White Paper

IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TRAINING IN ENTERPRISE-WIDE SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATIONS

M. Glenn Newkirk

November 11, 2002

InfoSENTRY Services, Inc.
www.infosentry.com
919.838.8570

www.infosentry.com

IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TRAINING IN ENTERPRISE-WIDE SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATIONS

Some of the most challenging projects are implementations of Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) and Customer Relationship Management (CRM) systems. In Info**SENTRY**'s project management and quality assurance (QA) reviews of information technology systems, we frequently find that the projects have had major problems with the organizational change management and, more specifically, training components of the projects. To dig deeper into the "why" behind these problems, we convened a roundtable session to discuss details of training in ERP implementations.

Info**SENTRY** Services' President, Glenn Newkirk, spoke with a group of experts who recently have been down the path of a major ERP implementation. Representing ERP implementations in both the private and the public sector, participants were from organizations spread widely across the country and from organizations that were large and structurally complex.

November 11, 2002

Moderator
M. Glenn Newkirk, President, InfoSENTRY Services, Inc.

Participants:
Joy Gumz, Project Manager, Project Auditors, Mission Viejo, CA
Erich C. Pearson, IT Manager - Factory Systems, Fuji Photo Film, Inc.,
        Greenwood, SC
Sarah Reynolds, Business Analyst/Trainer, Seattle Public Schools, Seattle, WA
Jane Tucker, (Senior Manager, Administrative Systems, Duke University,
        Durham, NC

Glenn Newkirk: First, I want to go around and have everybody introduce yourself. If you would, just take a minute to tell us a little bit about the organization you are in, your ERP implementation, what the goals were, and how many users were involved. Erich, you are now with Fuji in South Carolina.

Erich Pearson: That is right.

Glenn Newkirk: And you were with BASF during a major implementation there of SAP. Maybe you can tell us just a little bit about that implementation.

Erich Pearson: Yes. That is the one I have the most familiarity with, although Fuji does have an SAP implementation here. I am not as familiar with the details of it, because I just came on board here in June of this year. BASF went through a major business-changing SAP implementation between 1997 and 1999. It affected approximately 8000 users within the corporation. We had implemented a number of the modules and I can go into as much detail at this point as you would like me too, but it was interesting, and a lengthy process.

Glenn Newkirk: I think what would be helpful Erich is if you would just give a brief idea of the SAP modules involved.

Erich Pearson: Let's see, we did FI, FM, CO, MM, PP, HR and whichever one deals with engineering change orders. I can never remember that one. So it was not a complete across the board implementation of all the modules that they have.

Glenn Newkirk: But you did HR and some of the tough ones.

Erich Pearson: Yes, that was one of the tough ones. Also one of the ones that is typically done as sort of an optional module.

Glenn Newkirk: Great. Sarah, you are with Seattle public schools. And which modules did you implement up there? You were also an SAP implementation. Is that right?

Sarah Reynolds: Right. Yes. Just a little bit of a background. They implemented B2B and R/3 before I was employed there, so I am going to give you the information I have.   I have talked to some of my coworkers too. We implemented FM, FI, CO and MM and then B2B, which is now EBP. We trained about 550 people. And like any school district you have many sites. We have about 110 sites and the project itself was on time and on budget, which is pretty amazing.

Glenn Newkirk: It sure is!   And I understand that you are planning to look at implementing HR, payroll and modules like that, but as a separate operation entirely. Is that right?

Sarah Reynolds: Yes we are looking at that and looking at Peoplesoft as well. We are doing an upgrade.

Glenn Newkirk: Jane. How about giving us an idea of how things went at Duke University Medical Center?

Jane Tucker: We started actually in 1998 and we are still going. In 1999 we brought on FI, CO, FM, PS, Asset Management and Materials Management. And then we rolled that out to three hospitals, involving about 2500 users. This past July 2002 we brought another few hundred people on the HR payroll module in SAP. Now we are rolling out FI, CO, FM and PS to the campus (the side that plays basketball). And we have just declared success on doing away with paper journal vouchers. We rolled out to about 700 people, and we are no longer processing paper journal vouchers centrally. This coming year we plan to stop printing the central financial paper reports.

