



OHIO
UNIVERSITY

**Student Information System
Phase 2:
Service Transformation and
RFP Development**

Change Management Validation Workshops

February 13, 14 and 15

MORAN TECHNOLOGY
CONSULTING

Agenda

What is SIS?

Change Management Methodology

Decision Framework

Guiding Principles

Change Management Interviews

Change Management Strategies

What functions are we talking about in the new SIS?

There has been a lot of discussion as to what we mean when we say 'SIS'. To help with everyone's understanding, the following functions are considered in scope for the OU SIS Project:

- Academic Advising
- Admissions
- Alumni Services
- Bursar
- Departmental Functions of Student Affairs
- Enrollment Services
- Financial Aid
- Housing / Dining
- Recruitment
- Registration
- Reporting
- Student Financials
- Student Records

SIS project deliverables can be found at: <http://www.ohio.edu/sisproject>

Agenda

What is SIS?

Change Management Methodology

Decision Framework

Guiding Principles

Change Management Interviews

Change Management Strategies

What process was used for the Change Management step?

A number of activities took place in order to complete the tasks associated with assessing the SIS Change Inhibitors for Ohio University (OU):

- A Decision Framework was developed to understand the decision making roles that various campus stakeholders will play for this project and the subsequent SIS implementation project
- A Draft set of Guiding Principles was developed to establish ‘the rules of the road’ for transforming OU’s student services and for deploying the new SIS system
- A meeting was held with a group of OU cabinet level executives to discuss the Decision Framework, identify the key decision makers for this project and review/refine the draft Guiding Principles
- Change Assessment interviews were conducted with representatives from key stakeholder groups
- Data collected from the interviews was analyzed to identify common themes and change inhibitors
- Validation workshops are being held to review the common themes and change inhibitors to gain agreement and buy-in
- The final deliverable for this step will be completed based on feedback from these workshops

What OU cabinet level executives participated?

The MTC team, along with Shelley Ruff, OU SIS Project Manager, met with the following OU cabinet level executives to discuss the decision framework and review the draft guiding principles:

- Kathy Krendl, Provost and OU SIS Project Sponsor
- Bill Sams, Associate Provost for Information Technology and CIO
- Charlie Bird, Vice President for Regional Higher Education
- Jack Brose, Dean of College of Osteopathic Medicine
- Larry Corrigan, Interim Vice President, Finance
- Molly Tampke, Interim Vice President, University Advancement

Agenda

What is SIS?

Change Management Methodology

Decision Framework

Guiding Principles

Change Management Interviews

Change Management Strategies

Some thoughts on Leadership and Change

We have begun our journey to transform OU's student services. This will require decisions that drive changes for our people, processes and technology. Here are some things to think about....

- "Great leaders are almost always great simplifiers - who can cut through argument, debate and doubt, to offer a solution that everyone can understand." (*Colin Powell*)
- "It is an important principle of life that the most likely way to reach a goal is to be aiming not at that goal itself but at some more ambitious goal beyond it." (*Arnold Toynbee*)
- "Command is lonely" (*Harry Truman*)
- "Leadership is the art of accomplishing more than the science of management says is possible." (*Colin Powell*)
- "The man who is denied the opportunity of making decisions of importance begins to regard as important the decisions he is allowed to make." (*C. Northcote Parkinson*)
- "I have a perfect horror of words that are not backed up by deeds."
(*Theodore Roosevelt*)
- "When you're finished changing, you're finished." (*Benjamin Franklin*)
- "Work expands to fill the time available for its completion." (*C. Northcote Parkinson*)
- "They said it couldn't be done but sometimes it doesn't work out that way."
(*Casey Stengel*)

Decision Roles & Responsibilities – Who has the ‘D’ ?

Ohio University can become more effective at making decisions (enabling faster decision implementations) — if it understands and breaks its decision-making bottlenecks.

