Retrospective

Feedback:

- Daily HCC and Reporting
  - Reporting feedback incorporated into reporting
    - Adjust filters and graphs
    - Focus primarily on ‘Critical’ items
    - Capture business impact
  - Reinforce priority definitions with Pods
- Explored other meeting times – agreed to keep 8:30 timeslot – change previous day cutoff time to 3:30 M/W/F cadence
- Feedback from community re length of time to respond to requests for Access
  - Identify risks & improvement opportunities
    - Risk re Access requests- # of requests building, impact to community trust
    - Improvement – identify root cause, optimize/streamline where possible
Breakdown of existing requests

1) Users missed in initial provisioning (mainly Scheduling – T-Reps – Qty 83)

2) Users not provisioned that think they should be
   • Some requests deemed high priority (Grad) were granted immediately

3) Requests for view only access (from individual with no clear business role)

4) Users with some access that feel they potentially should have wider access
### Potential Root Cause of Delays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Contributing Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Understanding of Data Security Framework/WD | • Lack of understanding of framework and role/responsibility, criteria, and how the framework translates to individual roles  
• Data stewards need more knowledge on what roles really mean |
| Data security model for Admissions     | • Potential disconnects between two  
• Users assuming same access ADM/WD                                                   |
| User Validation                       | • Final ES/Faculty validation of roles prior to final provisioning                     |
| Tier 1 Training                       | • Applying framework to new requests  
• New data to collect (Position ID, Academic Unit)                                    |
| Approvals of ad-hoc requests          | • Multiple approvers required (ES, Managers/Deans)                                    |
What’s being done to address

1) Communication being developed to explain delays/what to expect, and how it’s being addressed (TCM)
2) Update and integrate existing SIS form within service portal (ES/ISC/BIS) – reduce back and forth with end-users (ES)
3) Data Security Framework – Workshop with stakeholders (EDG, Data stewards/role owners, ES, IRP STU) to clarify roles and responsibilities and how to apply framework to security roles (TBD)
   • Address role mapping at large
   • Critical to success of launch 2
4) Determine how to apply security framework at the support level (Tier 1) for ad-hoc requests
5) Once all above addressed, streamline ‘request for access’ process
6) Continue to update as part of Continuous Improvement

**NOTE:** Access approvals for STU is more complex than R1 due to multiple approvers, multiple systems (WD, point solutions) plus shell roles/roles based access.
HIGHLIGHTS
- ~1200 undergraduate admission applications from EPBC
- Many undergraduate admissions staff have created test files in AAP (ADM) to learn to navigate/determine processes are working as expected
- External Admission Management System (XAMS) applications open, applications processing, and students being admitted

UPCOMING BUSINESS EVENTS
- Re-admissions/change of program applications opened in late October
- Admissions staff begin acknowledging applications at end of October

LAUNCH 1 SUPPORT & RESOURCES
- 258 visits to IRP Student Launch 1 website since Oct. 4
- Drop-In training session with business & TCM leads for undergraduate Admissions staff scheduled Oct. 18
- Community using promoted path for support and using Self Service Portal to submit support requests

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK
- Staff/PTL users contacted TCM reporting AAP access challenges. Updated directions published on L1 System Updates webpage to support
- Admissions dept and pod quickly identifying and adapting training scenarios to support as needed
**HIGHLIGHTS**
- Successful cutover with limited issues
- Hypercare and incident reporting working as planned
- Users logging tickets via portal, pods triaging issues
- HCC meeting daily, monitoring critical/high priority items

**TICKET TRENDS**
- Access requests/ issues
- Data quality
- Integration issues

**HIGH VOLUME PODS**
- Admissions
- Tech Delivery
- Tier 1 Access & Security

**CRITICAL ISSUES - 3**
- Welcome email sent to former UBCO grad students in error (27 students)
- Bulk email communication error (155 students)
- Stalled applications EPBC – AAP (reported by 12 users)

**SERVICENOW METRICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident Count: Count to Date</th>
<th>Incident Count: Currently Open</th>
<th>Incident Resolved to date: Last 7 days</th>
<th>Incident Open: Last 7 days</th>
<th>Resolve rate: Last 7 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Access Issues Summary

Breakdown of existing requests (Note: 550 users provisioned to start)

1) Users missed in initial provisioning (mainly Scheduling – T-Reps – Qty 83)
   • No final validation done with the business on roles
   • Once discovered, delay in getting these reps provisioned as Tier 1 didn’t know how to ask for the type of role/access the user needed

2) Users not provisioned that potentially thought they should be – no understanding by to Community around who would be provisioned and why.
   • Workshops done early in the year with data stewards/role owners but translation and understanding of the security framework needed and how that applies to front line access.
   • Tier 1 (receiving the requests) not able to determine whether someone should have access and then the security role they needed. Also ADM vs Workday

3) Users with some access that feel they potentially should have more.
   • Easiest to review and pass on to Pods and Security & Access pods
Workday Student Incident Trend Reported vs Resolved per day

- Incidents Created
- Resolved Incidents

Dates: 2023-10-03 to 2023-10-11
What’s being done to address

1) Users missed in initial provisioning
   • Now being provisioned. Missing data found and provided to Access Pod.

2) Users wanting access (not part of initial provisioning list and mainly requests for ‘Read-Only’)
   • Communication being developed to all explaining who should have access at this time
   • CEPs and PTL communicating directly within their units to reinforce
   • Clear information on the approval process if access still required

3) Existing SIS form updated to include Workday/Point Solution access
   • Basic data collected re Position ID and Academic Unit
   • What info they need access to

4) Review of process and application of data compliance requirements
   • Who owns the process in determining access
   • Needs a community level set change about who’s role is to do what - who has ultimate say
     • Not from a support perspective but initial assignment of the roles
   • Understanding of how data compliance applied at front-line
   • Approval process more complex than HCM/FIN as more than manager required for approvals