

**NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION**

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet  
2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Project #13-01  
Page 1 of 3

Project #	Agency	Project Title
13-01	Department of Education	Nebraska eLearning Project

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)**

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: [http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project\\_proposals/2015-2017.html](http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html) ]

The Nebraska eLearning Project would center on the creation and procurement of high quality electronic learning objects for distribution to PreK-12 public schools at no cost to schools, in support of the statewide BlendEd Initiative, the NITC committee's digital education goals and as an enhancement to the Data Dashboard currently being developed by NDE, while providing an in-depth, hands-on professional development process for Nebraska teachers, pre-service teachers and content specific undergraduate students.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2016 (Year 1)	Request for FY2017 (Year 2)	Request for FY2018 (Year 3)	Request for FY2019 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs		\$ 88,000.00	\$ 90,000.00	\$ 92,000.00	\$ 94,000.00		\$ 364,000.00
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							\$ -
2.2 Programming							\$ -
2.3 Project Management							\$ -
2.4 Other							\$ -
3. Supplies and Materials							\$ -
4. Telecommunications							\$ -
5. Training							\$ -
6. Travel							\$ -
7. Other Operating Costs		\$ 2,500,000.00	\$ 2,500,000.00	\$ 2,500,000.00	\$ 2,500,000.00		\$ 10,000,000.00
8. Capital Expenditures							
8.1 Hardware							\$ -
8.2 Software							\$ -
8.3 Network							\$ -
8.4 Other							\$ -
<b>TOTAL COSTS</b>	\$ -	\$ 2,588,000.00	\$ 2,590,000.00	\$ 2,592,000.00	\$ 2,594,000.00	\$ -	\$ 10,364,000.00
General Funds		\$ 2,607,000.00	\$ 2,607,000.00	\$ 2,607,000.00	\$ 2,607,000.00		\$ 10,428,000.00
Cash Funds							\$ -
Federal Funds							\$ -
Revolving Funds							\$ -
Other Funds							\$ -
<b>TOTAL FUNDS</b>	\$ -	\$ 2,607,000.00	\$ 2,607,000.00	\$ 2,607,000.00	\$ 2,607,000.00	\$ -	\$ 10,428,000.00

**PROJECT SCORE**

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	9	12	7	9	15
Project Justification / Business Case	15	17	18	17	25
Technical Impact	5	14	2	7	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	5	7	6	6	10
Risk Assessment	5	7	6	6	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	10	14	13	12	20
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>57</b>	<b>100</b>

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project overview provides some specific and, ultimately, measurable goals in the form of project deliverables. The project outcomes are desirable within the larger context of what is needed to assist K12 schools moving forward with a digital conversion.</li> <li>- Vision: State-wide LOR System with Open Content with content that supports NE Ed needs.</li> <li>- Goals are laudable, but I question the need for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The evaluation plan is sketchy beyond the specific deliverables and some mention of working with Brightbytes. Goals, partners and measures of success are loosely correlated without necessary specifics to tie them together.</li> <li>- Cost Savings not specified. Can IRR/ROI be determined?</li> <li>- Metrics are provided, but vague. What does successful mean? Better metrics might be LOR</li> </ul>

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet  
2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Project #13-01  
Page 2 of 3