Glenn Newkirk: Thanks. That is a good background. I knew you would have to get the basketball in there somewhere.

Jane Tucker: Right. You knew I would do that. We actually are also headed towards Business Warehouse and an upgrade next year.

Glenn Newkirk: Great. Joy, you are working with Verizon Wireless. How about telling us a bit about the experience there.

Joy Gumz: Correct. Well I am probably odd person out in that Verizon did a Peoplesoft implementation. But it is probably no easier than SAP implementation to tell you the truth. Verizon Wireless is actually a merged company. It is a combination of Bell Atlantic, Primeco, AirTouch and GTE Wireless. They have put in Peoplesoft General Ledger and Accounts Payable plus requisitions. So basically throughout the company, which is 35,000 employees, those managers who are responsible for purchasing can do requisitions through Peoplesoft on the web.

And then in addition they have also put in Human Resources, Payroll, Benefits and they will be putting in employee self service so it is accessible for employees on the web.

Glenn Newkirk: As I recall, you indicated there were about 10,000 users nationwide.

Joy Gumz: That is correct. And the reason why it is so high is because a lot of these users are managers who need to do requisitions. They have not quite gone with employee self service, but 10,000 is still pretty large.

Glenn Newkirk: The topic that we want to focus on today is the issue of training and organizational change management in implementing these ERP systems in various types of organizations. I guess I would like for somebody to jump in, identify yourself, and talk about how you estimated the amount and cost of training in all of those users. We have a varying number of users involved in all of your installations. But they are all large. How did you estimate the amount of training that people would get and the cost of that training? Would anyone like to take a stab at that?

Erich Pearson: I will go ahead and take a stab at it for BASF. The first thing that we did was to hire a company to put together a CBT based training and testing package that was then rolled out to all the users.

> *The first thing that we did was to hire a company to put together a CBT-based training and testing package...*

This was tailored to the SAP roles that had been identified for each user. So there would be a module or a series of modules

that each role would need to go through. The user would take the CBT, take the training, review the modules and then at the end of each module there would be a test. Now the tests were graded and the grades were recorded. In order to have your user ID in SAP turned on, you had to have a passing grade of… I cannot remember what it was exactly. I think it was like 85 percent or 80 percent. So people really felt like their feet were held to the fire, and they were. This was the kind of thing where BASF said, "You do not have to learn how to use SAP, but then again we do not have to pay you either…"

(Laughter)

Erich Pearson: …so it was a command performance and the estimation for that was $250,000, just for the development of the modules to do the training. We also had some infrastructure costs because we did have a sandbox and we had a help desk that was set up for the first three, I think, months that was in addition to the normal IT Help Desk, that people could call up if they had any kind of question about how to use the new system. So that was staffed with 8 people. So we had eight FTEs for three months at approximately $75 or $100 an hour. So these are the different components that went into the total training estimate.

Glenn Newkirk: Great.

Jane Tucker: I just wanted to say along with Erich, we did not do the CBT but we looked at that. We hired an outside company who helped us develop materials and training based on roles and we still use their methodology. They actually taught us their methodology. We had one person on site with us along with seven other people on the team and then we had four people in Minnesota developing materials. But we had to develop 26 courses in two months.

…we had to develop 26 courses in two months.

That is the reason that we hired the company, which cost us approximately $300,000 initially. That did not include the salary costs.

Glenn Newkirk: It is interesting that we have two situations here where at a major chemical and textile corporation they paid about $250,000 for a CBT package and at a university medical center you ended up paying about the same for a similar kind of a situation.

Jane Tucker: It came up very quickly, which was good.

Glenn Newkirk: Sarah, how about Seattle public schools?

Sarah Reynolds: We had an implementation partner named Solbourne who helped us on every aspect from development to developing training materials for casual and core users. We had a project manager who was a Seattle School District employee who did create the actual budget and estimates of dollars spent. So I know she worked with Solbourne in creating the initial budget for that, for training as well just the overall plan. And for training specifically, what I could glean from their budget it was approximately $185,000, for everything. That includes staff and non-staff expenses. So a pretty small cost I guess, but we had a small population compared to everyone

else.   One thing that is interesting about Seattle schools is we are the only school district in the world that has implemented SAP R3 as well as the B2B, (which is the procurement system) together.

