WRIGHT COUNTY TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MINUTES

02/27/2018

<mark>THESE MINUTES ARE IN DRAFT FORMAT AND REQUIRE APPROVAL BY THE COUNTY BOARD</mark>

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioner Mark Daleiden, Commissioner Darek Vetsch, Adam Tagarro, Sue Vergin, Christine Partlow, Todd Hoffman, Bob Hiivala, Tanya West

OTHERS PRESENT: Olga Strobel, Cheri Nelson, ConnieMae Cooper, Britta Holland, Scott Weiland, Jen Rasset

1. Office 365 Status

Presented by Adam Tagarro

The O365 migration is 2/3rds complete. The migration consists of moving all County departments to the O365 Outlook client. Health and Human Services was moved last week, which included over 200 users. This migration went relatively smooth; issues were seen with mobile users and shared calendars. Court Services, Extension, Parks, and Surveyors were moved on Tuesday. The remaining departments will be migrated over the next two weekends. Staff members have continued to report that the Outlook move has been relatively uneventful for them, wondering what changes were made. Tagarro noted that the IT team has been happy with the progress of the migrations and that the big changes were made on the back side with heavy leg work from the IT department. He went on to state the users will see some slight changes when Office 2016 (part of O365) is rolled out and the really new tool will be Skype for Business. The Governance Committee has already received a demo on Skype. Skype is being planned to roll out with the O365 Office 2016 client. As an incentive for departments to ensure training has been completed, those departments who have an 80% staff completion rate for training will be able to migrate first. Commissioner Daleiden was strongly in favor of the incentive as it provides users the independence to answer questions on their own. Cheri Nelson stated that the Office 2016 and Skype rollout will be completed with the SCCM product, allowing the IT team to remotely install the client on user's computers without having to physically go to every desk. This will be a tremendous saving on staff time.

The migration to Outlook brought up a question of usage of pictures within O365. Sue Vergin questioned, on behalf of the Branding Committee, if there would be any requirements for the picture. There was brief discussion with the consensus that usage will need to be reviewed and a policy or guideline will likely be adopted. The Microsoft Licensing Agreement was also discussed. Nelson stated that the Board approved the new agreement this month, the licensing process has been submitted with Microsoft. There will be 800 licenses for the County, additional licenses may be necessary due to the requirements of some shared accounts. Commissioner Daleiden questioned why there was a need for so many extra licenses. It was asked how many employees the County currently has, Vergin answered that there are 737 full

time employees. She noted that this number doesn't account for part time employees or contractors. Nelson said that part time employees and certain contractors will need O365 licenses, as well as certain shared accounts. Commissioner Vetsch questioned what happens when an employee leaves. Tagarro responded that the license is left as is for about 30 days allowing for the closeout of the account and notice to any parties, after this time the license is released allowing it to be used by a new staff member. Christine Paltrow noted that 30 days is fitting as that is about how long the hiring process takes. The migration to O365 is on track, with the Outlook client presenting the heavy work for IT. The IT team is looking forward to finishing with Outlook and moving on to the Office and Skype rollout.

Action: Informational update only

2. IT Project Portfolio Update

Presented by Britta Holland

The presentation began with a recap of the previous meeting. Both Commissioners stated that they were thankful for the work done by Holland, and that when speaking with the other Commissioners they felt it would be helpful to provide them with a brief summary of the Feb. 14th information. Holland agreed that she would put a document together for them. After a brief discussion on the types of projects and work that IT does, one being categorized as operational or "keeping the lights on" type of tasks, Commissioner Daleiden requested the number of track-it tickets that IT receives daily be added to the minutes. As request, and per Nelson, the IT team receives on average 900 work tickets a month, averaging out to 45 per day. After reviewing the previous meeting Holland then moved the discussion to present two of the project lists along with a general data change. She stated that the team was using "Enterprise" as a department that could "own" a project. This usage while correct in one sense was flawed in that it does not allow a resource to refer to anyone specifically for project questions. The team decided that the usage of an "Authorizing Department or Department Sponsor" would be used instead, noting that the "Impact" would still be noted as enterprise, multi-department, or single department. After reviewing this change Holland presented the Project Portfolio page on SharePoint. Commissioner Daleiden questioned who could access the page. Olga Strobel stated that presently it was the IT project management group.

Holland reviewed the page with the committee focusing on the two categories of Discretionary Projects (mainly single department projects) and Technical Compliance Projects (internal IT projects). Commissioner Daleiden questioned the CAMA and tax system projects, which Holland stated were Strategic Projects due to their Board directed development. The Discretionary projects were presented first, where members were able to see how the prioritization method played out. Holland noted that using the method discussed in last week's