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	<p>yet another LOR just to have one special for Nebraska. Many LORs are already started, could we not work with someone who has begun this work already?</p>	<p>has X number of learning objects available for faculty use in year 1, Y number in year 2, etc.</p>
<p>Project Justification / Business Case</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Components of the project are consistent with desired outcomes and stated project goals. Components of the project do provide an indication of the process for development, implementation/adoption, and technical integration.</li> <li>- Content creation teams config for K-6 projects and Fellowship program</li> <li>- Adoption of OER, training for faculty in OER acquisition and development and contributing back to the OER community is a wonderful set of goals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The specifics associated with each component do not provide insight into the scalability, feasibility or sustainability of the project. There are clearly tangible benefits, however, there is much less clarity as to whether those benefits can be achieved.</li> <li>- Plan is lacking sufficient detail. Administrative and LOR system support? Size and configuration of physical space.. multi-media production and editing resources (equipment and support) for content teams? Development of Fellows? Consider a competitive pool for advanced content creation to address K7-12 needs.</li> <li>- No evidence was provided that existing LOR efforts in other states (or for that matter, in higher ed) could be partnered with to facilitate a broader content pool and lower cost. Why must we build our own?</li> </ul>
<p>Technical Impact</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- High quality digital learning content that is highly accessible, standardized and packaged in a modular format conducive to inclusion and presentation via learning management platforms is desirable.</li> <li>- Vision of centralized LOR.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Beyond mention of the support for a number of current projects, the balance of this section was cast in the context of cost savings/cost avoidance. The assertion that a LOR with high quality content will reduce the need for districts to purchase student devices is utterly groundless and nearly senseless. It will, in all likelihood, have just the opposite effect. As a device becomes a necessary condition for the delivery of instructional content the assertion that a device is to digital content what a backpack is to books, demonstrates reckless disregard for the technical realities of delivering digital content to 100s of thousands of learners across the state.</li> <li>- BYOD has its own set of challenges and cost implications that need to be addressed. Age and quality of devices and components. Technical support (operating systems, drivers, software versions...) compliance, security implications. Is the infrastructure ready for additional devices? Content standards and tools should be included to ensure a uniform experience for users.</li> <li>- No technical implementation details were provided. While claims are made that this will reduce costs, no data is provided to indicate what current costs are.</li> </ul>
<p>Preliminary Plan for Implementation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A timeline is provided with some indication of scope and sequence.</li> <li>- While the details of the implementation plan are weak, the overall timeline appears to be reasonable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is very little in the way of specific outcomes and the impact they might have on student achievement and teacher effectiveness.</li> <li>- There is a ton of work being done in this area already nationally, but little evidence in implementation of a market survey or other means of determining best practice/potential partnerships, other than a tacit mention of "establishing needed partnerships". Demarcation of roles is not clearly spelled out.</li> </ul>
<p>Risk Assessment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The author outlines the foreseeable risks including solution fragmentation resulting from an inability to achieve stakeholder consensus, and the potential of budget overrun based on improperly scoping the project or having to over promise in an attempt to achieve sufficient adoption velocity to keep the project moving forward.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No specific mitigation strategy beyond the hope that a dedicated eLearning Project director can sprinkle sufficient magic dust to build and maintain a partnership coalition.</li> <li>- What happens to project funding if State-wide LOR cannot be agreed upon? Can LOR selection and agreement be contingent upon and completed prior to project start? What is the risk</li> </ul>

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		for low quantity, low quality or relevant content? How will this be mitigated? - One significant risk not identified is reluctance of faculty to move to OER from commercial sources.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Project proposal, in total, does provide a breakdown of anticipated costs.	- The costs, as indicated in the attached summary document, show that less than 7% will be spent on content, whereas, nearly 20% will be spent on creation/curation. Moreover, the single largest expenditure constituting nearly 35% of the total is for data dashboard integration leading the reviewer to conclude this is miscast as a content/LOR project when, in actuality, it is much more about the data dashboard. - Can cost savings projections for state-wide LOR be provided? Can an IRR/ROI be established for the project?

**TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS**

Technical Panel Checklist				Comments
	Yes	No	Unknown	
1. Is the project technically feasible?				✓
2. Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?				
3. Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?				

Project #	Agency	Project Title
13-02	Department of Education	Education Data Systems Capacity Building

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)**

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: [http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project\\_proposals/2015-2017.html](http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html) ]

The recent Nebraska Education Data Systems study, in response to Legislative Resolution 264, found that Nebraska spends an estimated \$100 million annually for technology systems, software systems, and accountability data submissions by the public school districts and the Nebraska Department of Education (NDE). The systems and applications are largely focused on satisfying Federal and State accountability reporting requirements and do not directly contribute to supporting teaching and learning. The districts submit annual collections of data to support accountability to the state using a combination of automated and manual methods. An estimated 655,200 hours are spent by districts preparing the required collections for each year's accountability data submission.