Decision Inhibitors:



- More than one person thinks they have final decision authority
- No one knows who has final decision authority
- No one is accountable for crucial decisions
- Too many people have veto power for decisions
- No tie-breaking escalation person
- No time limits on discussions
- 100% Consensus is required

Decision Enablers:



- Clearly defined and communicated roles and responsibilities for each decision
- The final decision maker is identified and accountable before discussion begins
- There is a clearly defined tie-breaking escalation process and person
- Empower staff who are close to the work
- Decision dates are set and met
- Consensus is desired not required

NOTE: These concepts are modeled on the 2006 Harvard Business Review article “Who has the ‘D’?”

Key drivers of a Decision Driven Organization

- **Some decisions matter more than others**
 - » Decisions that are crucial to building institutional value are the ones that matter most.
- **Action is the goal**
 - » Good decision making doesn't end with a decision; it ends with implementation.
- **Ambiguity is the enemy**
 - » Clear accountability is essential. Ambiguity creates gridlock and costly delay
- **Speed and adaptability are crucial**
 - » Institutions that makes good decisions quickly have a higher 'decision metabolism', allowing it to flexibly act on opportunities and overcome obstacles.
- **Decision roles trump the organizational chart**
 - » The key is to involve the right people at the right level in the right part of the organization at the right time.
- **A well-aligned organization reinforces roles**
 - » If an organization does not reinforce effective decision-making through its measures, incentives, information flows and culture, the behavior won't become part of its culture.
- **Practicing beats preaching**
 - » Involve the people who will live with the new decision roles in designing them.

What are the Critical Decision Making Roles?

- **Sponsor**
 - » The highest level executive responsible for the project; has final funding / personnel / organization decision making authority and responsibility.
- **Decider:**
 - » The final (single) decision maker; is ultimately accountable for decisions and has the authority to resolve any impasse and to commit the organization to action.
- **Reviewers:**
 - » Have veto power—yes or no—over a proposed recommendation. Exercising their veto triggers a negotiation between them and the recommenders, leading to a modified proposal.
 - » If negotiation takes too long or if the two parties simply can't agree, the recommender escalates the issue to the Decider.
- **Recommenders:**
 - » Responsible for making a decision proposal, gathering input, providing the right data and analysis to make a sensible and timely decision.
 - » Consult with the people who provide input, not just hearing and incorporating their views but also building buy-in along the way.
- **Advisors:**
 - » Consulted on the decision. Because the people who provide input are typically involved in implementation, recommenders have a strong interest in taking their advice seriously.
 - » Their input isn't binding, but this shouldn't undermine its importance or consideration.
- **Performers:**
 - » Responsible for executing the decision. In some instances, the people responsible for implementing a decision are the same people who recommended it.

Who has the “D” for the OU SIS Project?

DECISION ROLE

BUSINESS DECISIONS

TECHNOLOGY DECISIONS



Project Sponsor

Overall Project Leadership / Accountability / Escalation Point

Kathy Krendl (Provost)

Bill Sams (OU CIO)



Deciders:

Final Decision Maker / Tie-Breaker / Authority to Decide

David Descutner

Shelley Ruff (SIS PM)



Recommenders / Reviewers:

Make Proposals / Have Veto Power / Negotiate Compromise Proposals / Implement Final Decision

Student Services
Functional Directors

IT Directors



Advisors:

Consulted on Decision / Provide input on alternatives

OU Community

OU Community

Performers:

Responsible / Accountable to Execute Decisions

OU Community

OU Community

NOTE 1: *Effective organizations keep most decisions at the Recommender / Reviewer level – if there is agreement, the decision is made and they move on without involving the Decider.*

NOTE 2: *Directors can be either Recommenders or Reviewers for any decision, depending on the context for the decision.*

Agenda

What is SIS?

Change Management Methodology

Decision Framework

Guiding Principles

Change Management Interviews

Change Management Strategies

What are Guiding Principles?

