



**PROJECT SCORE**

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	14	14	14.0	15
4: Project Justification / Business Case	25	24	24	24.3	25
5: Technical Impact	15	19	14	16.0	20
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	10	8	9.0	10
7: Risk Assessment	9	9	9	9.0	10
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	20	19	19	19.3	20
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>92</b>	100

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
3: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Specific and measurable outcomes articulated. Impact of the additional services scoped to include both administrative and student users of the system. Clear tie to existing plans to reduce application complexity and application rationalization process.</li> <li>- The strength that stood out the most was the benefit the new system would provide the students. I've spent the last 4 days at the League for Innovation Conference on Technology and theme mentioned over and over was that students are demanding changes in the way they receive information and interact with their professors. A 24/7 web-based system is clearly the mandate for the future. The goals are clear and the benefits many!</li> <li>- Concurrence with the strengths indicated in the 2006 Review.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The only notable weakness is the lack of inward-facing assessment methods. That is, those methods listed are mostly outcome or "outward-facing." Beyond before/after surveys of the users additional assessment data might be gathered from users to align business processes with the functions of the new software.</li> <li>- Concurrence with the weaknesses indicated in the 2006 Review.</li> </ul>
4: Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear and tangible benefits were listed along with solid rationale for migrating to a new SIS. The implications for remaining on the current system were clearly articulated.</li> <li>- The challenge of maintaining an aging legacy system that the vendor does not improve or enhance with new innovations in technology is unacceptable. The benefits of providing services that today's students expect, providing uniform services throughout the University system, and benefiting through the economies of scale seem on the mark and achievable with this proposal.</li> <li>- Concurrence with the strengths indicated in the 2006 Review.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The relationship of the proposed SIS to compliance is not spelled out but may be beyond the scope of this summary.</li> <li>- Concurrence with the weaknesses indicated in the 2006 Review.</li> </ul>
5: Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear indication that the new system will be based upon current software code, RDBMS and hardware architecture.</li> <li>- The challenge of providing better accessibility without compromising security</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was difficult to evaluate the technical impact with the limited information relative to hardware, software and system architecture. In fairness to the proposer this is a reflection of the status of the project.</li> </ul>

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	<p>are properly addressed. The improvements and new technical elements have been identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concurrence with the strengths indicated in the 2006 Review.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concurrence with the weaknesses indicated in the 2006 Review.</li> </ul>
6: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear plan to engage users and technical staff at many levels. Clear and reasonable milestones along with an overall timeline that is appropriate.</li> <li>- The time necessary to plan the implementation seems reasonable and points to the necessity of making a decision for a new SIS system. The plan is thorough and reasonable. Pleased to see that additional staffing has been addressed and planned for. Implementation means for a period of time the University would be supporting two systems until the full implementation has been completed.</li> <li>- Concurrence with the strengths indicated in the 2006 Review.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Until a system is selected the specific new skills can't be fully articulated, however, additional information would have been helpful.</li> <li>- Concurrence with the weaknesses indicated in the 2006 Review.</li> </ul>
7: Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clearly articulated technical barriers and remediation strategies. Clear indication of previous success migrating complex computing environments.</li> <li>- The University will benefit from the knowledge peer institutions have gained and share through their implementations. Our college experienced this with its recent implementation of a new SIS system. Data mapping and migration from the old system to the new are huge tasks and the University has properly gauged the scope of the work and has planned accordingly.</li> <li>- Concurrence with the strengths indicated in the 2006 Review.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No specific "human" or "process" barriers were listed. Given that this will include 2nd-order change recognition of "human" barriers at the outset is an important consideration.</li> <li>- None</li> </ul>
8: Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Hardware, software and personnel costs are clearly indicated including 5-year TCO.</li> <li>- The budget reflects costs that seem high but the cost of delay add up as well. It would seem that acquiring a new SIS system is not a question of if but when. The spreadsheet showing the four year costs are well done. The comment regarding the use of some of the student fees to support the project seem reasonable as the students are the main beneficiary.</li> <li>- Concurrence with the strengths indicated in the 2006 Review.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is not clear what RDBMS will be used so there is no method to understand the costs associated with the licensing.</li> <li>- Concurrence with the weaknesses indicated in the 2006 Review.</li> </ul>

Staff Note: The University indicates that, "This is a re-submission of the original (51-01) request submitted to the NITC in Aug 2006, in response to the New or Additional State Funding Requests for Information Technology Projects FY2007-2009 Biennium. The only significant change to this submission is in the budget portion of the original request. All other sections of the request are unchanged."

Below are links to the project review documents from last year for this project:

2006 Project Proposal Form - <http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/ppf/51-01.pdf>

Summary Sheet with Reviewer Scores and Comments - [http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/ss/51-01\\_s.pdf](http://nitc.ne.gov/nitc/documents/fy2007-09/ss/51-01_s.pdf)

**TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS**

Technical Panel Checklist				Technical Panel Comment
	Yes	No	UNK	
1. The project is technically feasible.				
2. The proposed technology is appropriate for the project.				
3. The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget.				

**EDUCATION COUNCIL COMMENTS**

- The Education Council recommends the project be designated as a Tier 1 Priority (mission critical for the agency) because of discontinuation of support of the existing student information system.
- The Education Council adds the following remarks:
  - To commend the University of Nebraska staff on their efforts to operate as an integrated system of four campuses.
  - To require the University of Nebraska to more clearly delineate "Other" as part of the budget (\$8.246million).
  - To the extent possible, both the State College System and the University of Nebraska must synchronize their RFP processes and co-evaluate vendors.
  - To require an analysis of cost-savings and an analysis of 'effect on students' for two pathways:
    - Centralization and cooperative hosting of Projects 50-01 and 51-01
    - Adoption of a single vendor for Projects 50-01 and 51-01
  - To require a unified look at adopting the same vendor by both the State College System and the University of Nebraska; and if not the same result, to provide a justification for divergence.

**NITC COMMENTS**