

Meeting:	Modernization Oversight Forum				
Date/time:	April 21, 2022 2-3:00 p.m.				
Attendees:	P (Present)		A (Absent)		
Forum Members			Guests		
P	Senator Tim Knopp	P	Renee Royston	P	Maggie Gleason
P	Representative Paul Holvey	P	David Gerstenfeld	P	Bill Truex
P	Representative Nancy Nathanson	P	Alex Kasner	P	David Genz
P	Terrance Woods	A	Drew Sutter		
P	Sean McSpaden	P	Jayne Martin		
		P	Lynn Kneeland		

AGENDA

	Topic	Time	Presenter
1.	Welcome and introductions	5 min	Sean McSpaden
2.	Review and approval of meeting minutes Minutes from 10/26/21 meeting were adopted.	5 min	Sean McSpaden
3.	Membership Sean introduced the topic of filling the vacant position formerly held by Senator Riley. It was confirmed that the Senate president will appoint Senator Riley's replacement.	5 min	Sean McSpaden/Forum members
4.	OED Project highlights David shared an agency update that included information related to the recent creation of the Contributions and Recovery Division, the agency's ongoing work across divisions, community engagement in preparation for budget development, the agency's work with A & M, invitations to share about Oregon's modernization efforts on regional and national platforms, and PFML's use of Frances for Equivalent plans. Renee commented regarding the good work done every day by the agency employees and project team and introduced the comprehensive implementation update and demo planned later in the agenda.	10 min	David Gerstenfeld & Renee Royston
5.	iQMS report – CSG Overall Project Health The overall health rating for the UI Modernization Project is medium risk. There are nine health indicators that CSG reports on monthly. Two of the areas have no open risks, Budget, and Scope. Schedule – There are two risks related to Schedule. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk #17, regarding IT Support Tasks and Level of Effort Not Defined, was lowered from a high risk to a medium risk during March. Most of systems have been reviewed and the activities have been defined, with a few areas still needing review or analysis. Risk #6, regarding the UI Modernization Project schedule, also remains high. There has been some slippage in procurements. 	5 min	Jayne Martin

The Modernization team has opened a risk regarding procurement resources and has begun mitigation.

Communication – The Communication health indicator is ranked low. There is one open risk related to communication and it is ranked low, related to a lack of communication to external stakeholders. There has been a great deal of progress mitigating this risk. The project has held several focus groups with employers, the main customers for rollout 1. The agency has an inter-agency committee specifically dealing with employer communications, as PFMLI, Contributions, and Modernization all have communications they need to distribute.

Quality – The Quality area is ranked medium. There are two open risks related to this area.

- Risk #1, regarding missing requirements, is a medium risk. Actions that are helping mitigate this risk include “go-back” meetings, where the Modernization team demonstrates certain functionality of the new system to business users. They are then able to provide input, ask questions, or raise any concerns. These meetings have been well attended and generally positive.
- Risk #18, regarding concurrent PFMLI implementation is a medium risk as well. PFMLI, Modernization, UI, and Contributions are working collaboratively and communicating well. The OMC aspect for the Contributions staff remains due to their remaining high workloads and the amount of change, moving to a new system and implementing a new program.

Organizational Readiness – This health indicator was changed from high rank to medium during March 2022 due to the progress being made regarding the undefined IT work (Risk #17). The bridging meetings during this reporting period have been productive and the major systems impacted by rollout 1 have been reviewed to determine what changes need to be made to ensure there is no negative impact to UI benefits when the tax data is moved to Frances.

The other risk in this health area is Risk #4, regarding staff not ready for or accepting of the change- Staff accepting the change is not a high concern at this time, as the readiness assessment refresh showed an 5% increase in positive responses. The remaining concern is the preparedness of the staff for rollout 1. The Contributions and Recovery team is still busy with backlogs of work that was lower priority during the pandemic claim surge. Business testing begins May 2022 and resources are spread thin in the business unit, though leaders and staff are committed to supporting the project. There has been no issue with business staff not being available or being engaged with the project.