- Provide direction and guidance for transforming OU's student services environment
- Provide statements of preferred approach, practice or agreement
- Not open to interpretation – they must be clear

TO BE USED TO:

- Establish the decision making boundaries that define the People, Processes, Technology and Information
- Establish an agreed upon model of governance to which the project team and OU leadership can agree and commit
- Clearly define the fundamental ways that OU will change the way it delivers student services
- Establish a standard of personal and organizational behavior that aligns with and supports the goals of Vision OHIO

Ohio University SIS Guiding Principles

- For every student-related process, we will: identify the customers of the process; work with them to determine their real needs; and strive to provide them with outstanding **CUSTOMER SERVICE**.
- Students, faculty and staff should have easy, well supported electronic access to the data and information necessary to perform and manage their university functions.
- We will work as a '**SILO-FREE**' **TEAM** to solve the problems of our students, faculty, staff and institution.
- We will become an institution that makes '**DATA BASED**' decisions through the use of “easy to use” management reporting processes and technologies.
- We will treat information as a strategic asset that is: **COMMONLY DEFINED**; electronically **CAPTURED ONCE** at its point of origin; and appropriately **SHARED** across the entire institution.
- We will strive to have **COMMON** processes and data across the entire institution (Athens Campus, Regional Campuses, Lifelong Learning, College of Medicine, etc.).
- We will make **ZERO** customizations to the new SIS software – we will **REENGINEER** our processes to fit the software.
- We will maximize our use of new SIS **SELF-SERVICE** functionality.
- All new information technology related purchases must be approved by the University CIO.
- We will establish **DECISION DUE DATES** to keep our projects on time and on budget. If these due dates are not met, the delayed decision will immediately be escalated and made by executive management – the project will then move on.
- We will create **CUSTOMER PARTICIPATION OPPORTUNITIES** and **TWO-WAY COMMUNICATIONS** channels to ensure that our project choices meet **REAL** user needs.

What feedback did we hear about the Guiding Principles?

- Two guiding principles raised the most discussion:
 - ❑ We will make **ZERO** customizations to the new SIS software – we will **REENGINEER** our processes to fit the software.
 - ❑ All new information technology related purchases must be approved by the University CIO.
- Zero Customization should be a goal of most package software installations.
 - ❑ Customizations raise the cost of not only the implementation but also the ongoing maintenance.
 - ❑ There may be instances where customizations are absolutely necessary, for example to comply with state/federal laws and university policies and legislation that cannot be changed.
- Will requiring all information technology related purchases to be approved by Bill Sams create a bottleneck? Do ALL purchases need to be approved?
 - ❑ The intent is not to create a bottleneck by funneling all purchases through the OU CIO.
 - ❑ Architectural standards and spending limits will minimize the number of purchases that will be impacted by this Guiding Principle.
 - ❑ We want to make sure that departments are not making purchases that are in conflict with the goal of a comprehensive, integrated student information system.

Additional Guiding Principle details should be developed.

- Zero Customization should continue to be a goal for OU's SIS implementation.
 - ❑ Policy issues that may drive package customizations require a clear and formal escalation process.
 - ❑ Detailed background analysis should be developed to justify each policy-driven customization, including the evaluation of all practical alternatives. Ideally, any customization will occur outside of the base application in an add-on module to limit the ongoing maintenance costs.
 - The customization analysis should include estimates of the initial and on-going costs
 - ❑ The proposed customization must move through the Recommender/Reviewer path to the Decider. If the Decider agrees, the Decider should then move the recommendation to the project sponsors, who will make the final decision.

- The purpose of having the CIO approve all technology purchases is to ensure that no resources are spent to circumvent the use of the new Student Information System and that the University's technology environment can cost effectively be supported.
 - ❑ The IT Department should quickly work with the appropriate campus groups to establish architectural standards that will guide technology purchases. It should establish an annual process to review and update these standards as technology changes.
 - ❑ OU's CIO should work with the appropriate academic, research and administrative executives to determine the spending level below which departments will not require direct review by the CIO.
 - ❑ All purchases, regardless of spending level, should comply with the final set of architectural standards.

