, you create an enormous problem for yourself with work you have to take on that the vendor never told you about. In the event there's not a good fit, you have to customize it, and then you own it. That means these training things go down the tubes, the infrastructure and interfaces are always the biggest challenge.

So, going into these things, there's a very compelling case for a packaged product, like Windows, which no buyer would ever modify. But, depending upon whether or not there's a good match, an ERP solution can take a smaller or much larger amount of time and money.

It became clear to us that there were solutions there, but we were going to have a fractured university if we didn't find a way to identify, validate, and prioritize the requirements. And that, too, philosophically, becomes a really key step in the process. Because if you don't have the list of all the priorities agreed to, then by definition the system will fail. It's like your kids not liking the car because it doesn't have 8 way speakers. So, if someone later on says, well, it didn't do this, then we're sunk. Understanding what the user needs and the infrastructure really becomes key up front.

While I have a philosophical bias toward ERP products, I also have been around long enough to know it's critically important to put the bias aside and ensure the analysis is clean, clear, and that those biases are on the back burner. Sooner or later, any system becomes a legacy system, the technology is old, requirements have changed, and it doesn't meet needs. You have to make a decision about what to do next—a make or buy type decision. I never want to have to make Microsoft Windows products, but I want them to be continually refreshed to meet commercial needs.

By January's COVCA meeting, the VCs were all in agreement that we needed to step back. We knew there were products out there to meet needs in e-procurement and HRIS area, but we also knew they wouldn't meet every need, and there were needs in the university environment that would fall outside the scope of packaged products. So a decision was made to step back to do the requirements documentation and needs assessment as a fundamental first step, and in consultation and collaboration across the university. For e-procurement, it's the labs; for HR it's campuses, medical centers, OP. It was also taken on as a high priority, urgent project, and get it done in time for the COVCA meeting for June could assess what the requirements really are.

COVCA meeting got slipped to July, so we put together a pretty compressed schedule to get a consultant to come in and help us with a needs assessment, look at documentation of work that's already been done. We felt we had a running start because of previous work that had been done—Berkeley's definitions, for example—so we let the contract for a process to vet and validate the needs by looking at what had already been done, finding a way to engage personally with representatives at the campus, finding a way to use electronic tools to get consensus on needs and priorities, and do it without spending a lot of time and money going out to every campus and medical center. I believe we started work on the 29th of April, and the requirement is to get the completed document by the 29th of June.

The document will have 3 fundamental components: 1) Requirements analysis—comprehensive set of requirements based on all of the input provided and an analysis of the requirements documents previously done; with those requirements arrayed in a way so we understand priorities, dependencies, and can be rolled into an RFP for phase 2 solutions. 2) Options to address performance, schedule, and cost--A set of options or alternatives on how to approach this whole thing to acquire a capability to meet the requirements that have been documented. We're relying on KPMG to leverage their entire corporate expertise, their knowledge base, and map that into what they've collected with you on our requirements, and provide us with their insight on options on what's in the trade space. It's like buying a new car—I'd like a nice, safe Mercedes SUV, but I don't want to pay for all that gas. I've got to worry about cost and balancing that against performance. In a system like this, what's in the trade space is in increments of functionality and infrastructure that can be delivered in phases, in stages. 3) Governance and user-empowered process that fits within the university culture and leverages best practices for building, acquiring, training, and sustaining a system that meets user needs.

In my past experience, the thing that really worked the best in the third area was a series of levels that began with user juries, where user juries are comprised of people who have to execute the tasks. Then there's a series of bodies where stakeholders all partner together to manage and make decisions about how this process is to work.

I spent most of my life in Department of Defense. When we had these dicey integration problems like putting sensors and computers and processors and communications into things like a high performance aircraft or another type of military vehicle that operates in extreme environments, you really can't give somebody a heads-down display. You can't ask them to operate a mouse. So when we had the engineers come in with their solutions in some of these major projects, what we heard more often than not from a generation of young people was that, "this really sucks," and in order to avoid that, we put together the central technical support facility, and I was systems architect for some really daunting broad scope projects that had us working 20 hours a day, 7 days a week. We had all these contractors delivering their stuff, none of which integrated. We told them to bring their systems engineers brought in to one facility, and we had the soldiers who had to operate this, and we built the team. And it was amazing how this became a forcing function to make the system really integrate. We had the key people there, and they

could leverage the power and intelligence of their home organization to implement the system. It turned out to be a wonderful success. What came out of that was a firm conviction that nothing will work without the users being involved early and often, and having the opportunity to influence the outcome of the project.