Each district has selected its own set of administrative, teaching and learning, and back office applications and there is a large disparity in the number of applications available in small districts versus larger districts due to budget, staff, and capacity. Outside of Nebraska's largest districts, the digital tools are poorly integrated, there is little support for data-driven decision-making, and modern tools are not available to support instructional improvement necessary for the state's education initiatives of blended learning, teacher and principal evaluation, career readiness, and continuous school improvement.

Nebraska's network of Educational Service Units (ESUs), the ESU Coordinating Council (ESUCC), and Network Nebraska are all contributing to improving the capabilities and the efficiencies of the data systems for the districts. However, the coordination, support, and access for systems can be dramatically improved and serves as the basis for this multi-faceted approach to develop a statewide data system that builds long-term capacity, efficacy, and efficiency for the system of education. The study established 10 recommendations that included five work streams; leverage work conducted using the federal \$4.3 million SLDS grant scheduled to end June 2015.

The proposed implementation roadmap for the Nebraska Education Data System estimates a three-year investment of \$41,960,110, roughly evenly split across the three years. The rollout plan targets a phase in process over three years that could include 50 districts the first year, 150 the second year, and 245 during the third year resulting in cost savings and efficiencies that will also provide a financial return from substantially-reduced accountability costs and from reduced technology costs to districts. The projected cumulative net return for the investment over five years is \$44.8 million. However, the primary benefits from the recommended investments will come from a greatly improved instructional system that improves student performance leading to greater student success.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

[Next page]

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet  
2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Project #13-02  
Page 2 of 4