Agenda

What is SIS?

Change Management Methodology

Decision Framework

Guiding Principles

Change Management Interviews

Change Management Strategies

What OU stakeholder groups were interviewed?

The MTC team, along with Shelley Ruff, OU SIS Project Manager, conducted SIS stakeholder interviews to understand the key change inhibitors that can impact the SIS project. The following staff participated in these interviews:

- **College Of Medicine** (Brian Phillips, COM CIO; John Brennan, COM Manager of Network and Data Services; Doug Mann, COM Executive Assistant to the Dean)
- **Lifelong Learning & Regional Higher Education** (Steve Flaherty, Vice President Regional Higher Education; Rich Moffitt, Dean, Lifelong Learning)
- **Bursar** (Sherry Downs, Bursar)
- **Student Focus Group** (students from various OU colleges)
- **Institutional Research** (Michael Williford, Associate Provost, Institutional Research and Enrollment Planning; Diane Mack, Sr. Research Analyst; Liz Bennett, Associate Director for Data Management, Analysis, & Reporting; Annette Skillman, Associate Director for Enrollment Analysis and Reporting; Joni Schaller, Associate Director for Academic And Student Assessment)
- **Admissions** (David Garcia, Director; Jean Lewis, Associate Director for Operations & Technology)
- **Financial Aid** (Soni Williams, Director; Jill Lallier, Associate Director of Operations)
- **Registrar** (Deb Benton, Registrar)
- **Graduate Student Services** (Mike Mumper, Associate Provost for Graduate Studies; Katie Tadlock, Director)
- **Deans, Assistant Deans and Associate Deans Focus Group** (Jan Hodson, Assistant Dean; Laura Chapman, Assistant Dean; Bill Allen, Associate Dean; Norma Humphreys, Assistant Dean; Tina Seeter; Ken Sampson, Associate Dean; Karen Dahn, Assistant to Dean, Dee Dee Riffe, Assistant Dean)
- **Faculty Focus Group** (Valerie Conley, David Ingram, Marvin Fletcher, Phyllis Bernt)
- **Housing / Dining** (Christine Sheets, Director, Residence and Auxiliary Services, Beverly Wyatt, Director of Housing)
- **Residence Life** (Barb Harrison, Assoc Director)
- **Student Services** (Patty McSteen, Assoc Dean)

Common themes were found in the analysis of the interview data.

- Cultural issues
- Lack of quality communication
- Ownership of and access to data
- Less than adequate support from Information Technology
- Organization and process issues
- Issues related to implementation

Cultural issues were clearly perceived as SIS inhibitors.

- Because of the high rate of turnover in executive positions, there is a belief among the staff that if they just wait out a change directive that they don't like, it will eventually go away.
- OU is perceived as being poor at both making timely decisions and then making those decisions stick.
- Poor 'customer service' is a common complaint across the campus – many departments were described as being more 'staff oriented' (want their staff to be happy) than 'customer oriented' (want their 'customers' to be happy). Several staff hypothesized that SIS self-service functions may allow stakeholders to bypass interacting with some of the staffs.
- The Registrar and Institutional Research departments both described their need to be responsible and accountable for the quality and protection of their data – at the same time, they were both identified by many other groups as overly-controlling.
- Among the student services departments, there is inadequate communications, strained relationships and a sense of mistrust, often resulting in inadequate cooperation.
- While the majority of departments we interviewed are excited about the prospect of a new comprehensive, integrated student information system, some staff were not interested in using new systems (like SIS) and want to continue using their shadow systems.
- OU is perceived by many as doing things 'on-the-cheap'. We heard some concern on the impact of this issue on the quality of the new SIS system.
- A consistent concern: many people have been at Ohio University for a long time and have not had to change – what's different this time?