Glenn Newkirk: Right.

Sarah Reynolds: So that is what makes us unique I think.

Glenn   Newkirk: In   our   previous conversations with folks at Seattle public schools, one of the things that we were struck with is that implementing an ERP inside   an   education   or   an   academic institution has some advantage in that a large number of people would be highly literate in computer operations and things of that nature. And we recall conversations that in reality in those kinds of institutions as well you still had to go back and train people simply in using Windows and other basic computer operations.   Did you find that to be the case as well Jane?

Jane Tucker: We found that only in one hospital, one of our smaller hospitals. We did have to do that, but we did not have to do that at Duke.

Glenn Newkirk: Joy, how about Verizon?

Joy Gumz: Verizon used a variety of approaches to training because there were so many different user groups. You had the IT people, the technical support people, the superusers, the financial people, and then just   casual   users.   So   the   budgeting methods   including   checking   some benchmarks, for example, we looked to

Gartner Group and so that they estimated you should be spending 10 to 15 percent of your budget for training. So that was one benchmark that was used.   Another thing that we used was per user estimates. Costs are $150 to $200 per person per day if you are going to a face-to-face training session.

Costs are $150 to $200 per person per day if you are going   to   a   face-to-face training session.

So we took the number of users that we would have to train in various groups and say – Well this person is going to need some face-to-face time. They are going to need at least three days of training and extended it out in Excel to get some estimates. And then, of course, we added travel costs on top of that.   The Verizon training department, which has over 60 people in it, helped with some of the estimates. And then we also hired another company to develop some web courses for us and I think that helped immensely because a lot of the purchasing and requisition training would not have been possible without that.   Verizon has a two hour online course now that people can take when they want to and they can get up to speed with Verizon's purchasing processes and how you do a requisition and they do not have to go to class. It is there for them if they just got promoted and now they have to do this. They can log into the web and they can take that course.   And we figured that we would have at least 750 users over two years in this course and it would   be   the   equivalent   to   spending $600,000 in face-to-face courses, so we saved   a   bundle   using   self-service   web training.

Glenn Newkirk: Joy, being such a large company with such a wide distribution of

people I suspect that just an attempt or an ability to limit travel costs was a major consideration in Verizon Wireless' attempt to use CBT and other kinds of training as opposed to the face-to-face operation.

Joy Gumz: That was a big driver. Verizon has a number of different locations across the nation. And so for financials we actually had trainers that would come out for a day and do say, San Ramon, California, for example, and after they did San Ramon they would go to Alpharetta, Georgia. So we had the people in financials learn in Verizon's facilities versus sending everybody to Peoplesoft classes.

Glenn Newkirk: Erich, was that also a consideration at BASF, the geographic distribution of people? Is that another reason you think that used CBT?

Erich Pearson: Yes, because we had quite a few different places that had to be trained up and rather than fly everybody to a single location it just made a whole lot more sense to do it at the individual locations. We did have some kind of hidden or additional costs. You had mentioned

We did have some kind of hidden costs...like getting users trained up on Windows.

them a little bit earlier about like getting users trained up on Windows. We had some of that, some kinds of remedial foundation or prerequisite-type training that we had to go through. Also just in our particular location where I was at in rural western North Carolina, we had a large production and maintenance population of workers, and many of them were not literate, could not read or write, which by itself posed a lot of problems. So that was

another issue, another hurdle that we had to get across.

We had some other initiatives that sort of came together at the same time. One was the year 2000 issue. So, we need to go to SAP now, before Y2K. We have different operating systems and different levels of abilities and capabilities on the desktops. We had some old Windows 3.1 PCs. We had some DOS PCs throughout the corporation. So the thought was – Well, this is a good time to get everybody up to the same level. Okay, let's pick a PC. We went with a PC; went with an operating system. The operating system was Windows NT. Oh well, Windows NT has security features. Now we have to put in place a whole set of procedures and policies governing use of PCs, for security of the desktop. And suddenly pulled into all of this were issues like - How do we upgrade our software? How do we know that things are compatible when you load Client A and then all of sudden you load Client B? How do you know that those DLLs do not get overwritten, etc? So there was a whole raft of issues that got pulled into this that is real hard to define in terms of costs, but certainly added to the complexity and the ultimate bottom line for the training effort.