In addition to the user jury, what was also very important was to be able to do things in relatively short cycles so you could deliver a product, get feedback, and keep the user satisfied. So the relevance of what I've been trying to describe is what type of structure we need to have in place so that end users and stakeholders at all increments are represented adequately and effectively is key.

We get the report on the 29th of June, it will go to the COVCA on the 26th of July. In that intervening time frame, we will need to engage the steering committee again and get their input into the process, and we will need to coordinate and get views and inputs on this final product before we go to the COVCA. This process that started last fall with the NBA briefing, going through the 26th of July, is really phase 1. And that Phase 1 focuses on the needs assessment and the requirements. What comes after that is phase 2, which is acquisition and implementation. My biggest question is one that you probably share: how much funding is going to be available, from what sources, to deliver what functionality, on what schedule, and it becomes important that the end users have an opportunity to express their views about the need. And we have to make a compelling case to decisionmakers that if we don't satisfy these requirements that you're identifying right now, there's a cost to us that will far exceed the investment. But, there's a caveat to this thing: as you go through this whole process, we have to make sure that we're using hard, cold facts and analysis to drive our judgments, not hope. My sensing is that this is a one-shot opportunity; if we don't get this right, and we don't manage this in a way that we're getting continual feedback that we're on the right track, then I can envision the slings and arrows that I'll be dodging.

We need to get it right.

Q & A with Bill Campbell

David: given your bias to packaged products and the integration challenges, we're getting the sense that OP has a preference toward retaining the payroll system and adding an HR system to that. I wonder if you might speak to the integration challenges you see there, and pros and cons.

BC: in a general sense, integration is always very difficult. Hard vertically, even harder horizontally. Larry Ellison described an approach: to not worry about how stuff integrates, so you should go to a single ERP provider for all your functionality, and leave the challenge of integration with one provider. If you're going to use Oracle, use all the stuff. If you're going to use somebody else's stuff, use all their stuff. If you use best of breed approach, and you end up with different vendors, then you're going to make the systems integrators rich. I'll give you a 80% solution, and I'll commit to what I'll build in the remaining 20%. Can we do that? Probably not, we've got a different set of rules, we have to go out in a competitive process, and a 36:1 vote is a tie, but that's the reality. Integration is hard, there are solutions to integration by buying packages of the same breed, but it highlights how tough integration is. Specifically regarding PPS, the guidance that we had, is that this is an HRIS initiative, PwC was correct in its assessment last year that the last thing UC wants to do is to take on something very large. The current system gives everybody their check right now. PwC recommended that we keep payroll intact, that we focus on the HRIS and that was the guidance from the COVCA.

My sense is that if it had not been for Judy Boyette's very strong argument for the HRIS, we wouldn't have had this. It was Judy who carried the day to have HRIS added, but with the caveat that payroll system was out of scope in terms of what we're doing on this project.

David: I think this is the first time that this group has been clear about that point. Making that integration choice actually will lead you to choices in customization. At least half of our customization has to deal with the need to integrate. We have to go into it with our eyes open to that fact. When we go to the RFP, we have to get a solution with a core that remains intact, and the customization is at the edge so we can isolate the customization.

Patti: it seems to me that it's really hard to disconnect HR and payroll. If we're looking at an enterprise solution, we can't ignore the payroll piece.

BC: It's more an issue of staging and phasing. Sooner or later, every system needs to be refreshed. Having an enterprise product that facilitates horizontal and vertical expansion is a smart thing to do. My guess is that unless we can make a compelling case that replacing the payroll piece of this would not be very high on the funding list, especially given the funding situation. But you're absolutely right that the breadth of the enterprise products have plug-in, plug-out functionality.

Patti: if Oracle could meet HR needs but has a horrible payroll product, then we're going to have the integration issue that you're talking about.