Communications is another problematic area at OU.

Everyone understands that quality communication is a key to making the SIS project successful, however...

- Just about every group felt that two-way communication at OU is not very good – it's inconsistent, incomplete, inaccurate, etc.
- While many thought the student paper was a good way to communicate with students, our small student group was unanimous in the view that 'nobody reads the paper'.
- We heard of instances where one department was collecting information that another department was not aware of and could have used, if they had known it existed.
- A historically inadequate focus on effective communications has turned off many stakeholders to listening to many communications vehicles (school paper, e-mails, etc.).
- It is difficult to get people to think outside of their known "box/silo" on the big picture.
- Historically, there has been minimal communications to newly admitted students – are we willing to invest in improving the quality and quantity of communications to this important group?
- In this day and age of skeptical consumers, clear and honest communications are critical to building credibility – e.g., The elimination of paper student bills has caused much frustration and anger among students and parents. What's the impact of this change on long-term fund-raising/development?
- Historically, OU has not done a good job at training users on new systems and technology capabilities. Since the new SIS system will grow the base of system users from **hundreds** (using today's SIS) to over **30,000** (through self-service functionality), effective communications and training with SIS stakeholders is critical.

People have issues with ownership of and access to data.

- “Who owns the data” is a common question raised throughout our interview process – people believe that, in some instances, the wrong people are laying claim to ownership / control of data.
 - ❑ Some people have been denied access to data that they believe they should be able to access in order to do their job.
 - ❑ With inadequate access to student data, many users are trying to not only improve their access, they are trying to improve the access for others, potentially without understanding the security and access issues that must be considered – e.g., Creating internal web sites the supply data to others, without getting approval for this type of information dispersal.
 - ❑ There is no effective decision-making process or escalation process for getting access if it is denied by someone.
 - ❑ There are programmers ‘popping-up’ across the university to build student information based reports.
- There are varying responses to the effectiveness of the current data warehouse – some people believe the data is easy to get to and report on while others feel the data warehouse is restrictive and difficult to use.
- There are many concerns about the quality of the data in the warehouse and with the lack of training for warehouse users to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the current warehouse.

The level of IT support has not always met expectations.

- Several groups felt that Computer Services and Computer Network Services have not been responsive to their needs, either in extracting data in a timely and accurate manner or in providing support for their development needs.
- There was concern expressed over the amount of web development that is being done across the university in an uncontrolled manner – are we duplicating our efforts instead of optimizing them? Are we exposing confidential data because some decentralized staffs don't understand the constraints that need to occur with data access? Do we even know who's publishing student data on this campus?
- People expressed frustration with the need to remember multiple user ids and passwords in order to access the multiple systems that they need.
- The IT dept builds systems without adequate user input – whose needs are they meeting?
- The IT department makes decisions that negatively impact user departments without clear path for escalation – e.g., Providing student id's when they apply to OU; providing parents with id's for electronic bills. Other schools have figured this out, but OU IT hasn't.
- Many in IT feel that they are very understaffed to meet the growing needs of campus users.
- IT doesn't have a project prioritization process that its users understand – “how do they decide what they'll work on?”
- Many users expressed the concerns about the ability of the IT staffs to meet the demands of a new SIS system – multiple people cited the example that 'e-mail forwarding' is broken.
- When asked, none of the interviewees could identify any published technology architecture standards at OU; nor could they identify any process for creating these standards.

Organization and Processes are dysfunctional as well.