Glenn Newkirk: One of the things that I am curious about is an issue we have found in a number of implementations. It was the issue of people not adding into their cost estimations a lot of those hidden elements you described, Erich. For example – We know that in some places they are pretty much required to add in a cost estimate of the replacement costs of the worker who is out for three days or three weeks for training. Did any of you run into that as a cost calculation issue?

Sarah Reynolds: At Seattle schools, we have people who are in the union who had to get trained.

We had to pay for overtime and/or substitutes...

We had to pay for overtime and/or substitutes for some of those employees. That constituted about $50,000.

Jane Tucker: Yes, we had that with our nurses on the floors, because they had to be replaced while they were being trained.

Glenn Newkirk: Good.

Jane Tucker: And by the way, I just wanted to tell Joy, I just came up with an end user cost of about $120 per person per day. So it was interesting to hear her costs. But the thing you have to remember is that that person may get trained in more than one module. And they also may go back to their desk and not use SAP and come back for refresher training. So you cannot do a straight numbers of people times the dollar figure, you have to add more.

So you cannot do a straight number of people times the dollar figure, you have to add more.

Joy Gumz: Right. Good observation. That is probably why, we did the range and then we did some extrapolation and said – Well not all the users are going to be $150 and not all are going to be at $200. So let's do a distribution and see what we come up with.

Jane Tucker: It was not too far off. That was good.

Glenn Newkirk: Again, interesting that you are coming to similar cost estimates for training--and I would add that is with two different software packages as well.

Jane Tucker: Yes, although we do have Peoplesoft because they are the only people that do students work, but I am thinking of the SAP implementation. By the way, you may want an estimate on the cost of facilities.

...you may want [to add] an estimate on the cost of facilities.

We had two dedicated labs and that was about $40,000. Then we had to upgrade two years later and that was another $40,000.

Glenn Newkirk: Now Jane, are you running SAP internally or are you using an ASP for hosting?

Jane Tucker: We are running it internally. All of the configuration and all of the basis work, all of the technology work is done with people inside.

Glenn Newkirk: Did you find that you also had additional costs driven by technical training that was required, in other words not just end user training but technical training?

Jane Tucker: Lots of people went off to SAP courses, yes. And we originally had 70

people on the project but some of those were KPMG or SAP consultants.

Glenn Newkirk: Right. Let me ask, if I could, was training part of an overall organizational change management operation or was it something that really stood aside from the point of view of budgeting and operation? How about if we start with you Sarah on that one? Was there a separate budget for organizational change management included in Seattle Public Schools' implementation?

Sarah Reynolds: No. However, there was a change management plan.

Glenn Newkirk: Jane, how about at Duke?

Jane Tucker: Definitely. In fact we were called the Change Management Team and it included change management work. Change management also included a lot of communications work, which I estimated at $183,000.

Glenn Newkirk: What kind of communications work was in there, Jane?

Jane Tucker: Actually we have one person who is almost full-time on our communications and we did a lot of interviewing, a lot of visiting with areas. We show up at senior meetings. We show up at all the business manager meetings. We developed special brochures to go out about the payrolls that went to 36,000 people. We developed a communication plan for every rollout. Training is obviously part of any rollout, but the communication is the first step.

Glenn Newkirk: Jane, was that communication plan a two-way plan, which is to say while you were out giving information...?

Jane Tucker: Oh we are collecting it, absolutely.

Glenn Newkirk: You are collecting it and then feeding that back into the training requirements?

Jane Tucker: And part of the change management is for them to get to know us and to establish relationships, as well as to give us feedback relative to their needs.

Glenn Newkirk: Joy, did you find that to be the case as well at Verizon?

Joy Gumz: No, Verizon did not really budget from a change management perspective. There was a lot of work done comparing how processes were done under the old system – In training, you'd review how you used to do a process with the old system, depending on whether it was GTE or Primeco or AirTouch and now, here's how you will do it with the new system. So that was done on a functional level, but overall there was not really the approach taken that this is going to be a big change in your organization - and how it could the change make you more efficient. I think that was probably something that should have happened but just didn't.