Nebraska Department of Education Infrastructure Activities						
	Year 0 FY 2015 SY 2014-2015 8 Districts	Biennium Budget Request	Biennium Budget Request			
			Year 1 FY 2016 SY 2015-2016 50 Districts	Year 2 FY 2017 SY 2016-2017 150 Districts	Year 3 FY 2018 SY 2017-2018 245 Districts	
<b>1 Nebraska Education Infrastructure</b>		<b>Activities and Objectives</b>				
<i>NDC will leverage the Ed-Fi infrastructure to connect source systems and drive down costs.</i>	Pilot Initial SIS vendor Ed-Fi interfaces	Identify and collectively procure state-sponsored SIS(s)				
	Pilot assessment vendor interfaces	Support SIS Vendor Ed-Fi interfaces	\$ 166,667	\$ 166,667	\$ 166,667	
		Support assessment vendor Ed-Fi interfaces	166,667	166,667	166,667	
		Other source system interfaces to Ed-Fi (i.e. SIS, applications)	250,000	250,000	250,000	
		Support transfer to state supported systems in years 2 and 3	166,667	166,667	166,667	
		Develop identity management solution for statewide single sign-on	100,000	100,000	100,000	
		ESUCC Infrastructure	500,000	500,000	500,000	
		Infrastructure scaling and security audit activities	250,000	250,000	250,000	
		<b>Total Contractual Expenditures</b>	<b>1,600,000</b>	<b>1,600,000</b>	<b>1,600,000</b>	
		<b>New Positions</b>				
		Chief of Staff	60,523	60,523	60,523	
		Chief Technology Officer	60,523	60,523	60,523	
		Lead	60,523	60,523	60,523	
		Senior	55,047	55,047	55,047	
		Analyst	50,099	50,099	50,099	
	Analyst	50,099	50,099	50,099		
	<b>Total Salary Expenditures</b>	<b>364,793</b>	<b>364,793</b>	<b>364,793</b>		
	Benefits Expenditures	165,254	165,254	165,254		
	Operating Expenditures	23,805	23,805	23,805		
	Travel Expenditures	10,395	10,395	10,395		
	Equipment Expenditures	60,360	-	-		
	<b>Nebraska Education Infrastructure Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,204,617</b>	<b>\$ 2,244,287</b>	<b>\$ 2,244,287</b>		
<b>2 NDE Data Collection System</b>		<b>Objectives</b>				
<i>NDC will reduce the burden of accountability data submissions on districts through automated process leveraging the Ed-Fi infrastructure.</i>	Accountability Pilot - Integrate CDC, Staff, NRSRS	Statewide rollout with dual submissions (rollout plan based on SIS vendor)	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	
		Develop and validate state accountability reports	500,000	500,000	500,000	
		Develop business rules and validation for automatic accountability submissions	250,000	250,000	250,000	
		Develop and validate federal accountability report submissions	500,000	500,000	500,000	
		Develop district review and approval infrastructure	250,000	250,000	250,000	
		<b>Total Contractual Expenditures</b>	<b>2,000,000</b>	<b>2,000,000</b>	<b>2,000,000</b>	
		<b>New Positions</b>				
		Director, Accountability Data Systems	68,502	68,502	68,502	
		Program Specialist III	55,047	55,047	55,047	
		Database Analyst Lead	60,523	60,523	60,523	
		Database Analyst Senior	55,047	55,047	55,047	
		Database Analyst	50,099	50,099	50,099	
		Database Analyst	50,099	50,099	50,099	
		<b>Total Salary Expenditures</b>	<b>339,217</b>	<b>339,217</b>	<b>339,217</b>	
		Benefits Expenditures	164,380	164,380	164,380	
	Operating Expenditures	23,805	23,805	23,805		
	Travel Expenditures	14,070	14,070	14,070		
	Equipment Expenditures	37,680	-	-		
	<b>NDE Accountability Data System Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,579,252</b>	<b>\$ 2,541,972</b>	<b>\$ 2,541,972</b>		
<b>3 NDE Education Intelligence System</b>		<b>Objectives</b>				
<i>NDC will create education intelligence - access to actionable insight - through a warehouse, business intelligence tool, and increased internal capacity.</i>	Pilot SLDS Student-Level Dashboard	Dashboard statewide rollout	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	
		Dashboard updates and extensions	500,000	500,000	500,000	
		District data warehouse and reporting layer	333,333	333,333	333,333	
		District data warehouse security layer (with and without de-identification)	250,000	250,000	250,000	
		NDE data warehouse cubes and BI layer	166,667	166,667	166,667	
		<b>Total Contractual Expenditures</b>	<b>1,450,000</b>	<b>1,450,000</b>	<b>1,450,000</b>	
		<b>New Positions</b>				
		Chief Privacy Officer	79,873	79,873	79,873	
		Director, Data Research and Evaluation	68,502	68,502	68,502	
		Database Analyst Lead	60,523	60,523	60,523	
		Database Analyst Senior	55,047	55,047	55,047	
		Database Analyst	50,099	50,099	50,099	
		Database Analyst	50,099	50,099	50,099	
		<b>Total Salary Expenditures</b>	<b>364,143</b>	<b>364,143</b>	<b>364,143</b>	
		Benefits Expenditures	168,387	168,387	168,387	
	Operating Expenditures	24,510	24,510	24,510		
	Travel Expenditures	17,680	17,680	17,680		
	Equipment Expenditures	60,360	-	-		
	<b>NDE Education Intelligence System Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,065,080</b>	<b>\$ 2,015,720</b>	<b>\$ 2,015,720</b>		
<b>4 Help Desk &amp; Support</b>		<b>Objectives</b>				