- Silo thinking is very pervasive according to most people at OU – we don't think of peer departments as customers of our work.
- People have a common perception that the organization structure below the Provost level is uncommon and causes issues – the current structure of having student services report through 4 different channels has caused some problems and was identified by many as being a serious problem for getting the SIS project successfully completed.
- Some student services departments have become confused when executives from other departments can sometimes give them direction in addition to their identified bosses – they may have become matrix managed without knowing it.
- Current processes are too paper intensive, and because of silos and other factors, not efficient and not meeting the needs of the 'customers' of the process.
- Students are frequently bounced from window to window and floor to floor in order to get serviced.
- The good news: most people were united in their belief that self service is the future and needed in order to provide good customer service in the face of budget realignments.
- While the regional campus student services staff seem to work well with their Athens counterparts, it's not clear that the needs of these rapidly growing programs are understood in Athens.
- Student billing is a major problem for students and parents – “what are these charges for?”

Many inhibitors we heard are related to implementation.

- There is growing concern over the rumor that the university will be moving to semesters:
 - ❑ People feel the discussion has not occurred but the change is a foregone conclusion.
 - ❑ No one has told the faculty and they have the most work related to this change.
 - ❑ Should the change, if it happens, occur at the same time as an SIS implementation?
- Much discussion needs to occur related to data conversion. There are differing opinions as to how much data should be converted into the new SIS – the answer has a major cost impact on the implementation. Additionally, there were differing opinions on the quality of the current system's data – some assert the data is clean, others assert there are on-going data quality issues.
- Many departments are concerned with the impact to the departments in staffing the implementation team without degrading current service levels and how will the backfills be identified and paid for in the midst of a budget realignment.
- Training on and ease of use of the new system are two critical items to many of the people with whom we spoke.

Agenda

What is SIS?

Change Management Methodology

Decision Framework

Guiding Principles

Change Management Interviews

Change Management Strategies

Strategies to address the identified inhibitors were developed.

- Cultural issues
- Communication issues
- Information Technology Support
- Organization / Process / Implementation issues

Cultural Issues are hard to change, but the effort must begin.

• Decision-Making Process

- ❑ OU must demonstrate quickly that it is capable of making decisions and sticking to them.
- ❑ OU should begin using the Decision Framework immediately.
- ❑ OU Leadership needs to follow through on its decisions from this point forward or the SIS and other future projects are in danger of being less than successful due to passive resistance from the staff.

• “Customer Service”

- ❑ The upcoming process workshops will identify the ‘customers’ of each process. OU should begin to educate its staff on ‘Best Practices’ customer service and establish metrics for evaluating improvements with each customer group over time. This is a long term change.
- ❑ As new self-service processes and tools are developed, OU should develop feedback steps to ensure that the new tools meet the needs of each process’s customers.

• Balancing the ‘Need For Control’ with the ‘Need For Access’

- ❑ While many complaints were heard about the controlling nature of the Registrar and Institutional Research departments, there is clearly a need for these groups to maintain some level of control to protect the institution’s core operational and external reporting data.
- ❑ Each of these departments should develop a detailed written proposal on the areas where they feel a need for control and those areas where appropriate access is acceptable. These proposals should include proposed processes for escalating concerns and disagreements.
- ❑ The Decision Framework should be utilized to review and refine these proposals, providing a decision time frame that is in months and not years. Unresolved disagreements should be escalated to the Decider through the Decision Framework process.
- ❑ As part of these discussions, the relationships among the student services departments should be reviewed, including more formal and regular communications meetings of all Student Services Directors.

Communications strategies need to be constantly refined.