Glenn Newkirk: Erich, how about organizational change management at BASF?

Erich Pearson: It was not called that per se. It was called Communication and Planning, but that was really what it was. From a strategic standpoint the executives at BASF made the decision, as long as this software package can meet 80 percent of our needs then we are going to modify the way we do business for the other 20 percent. So it was "Thou Shalt" and it came down from on high. The first wave would have been just a lot of communication meetings with the consulting team. BASF used Andersen Consulting, and established corporate and local teams that were put in place to identify changes needed at the functional level, to capture those and put a timeline in place. That also fed back into the training requirements. I think the biggest piece of that would have been, in terms of cost, would have been the Andersen Consulting folks: five of those FTEs for half a year, 2 ½ man-years.

Glenn Newkirk: Thanks. Now let's talk about some of the obstacles that you ran into in implementing or in designing and implementing your training program. What do you consider to have been the major obstacles in carrying out a successful training plan in your ERP implementation? Let's start with you, Joy. What would you say were some of the major obstacles at Verizon Wireless?

Joy Gumz: I think the first thing is Verizon is a large organization with nationwide employees. It has over six major data processing locations, so you have multiple people, multiple places, multiple user groups and each group has different needs. And of course all the groups say – "We need training." And so training had to be looked at from a variety of different user groups and yet keeping in mind that

different people needed training depending on when the rollout occurred, because Verizon's Peoplesoft implementation actually started in 1999 and it really did not get done until mid 2001. So that is a pretty long time and all the while you are training different people. So it is just so many people over so many different locations I think probably was the biggest one. And in the end I think sometimes some of the people who were deemed to be more technically savvy probably got less training than maybe some of the other users. I know I talked to a director of finance and he said – "It was kind of tough when we first implemented Peoplesoft. I had to do this budget on Peoplesoft in Essbase and I had a one hour WebEx Session and that was it." And so he had to learn how the interface worked, how the different modules worked on his own. It took some time before he was really comfortable with using that interface because it was different. And when he transferred to Irvine from Texas he got a little bit more training. But that first period was pretty rough for him personally, I know.

Glenn Newkirk: So size was an obstacle to your training. Anything else?

Joy Gumz: I think size and just the diverse number of users. And you know different people learn differently. You really need to recognize that somebody who is an

..different people learn differently.

extravert is not going to be happy when training consists of a 2-inch thick manual to read. They might like the manual but they also want to be shown personally and they want to be told personally – how is this going to affect their job?

Glenn Newkirk: Sarah, how about in Seattle? What were some of the obstacles they faced there?

Sarah Reynolds: First of all it was a quick implementation-- 9 months. So they did do change management, meaning they did have user groups and met with many of the staff/schools involved well before "go live." But I think overall it was quick for users in general. But like you stated before, there were people who had a lack of Window skills, so I know they tried to put them in different sections. But that really does not work when you are training 550 people because some people can only make a certain session and are restricted by their work and personal schedules.

So my understanding is some of the classes had a wide range of learning skills. Also because we are a school district our fiscal year starts September 1st. We tried really hard to train folks in the summer. However many of our users do not work in the summer. We have employees who work a variety of different workdays per year. For example, we have folks who start their job August 12th while others start September 3rd. So I know that was a struggle working with different work schedules and getting folks trained in time.

As a result one of my coworkers stated that there was a lack of participation because people just could not get to the training sessions before September 1st. They may have been trained after September 1st, but again, that made it more difficult for them to try to do their job And along with that we had to work with unions because someone who does not work—let's say three weeks in the summer—is not going to come in for class. So what is the motivation? Should we pay them? Do they get extra time, over time? So we had to work really hard with the union on that. And because it was a quick implementation my understanding is

some of the screen shots in the first few classes, were not completely developed. So they were training folks on stagnant screen shots. Students were told, "This is what you will see." That's because the programmers were still programming and trying to get it up and running. So, for some, it was a challenge to learn this new system, especially in the first classes.

Jane Tucker: I hear you.

Sarah Reynolds: I mean literally they were writing the code. And that is what happens when your project is only 9-10 months. So those were some of the major ones and just to kind of recap it – Skill set, working with various work schedules and unions as well as it not being up and running. You want to train people on what they are going to be doing.