Leadership and Governance – This health area is ranked medium risk. There is one risk in this area.

- Risk #9, regarding organizational changes, such as PFMLI and the new Contributions unit. The Contributions and Recovery Division is progressing in its development. There are several new managers that are still learning about UI Tax. Resources and time are a concern, as there is still a great deal of work to be done. There are some backlogs that could impact

conversion if they are not cleared before cutover. The Modernization team is working with Contributions to attempt to get these backlogs prioritized. PFMLI is making progress in the development of its business rules and policies.

Project Management – This health indicator is ranked low. There are two risks in this health area.

- Risk #20, a medium ranked risk, was opened in March 2022 regarding the Frances Training Plan not including an evaluation processing of the training effectiveness. To mitigate this risk, the Modernization team is planning on adding an evaluation survey for the trainees. They are also exploring other plans that draw on their collective experiences from other successful projects.
- Risk #19, lack of documented details in the stakeholder engagement plan, is ranked low. The Modernization team will be updated the plan and including the identified missing details. In some case, the information is available, it is just not documented or mentioned in the plan.

Resources – The Resource Health area is ranked high, and there is one high ranked risk in this area.

- Risk #15, regarding IT resources, is ranked high. OED IT is in the process of evaluating the work that needs to be assigned to OED IT staff. So far, they do not see anything alarming and have not discovered any work that cannot be accomplished timely. We anticipate lowering this risk soon, once the definition of the work is completed, and IT management has progressed further on assigning the work to resources.

Quality Control Reviews

Recently, the CSG iQMS team has conducted quality control (QC) reviews of project plans for the FAST Implementation Plan, Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Governance Plans, and the Frances Training Plan.

To perform QC review, CSG identifies a set of quality criteria consistent with the phase of the project and the purpose of the document. CSG reviews Oregon practices and relevant State policies, methodologies, and software quality standards as part of the checklist customization and refinement process. Development of the review criteria is also guided by the *TeamCSGSM Risk Assessment Model*, PMBOK, and industry best practices, along with quality checklists developed for other Oregon programs and projects.

The document is reviewed against the quality criteria in the checklists. The criteria in the checklist have been established to evaluate general document quality, general deliverable quality, and specific criteria for project management plans based on PMBOK. CSG develops observations and recommendations for each checklist criterion that is partially met or not met.

- **FAST Implementation Plan** – CSG developed 11 observations and recommendations
- **Stakeholder Engagement Plan** – CSG developed 21 observations and recommendations. One risk was raised, Risk #19, lack of documented details in the stakeholder engagement plan,

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance Plan – CSG developed 9 observations and recommendations • Frances Training Plan – CSG developed 13 observations and recommendations and risk #20, training plan not including evaluation of training 		
6.	<p>Implementation update</p> <p>Maggie brought an implementation update covering the Organizational Change Management and Readiness, Business Process Changes, Testing including Business Testing, Training, Employer Engagement, Existing System and Cutover Planning, Conversion, Data Purification. Content available on related presentation.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Representative Holvey asked whether we feel we have the resources to appropriately train everyone and clear the backlog.</p> <p>David responded that this is a risk we are watching closely. Using a train-the-trainer model to exponentially increase those efforts. We are also intentionally assigning the work of resolving the backlog to our staff who are most familiar with the work.</p> <p>Representative Nathanson asked if we could bring back information related to improvements in future customer service options including a comparison of our current functionality and improvements in the new system.</p>	15 min	Renee Royston, Maggie Gleason, Bill Truex
7.	<p>Frances Online demo</p> <p>Maggie shared a demo of Frances Online.</p>	10 min	Maggie Gleason
8.	<p>Next steps</p>	5 min	Sean McSpaden

SUPPORTING MATERIALS

UI Modernization Project Monthly Quality Status Report February_2022_v1.0.pdf