- The recent development of the SIS Communications Plan is a good starting point to improve stakeholder communications – However, it is not the end of communications planning.
 - ❑ Each stakeholder group receives information in different ways, depending on the type of message being sent and learning style of each stakeholder.
 - ❑ Two-way project communications vehicles need to be created / used (e-mail and v-mail boxes, community forums, leveraging existing governance structures, etc.).
 - ❑ Rumors tend to run rampant during these types of projects, so early clarification or refuting of rumors is important to demonstrate an openness by OU to addressing stakeholder concerns.
 - ❑ OU should conduct workshops with various stakeholder groups to ensure that it understands what information each group wants to know and that it is using the most appropriate vehicles for communicating.
- User expectations of the benefits of the project need to be set early so that everyone understands the goals, scope and objectives of the SIS project. The functionality of the new SIS will be deployed in phases, so users need to know the functions that they will have and when they will have them.
- A key part of the success of the new SIS will be its ability to better support communications with students. OU should evaluate how it communicates with students, how it would like to communicate with students and how it can utilize the SIS to improve communications.
- OU should simultaneously commit to thoroughly training the OU community on the SIS, while making the user interface as intuitive as possible to minimize the need for extensive training.
- The new IT advisory structure being put into place can serve as an excellent communications vehicle for gaining stakeholder participation in IT planning and project prioritization.
- The new SIS Data Warehouse effort will develop strategies for addressing the needs of the university stakeholders, while addressing the concerns expressed in the workshops.

The IT Department has many tasks ahead to prepare for the SIS.

Our project's scope did not include a detailed assessment of the IT Organization. However, we have heard a variety of concerns that point to the need for the IT department to prepare for the new SIS organization. The following issues need to be better understood and then addressed:

- IT organizations tend to absorb the culture of the organization that they support.
 - ❑ OU's central IT department seems to have silos that don't communicate together well.
 - ❑ The Customer Service needs described earlier for the student services areas also appear to be a problem for the IT department. Many people we interviewed complained about the lack of responsiveness that IT has towards their needs. Several also described decisions that are made within IT without clearly explaining why they were made.
 - ❑ Many complained that IT delivers new functionality (e.g., data warehouse) that were developed without adequate user participation in requirements for the new tools.
- It is unclear who is responsible for developing Student Information System reports and tools. IT, Institutional Research, and various student services departments all claimed some level of ownership. OU needs to carefully define roles and responsibilities in this area.
- The growing number of OU groups that are creating and maintaining their own websites and user authentication and authorization processes appears to be problematic.
- IT needs to clarify, if it exists, or create, if it doesn't, an open process for prioritizing the projects that it takes on.
- IT needs to determine its standard architectures and tools – these are needed to support the new SIS system.
- Once the new SIS package is selected, IT needs to evaluate its staff skills, and then develop a strategy for growing / hiring the skills that it needs to support the new SIS system.

And finally, a variety of other items need to be addressed.

- OU has recently developed its current student services organizational structure. During this phase of the project, it should study the effectiveness of this structure and make changes, as appropriate, before it begins the massive SIS implementation project.
- With the growth of programs in the Regional campuses and Lifelong Learning, it should also use this opportunity to make sure that supporting the needs of these programs as 'mainstream' programs is a goal.
- OU should take advantage of this opportunity to streamline its student services processes, eliminate paper forms and approvals and focus its staff on value added tasks. It will not have another opportunity like this again for a long time.
- The process for deciding whether OU will move to a semester model should be identified as soon as feasible.
- There are a wide variety of strategies for implementing the new SIS that must be considered, including items such as data conversion needs, staff backfill, disaster planning, etc. OU should make clear that these will be discussed and decided at the appropriate time.

How will the strategies become actionable?

- This step has really focused on gathering inhibitors through the interview process and developing strategies to address them.
- Some of the strategies that have been developed will begin to become actionable during the next phase, requirements gathering and process mapping. During this phase, workshops will be held with key SIS project team functional directors and subject matter experts. The intent is to understand how student services are delivered today, but also focusing on what are the opportunities for improvement as the project implements the new software. These process workshops will be conducted from the viewpoint of the customer as opposed to a departmental view of activities. This customer driven focus will help us determine a better way to provide service to the customer.
- Some of the strategies require direction from the executive leadership of the project to help drive these strategies throughout the university.
- Lastly, there are strategies that cannot be implemented until the project is further along towards implementation. Shelley Ruff, working with her project team leaders, will lead the efforts to implement these strategies.