Glenn Newkirk: Interesting. We did a quality assurance review at one large implementation. Erich, this will sound very familiar to you because Erich worked with us on this quality assurance review. It was a situation where the employees by the hundreds were brought in and in their first training class their job was to take the printed training materials out of the plastic shrink-wrap and put it in the notebook they would be using for training. In the meantime there was a herd of programmers

> *...there was a herd of programmers writing code that was making everything they had just put in the training notebooks obsolete.*

writing code that was making everything they had just put in their training notebooks obsolete.

Rev1.0

(Laughter)

Glenn Newkirk: That implementation did not go well! Jane, how about at Duke?

Jane Tucker: I am laughing because in our first implementation with 1200 people that certainly was happening to us and I would have said – We still are configuring the system as we were developing the training materials. It is funny to look back on that, but it was not funny at the time. We have a very diverse number and kind of users, even though we are in one place. I would say, just the sheer amount of material was difficult. Also in the health system they changed the whole financial structure at the same time that we were rolling out SAP. That was a huge change management effort that I had not anticipated. The people had to completely relearn all their fund codes so that was difficult for us and so we had a separate training effort there.   I think making it relevant to their job initially was difficult. Now we are getting people calling us trying to get on SAP, but at the time I do not think a lot of people thought that they were going to have to use it.

We now teach in production when we teach financial reports, so I think teaching in the training client was an obstacle initially in that they had a hard time applying the learning. Some people could do it easily. Many were not technically savvy enough to do it easily. We used to go out initially (to lower expectations) and say that SAP was complex, difficult to learn and if they couldn't find something wrong with it, they were just not trying.   But we did have very clear step-by-step materials and we have

...we did have very clear step-by-step materials...

been told numerous times that that was enormously helpful to people and we did have open help lines that people used a great deal.

Glenn Newkirk: Erich, how about you? How about any obstacles that you can recall?

Erich Pearson: I have kind of touched on some of them, like neglecting the amount of effort that goes into some of these associated issues like the infrastructure. They are focused on getting training to the users on the specific functions and technical aspects of operating SAP, but neglected the fact that not everybody knew how to use NT, which was the standard for the operating system, or that we suddenly had this piece of managing all these NT PCs, and rolling out software, which added a layer of complexity that was overlooked. So our plan, even though incomplete when it went in, the implementation was successful, because it is up and running. The plan was not complete and it was maybe, I do not know, 80 percent. It did not go down to a sufficient level of detail. There was reluctance on the part of users, naturally, to embrace this change in a number of cases because the roles in SAP are so rigorously defined and peoples' jobs tend to kind of wander all over the place. You know how that is?   Some peoples' jobs really got reengineered as a result of SAP. How do we make them fit into a role or several roles? Well okay, we are going to take these two functions and we are going to give them to this person over here. So there was a lot of anxiety from people. "Oh my God, maybe my job is just going to be parceled out to other people, and I am going to be done away with". So that was an obstacle that was not planned for.

Glenn Newkirk: Good. Let me just run down and recap what we have said. After I do that I am going to mention one obstacle that I am a little surprised that nobody mentioned. But we will come back and talk about that in a minute.

1. Reengineering creates anxiety, which creates complexity for the training task and the entire implementation.

2. Neglecting the time required for other infrastructure issues that have to be taken into account.

3. Making the training relevant to the individuals' jobs was at times difficult.

4. Expect a wide diversity of users and user capabilities.

5. The sheer size of some of the implementations has a major impact on training strategies and tactics.

6. The speed of the implementation will have a major effect on training. Everybody tends to want these things done very, very quickly—and that often has a negative effect on the ability to carry out a sensible training plan.

7. And then, finally, and I think Jane, you mentioned that there was literally another project being undertaken at the same time, which added to complexity.

Let me mention one issue that nobody threw in directly: there is a tendency in large enterprise-wide implementations or in fact in virtually every IT implementation to get into a budget crunch. When the budget crunch hits and when people see how much the entire implementation really is going to cost, one of the first things they cut is training. Did anybody run into that problem?