meeting the projects were prioritized. She also stated that due to the nature of project work some projects that are prioritized lower may move along faster than anticipated. This is due to the prioritization method being used effectively. An example being one resource may have completed their work on project priority 1, project priority 2 may not be ready for them to work on yet, so project priority 3 is worked on. This scenario can play out several different ways, but being able to refer to the priority will allow resources to move projects along faster. Holland also noted that resource allocation can change as work progresses, for example if more resources need to be pulled in on a project than initially expected, or vice versa. Members noted that the progress percentages were listed, Nelson stated these were reflective of the project manager's best estimation. Also, that a project may be 30% complete, but that it doesn't necessarily mean the project is behind, simply that the project itself has many phases to complete before it is considered 100% complete. That 30% can still represent the project being on-task. Partlow noted that the list appears as if those departments with fewer projects will continually trump those with several projects. She also questioned if some existing projects can be reviewed for accuracy of existing project state. Holland stated that she will work on access to the Project Portfolio for committee members review. Tanya West also questioned how a project sits when it is a very large project, but perhaps not time sensitive. Her department specifically has an EDMS project, electronic data management system, that has seemed to stall out. West specifically questioned how to move the process along so that a vendor can get the greenlight to start their steps if needed or if IT needs to complete work first. Holland responded that from the review of the IT team, some projects need to have the scope redefined. She also stated that the EDMS projects in specific are more of an initiative and need ongoing effort to stay on task. Tagarro added that EDMS projects often began with an undefined scope, which presented issues of tracking progress as many pieces and projects came out of them. One project might be completed with the EDMS program but as a whole the program is not complete, this is where a more clearly defined scope and definition of the project would be beneficial. The committee agreed that the method of prioritization of Discretionary projects was acceptable, but the concerns brought up remained.

Holland then reviewed the Technical Compliance projects with members. Todd Hoffman questioned the timeframe of some of the projects, which the response was work is completed as the team is able to. Bob Hiivala questioned the percent complete being available, which Commissioner Daleiden added would be beneficial to the team to see. Paltrow noted that some items on the list were ones which would affect other departments, virtual desktop in particular. Tagarro noted that VDI is in the research stage, so it's placement is with the IT projects. Members expressed clear interest in seeing the IT project list or Technical Compliance list. Tagarro stated that the IT team is open to adjustment and tweaking of the project methodology as a whole. That the discussion and views of the members present allows the team to look differently at the projects. Commissioner Daleiden agreed that the portfolio really is a living document that can be fluid as change will naturally occur. In review Hoffman stated that it is nice to see how projects sit within the categories and the movement of individual

projects. Tagarro reminded the members that the process may seem dry but it really allows the need to show how resources are being used and why they are needed. Holland finished with a goal of having the Portfolio more visible and accessible to members. She also welcomed feedback as discussed as she wants the Portfolio to work for all members of the County. The next meeting will be a review of the Strategic Project list.

Action: Committee will work on prioritization of projects list. Design Project Portfolio Page for Technology Committee review.

Project Portfolio Management Overview – January/February 2018

Project Portfolio Goals:

- Align IT work efforts with county goals, strategy and mission
- Align IT resource skillsets with work efforts
- Develop and maintain capacity planning capabilities
- Provide project stakeholders with:
  - More accurate project timeline estimates
  - Meaningful project portfolio metrics

Portfolio management progress relies heavily on the following concepts and processes:

- Accurate project data
- Project intake and prioritization
- Resource identification and allocation

Below is a summary of what IT has done so far and is planning to do in the future to address the three categories above.

Accurate project data

- We continue to review and refine our current project list, ensuring that project status, percentage complete, and other data are accurate. Accurate project data creates a foundation for effective project prioritization and resource allocation, so this is an ongoing effort.
- We have increased scrutiny on our large, long-term projects to identify if/where it makes sense to break them down into smaller projects with better defined scopes, enabling us to provide more valuable services and more frequent successes for our department partners.

Project Intake and Prioritization

- To evaluate new projects, IT will create an impact/effort statement and complete a corresponding scorecard to determine the benefits, opportunities, resource needs, cost and risk for each project. The combination of impact vs. effort will place each new project into one of four quadrants:
  1. High Impact/Low Effort: Do as soon as possible!
  2. High Impact/High Effort: Plan and do soon
  3. Low Impact/Low Effort: Do as you have time
  4. Low Impact/High Effort: Is the project really needed?

- To evaluate and prioritize projects among similar projects, and focus the Technology Committee's time on the most important prioritization decisions, we created three categories

by which to group our projects based on their characteristics. Each project category is evaluated and prioritized a bit differently based on those characteristics. The three categories are described below:

Strategic • Impact: High • Effort: Any (likely high though) • Scorecard quadrant(s): "Do right now" or "Plan and do soon" • Approved and prioritized by Technology Committee
Discretionary • Impact: low to medium • Effort: low • Scorecard quadrant: "Do as you have time" • Visible to Technology Committee • Prioritized based on department priority, then request date
Technical Compliance/Internal IT • Impact: High (risk driven) • Effort: Any • Scorecard quadrant(s): "Do right now" or "Plan and do soon" • Visible to Technology Committee • Prioritized by IT

Resource identification and allocation

- IT will allocate each individual staff member's time on a monthly basis using the following allocation types:

Allocation Type	Description
Absence	Time spent out of the office (PTO or leave).
Administration	Time spent on activities such as non-project related emails or voicemails, staff meetings, training, conferences, paid breaks etc.
Operational (Keeping the lights on)	Time spent on activities such as day to day system and equipment maintenance, responding to work orders and tickets, new installation and machine preparation.
Projects	Time spent on project related tasks.

- Project time will be allocated based on priority. As an organization, we will devote time each month to all three project categories (strategic, discretionary and technical compliance), though the exact allocation to each category will differ for each staff member, depending on team and role.
- We will use a Project Portfolio Management Excel tool, developed by InfoTech, to capture and monitor resource allocation. This tool allows us to easily view total allocation vs. capacity for an individual, team, or the department as a whole, providing a realistic view of our workload, and enabling quick resource reassignment.