BC: One of the things that we have to make sure we do right is scope the source selection criteria so we're asking the right questions. I don't know exactly how we do that for this type of solicitation in the university environment, but in the federal government FAR Section M of the RFP is always the source selection criteria where you spell out how you're going to evaluate the proposals. If you don't stick to the criteria, the losers can all protest and have everything thrown out. Part of what we'd ask KPMG to provide is how do we provide our evaluation criteria together to include future expansion.

Terri: Can you talk about funding?

BC: In the COVC meetings that I've attended, that issue is always been carried forward, we'll address it when we get the needs assessment. I still haven't gone through a complete budget cycle. Any money retained at UCOP for an enterprise-wide project is viewed as money that was ripped off by headquarters, and the Regents and others look at it as overhead, and overhead is bad. So the campuses, the chancellors will prefer getting the maximum amount of money sent to them, and then they will allocate funds to their priorities. One of the Vice Chancellors for Administration said 1,000 out of 1,000 times, if more money comes in, the money will go to an academic program or professor's salary, or other critical things. His viewpoint is that if you're going to bring something, bring money with it. Some of the other campuses seem to feel that they should be given the money and have them figure it out. They want to have maximum flexibility. My guess would be that the funding model would be more likely to include one in which the money went to the campuses where the campuses agreed that they'd provide this much into it. It's not likely that we'd keep funding at the UCOP end and give you money with strings attached.

That's one of the reasons why it becomes important to get the academic users decisively engaged and cheerleading for this. We'll have a hard time competing for money that would otherwise go towards academic issues.

HRIS: The Next Generation

George Sevelle: the vision is to eliminate the pen and piece of paper, the personnel action form, etc. No more pen and paper interface.

The vision is to replace that electronically and push the transaction down to the person generating the transaction. “Enter and forget”—touch the data only once, no multiple data entry.

Workflow automation—i.e., for approvals/denials, routing, notifications, other processing steps. Implementing workflow encourages process improvement and redesign.

Recommendation: stagger implementation of workflow: move with notifications first, then approvals.

Provide help to end users—online, hyperlink to policy manuals so the person doing the transaction can access the manual at the transaction point. This is doable today with today’s technology.

Med Center workshop expressed interest in a single employee ID. A new system could provide this. And that employee ID would stay with that person all the way through the entity and the system.

Access to employee history—data warehouses are now being created simply to create employee history, not for merging and analyze divergent data, but just to build a history from your transactional system.

Toolsets are easy to use. Analytical tools are becoming more sophisticated, be able to use cubes to look at data from different dimensions. Several packages deliver “workforce analytics” predefined.

Data accuracy: Gloria indicated they were using 19 different systems to store employee data that they thought they could eliminate by using a single system.

80/20 rule: COTS systems will cover 80%, 20% (e.g., academic) of requirements that aren’t standard. “Configure,” not customize.

Portal: we’ll be seeing more and more of that. Everyone’s going to have their own desktop that they can customize. When you logon, your homepage will come up that will bring in your customized information. Ability to deliver very specific data to very specific people based on their roles and the rules you’ve built into the system.

Wrap-up

At COVC meetings, to address the agenda points, I had to have a position handed to me for that item. Need to coordinate, consult, build consensus, and communicate the campus position on each item. We should go home from here and involve 12, 15, 50, 130 people. If this matters to you, go home and build a case. Then, if you present case forcefully at systemwide forums, and show that you have a consensus campus position, as at the Davis campus, the position will gather more support.

How it’s possible to build a case:

- 1 What are you trying to solve? If we can define the problem, we can establish a solution. What does the problem look like and feel like?

- 2 Establish what the impact of the problem is. How does the problem impact your organization—the whole campus?
- 3 What will happen if you fix the problem? What will happen if you don't fix the problem? This problem won't get better by itself. If there's an incentive to fix the problem, and defined it well, you'll be able to provide incentives for people to fix.
- 4 Define the fix. Determine the broad outline of the implementation steps—costs, downside, workload, etc.
- 5 What's in it for each and every one of the VC counterparts? Each and every one of the people who has influence on the decision?

An issue is decided when the opposition quiets down. Let's quiet the opposition.