Joy Gumz: I think we ran into that at Verizon and that is why the finance manager got that one hour WebEx Session. I think even though Verizon tried to budget as part of the project, it is natural that when push comes to shove, expenses like training are often cut. Verizon is a privately held company by the way and it is not a public company. It is a fully owned subsidiary. And they were considering going for an IPO and very concerned about their numbers and when push came to shove, cuts were made. Quite frankly, although cutting expenses like training may seem like a good idea, it is a short-run proposition.

...although cutting expenses like training may seem like a good idea, it is a short-run proposition.

Glenn Newkirk: Did anybody else face that pressure?

Erich Pearson: I know that at BASF the cost ran over. The total costs for everything were very, very tightly held, so nothing got out to the press about exactly how many hundreds of millions of dollars it cost BASF. I am pretty sure it went over. However, they had absolute commitment from the top all the way down that this was going to happen and whatever it took to make it happen was going to be done.

Jane Tucker: That is what we had.

Glenn Newkirk: Let's look at the other side now. Let's talk about what you would

consider to be major critical success factors in ensuring that training works in a large ERP implementation. Would anyone like to jump in on that?

Jane Tucker: I can just say one thing that helped us that I have not heard mentioned. We set up something called User Administrators. It is kind of a bureaucratic name. But we set up a person in every area who actually signed people up for training, made sure they came, helped them with issues when they got back to departments.

> *...we set up a person in every area who actually signed people up for training, made sure they came, helped them with issues when they got back to the departments.*

We set that up initially as a change management technique… Expert or super users are different than the User Administrator, although they could be the same. The User Administrator was more of an administrative type of person.

Glenn Newkirk: I think that is really a great idea. Typically what people do is create the superuser and assume that the superuser is also going to be a super trainer.   But in reality the superuser is frequently so busy doing the work that is associated with being a superuser she or he does not have time to be a trainer. Frequently the superuser does not have the temperament or the personality to be a trainer.   They tend to want to fix the problem because they are a superuser rather than to help teach the regular users how to fix their own problems.   Your approach sounds excellent.   Did anybody else try that approach? No? Okay.

What are any other ideas that you have for critical success factors? I think everybody would agree with what Erich said: regardless of how it comes about or how it is enforced, senior management commitment to training, not just to the ERP implementation, but senior management commitment to training is a critical ingredient.

Erich Pearson: It sounds harsh and highly Teutonic, which it was of course, but I really think it was an effective way of motivating people to try. I know in my case, I did not want to merely pass, I wanted to get 100%. I did not want something in my permanent record somewhere where they could look at and

> *...regardless of how it comes about, senior management commitment to training was a critical ingredient.*

say, "Oh gosh, he only passed by one point." And I know I was not alone in that sentiment. There were a lot of people that spent a lot of nights pouring of those CBTs to make sure they had it cold before they took that test. Your name was on the line. Your reputation was on the line.

Glenn Newkirk: Anything else?

Sarah Reynolds: I came on about two months after the implementation at Seattle schools and was basically told that I had to work on the reputation of the system because of the initial things I talked about. So we actually looked at the second phase, meaning we had a pretty good help desk. We created all web-based training materials, about 50 documents that people could reference for very specific jobs. We then added about six more classes, second level classes, very specific classes again.

But beyond that and kind of tying in with training is we had a

...we had a user group, newsletters, and a web site...

user group, newsletters, a web site and also I visited sites. And in fact one year I think I visited 70 schools to just make sure the training was sticking and that they were using the software correctly.

Glenn Newkirk: So a lot of follow-up after the initial training is a success factor.

Sarah Reynolds: And a lot of that is still happening now, two years into it. And I think maybe it is the culture or just the fact that people cannot leave work four hours and take a class, some can, but a lot of people cannot because of the nature of their work. So we are really committed to making sure people are using the system to its full potential and just supporting them and letting them know that we are there for them.

Joy Gumz: I think we found some of the same things at Verizon and that is to get user feedback on the training because we had so many different user groups and we tried different things. We tried web. We tried face-to-face. We tried taking the trainer and train the trainer approach and taking them out to all the different locations. We had web site training trying to do something for each possible kind of user. To kind of give a smorgasbord option and to say – Well, maybe this training approach is not going to work for you. But that is okay because we have this other approach that you could try. If you cannot take time off from work or maybe leave your location, maybe you can try this other option. So I think that makes the user feel

a little bit more empowered that they are not put in this box and they have to be at this training session even though maybe they have scheduled vacation, for example.

Glenn Newkirk: So flexibility and options to get the training are important.

Joy Gumz: Exactly.

Glenn Newkirk: Anything else? Well let me ask one other question, one final question as we wrap up. Given that we can list so many of these ways to avoid failure and some of the obstacles that need to be overcome, given that we can lift some of these critical success factors, which are very good, innovative and many of them very straightforward, why do so many organizations fail to implement these kinds of training strategies ending up in such a high failure rate of implementation? Anyone like to try to tackle that one?

Joy Gumz: I think, Glenn, for a lot of implementations it comes down to dollars. Management does not always see an immediate return on investment. And a lot of public companies are pushed to deliver bottom line results. Jane is really lucky at Duke that they realize that training is hugely important, but maybe that is because they are a medical center. They have staff that are highly educated and I think that helps a great deal. But it is hard

.....proving that training does have a return on investment (ROI) will be critical...

to see a positive return on investment. Proving that training does have a return on investment (ROI) will be critical to CEOs and

top management to make them realize it is worth the money.

Jane Tucker: I think, Joy, maybe our board also helped with that. We had a lot of corporate people on our board that we said we had to do that. The return on investment is difficult, I agree with you, very difficult. We were very lucky.

Glenn Newkirk: We are getting to the end of our time here and obviously I want to thank you all very much. I think this has been very useful.

■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■

THE PARTICIPANTS

Erich Pearson has over twenty years experience in the Information Technology field, as a programmer, analyst, and manager. His background includes applied research, public sector consulting, telecommunications, manufacturing, and software quality assurance. He currently holds the position of IT Manager for Factory Systems at Fuji Photo Film, Inc. in Greenwood, SC. Erich, his wife, Liz, and their four children reside in Simpsonville, SC.   He   can   be   reached   at erich.pearson@att.net.

Jane Tucker, Ph.D., is Senior Manager, Change Management in the Administrative Systems Management department at Duke. She has had over 25 years of experience in developing learning programs including three years experience implementing the training, communications and change management for SAP R/3 and is now working with various other systems and programs in Financial Services at Duke. A primary research interest of hers is in Early Adopters in change processes.   She was

formerly Duke's Director of Learning and Organizational Development and is also adjunct faculty with the Looking Glass simulation at the Center for Creative Leadership.

Joy Gumz, Project Manager with Project Auditors in Mission Viejo, CA, is a technology expert with over 15 years experience. She has worked with Fortune 500 companies implementing Peoplesoft, SAP, and intranet portal software.   Her international experience includes implementing Peoplesoft in Europe for a global pharmaceutical company and one of the largest banks in Switzerland.   Her industry expertise includes the telecomm, financial, hospitality, and government sectors.

Ms. Gumz is also a CPA, and formerly worked with Ernst & Young.   She has testified before the Nevada state legislature regarding fiscal matters. She has an undergraduate degree in economics from Ripon College, in Ripon, Wisconsin, the birthplace of the Republican Party.

After eight years of working in the for profit sector, **Sarah Reynolds** moved to Seattle (from Chicago) and committed herself to working with non-profits. She has worked with communities of color and ensuring they have equal access to technology and has worked as a computer lab assistant in an inner-city Boys and Girls Club. She currently works as a Trainer and Business Analyst for the Financial Services Division at the Seattle Public Schools. She can be reached at snreynolds@seattleschools.org .

Glenn   Newkirk   is   President   of InfoSENTRY Services, Inc. in Raleigh, NC. He has designed and managed enterprise-wide information systems for 25 years. He

has directed project assessment and quality assurance engagements for ERP and CRM systems with total budgets in excess of $100 million. He has managed needs assessments and requirements analyses for statewide information systems throughout the United States and for the Pakistan National Assembly. He has published over three dozen articles, monographs, book chapters, and white papers. Glenn is a Certified Business Continuity Planner. He can be reached easily at his email address glenn_newkirk@infosentry.com .

Please contact Glenn Newkirk or Helen Sims (helen_sims@infosentry.com) for additional information about the issues raised in this white paper or for permission to re-print and distribute.