<i>NDC, along with the ESUCC and ESU's, will provide technical support for Nebraska education data systems through a virtual help desk and coordinated knowledge transfer.</i>	Virtual Help Desk Pilot - Dashboards PD Curriculum	Expand help-desk support to include Year 1, 2 & 3 systems	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	
		Develop professional development curriculum on Year 1, 2 & 3 systems	50,000	50,000	50,000	
		Integrate statewide ticketing system for "virtual help desk"	166,667	166,667	166,667	
		Level 4 Support and Contracts	500,000	500,000	500,000	
		<b>Total Contractual Expenditures</b>	<b>766,667</b>	<b>766,667</b>	<b>766,667</b>	
		<b>New Positions</b>				
		Director, Project Management Office	68,502	68,502	68,502	
		IT Help Desk Specialist Senior	50,099	50,099	50,099	
		IT Help Desk Specialist	41,706	41,706	41,706	
		IT Help Desk Specialist	41,706	41,706	41,706	
		Project Manager	50,099	50,099	50,099	
		Project Manager	50,099	50,099	50,099	
		<b>Total Salary Expenditures</b>	<b>302,211</b>	<b>302,211</b>	<b>302,211</b>	
		Benefits Expenditures	158,393	158,394	158,394	
		Operating Expenditures	23,805	26,555	26,555	
	Travel Expenditures	10,395	10,396	10,397		
	Equipment Expenditures	43,350	-	-		
	<b>Help Desk &amp; Support Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,304,821</b>	<b>\$ 1,284,223</b>	<b>\$ 1,284,223</b>		
	<b>Total NDE DRE Capacity Building</b>	<b>\$ 8,173,770</b>	<b>\$ 7,985,772</b>	<b>\$ 7,985,774</b>		
<b>IIS NE Instructional Improvement System</b>		<b>Objectives</b>				
<i>NDC will build the capacity of Nebraska educators to continuously improve the quality of instruction for students through integrated, efficient systems. This will serve as an application store.</i>	Identify key systems:	Identify and collectively procure state-sponsored systems				
	- learning management	Support vendors in integrating with SSO and state data systems	\$ 166,667	\$ 166,667	\$ 166,667	
	- blended learning	Provide PD for districts	83,333	83,333	83,333	
	- teacher/principal evaluation	System licenses paid by state	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	
	- school climate	App Store				
	- career readiness	Survey Resources and Tools				
		<b>Total Contractual Expenditures</b>	<b>5,250,000</b>	<b>5,250,000</b>	<b>5,250,000</b>	
		<b>New Positions</b>				
		Director, Instructional Improvement System	68,502	68,502	68,502	
		Education Specialist IV	68,502	68,502	68,502	
		Program Specialist III	60,523	60,523	60,523	
		Applications Developer Lead	60,523	60,523	60,523	
		Applications Developer Senior	55,047	55,047	55,047	
		Applications Developer	50,099	50,099	50,099	
		Applications Developer	50,099	50,099	50,099	
	<b>Total Salary Expenditures</b>	<b>413,295</b>	<b>413,295</b>	<b>413,295</b>		
	Benefits Expenditures	194,538	194,518	194,538		
	Operating Expenditures	28,360	29,360	29,360		
	Travel Expenditures	22,475	22,475	22,475		
	Equipment Expenditures	66,640	-	-		
	<b>NE Instructional Improvement System Total</b>	<b>\$ 5,975,358</b>	<b>\$ 5,919,718</b>	<b>\$ 5,919,718</b>		
	<b>Total NDE DRE Budget Issue Requests</b>	<b>\$ 14,149,128</b>	<b>\$ 13,905,490</b>	<b>\$ 13,905,492</b>		

**PROJECT SCORE**

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	12	11	13	15
Project Justification / Business Case	20	18	24	21	25
Technical Impact	18	15	18	17	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	7	6	7	10
Risk Assessment	8	6	6	7	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	18	14	15	16	20
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>80</b>	100

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Detailed plan that accounts for systemic change by increasing human, technical and fiscal resources. The proposal has clear goals, technically feasible deliverables and a rich set of milestones to gauge project progress.</li> <li>- Vision: State-wide access to timely, consistent and actionable business intelligence. Improved economies of scale by centralizing resources and standardizing systems and processes.</li> <li>- Goals are well defined</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The scope of the project is considerable requiring a great deal of communication and stakeholder involvement.</li> <li>- Did we consider vendor SAAS particularly as it relates to state sponsored SIS? Did we consider outsourcing Helpdesk Services to take advantage of the economies of scale?</li> <li>- Metrics for several of the goals (cost savings for example) are missing or poorly defined.</li> </ul>
Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal delineates three credible benefits including reduced accountability costs through standardization of data exchange, reduced technology costs through an enterprise approach to data warehousing/business intelligence and improved decision support through the equitable provision of data analytics to all school districts.</li> <li>- A grand idea with good architectural decisions. Open data standards to allow multiple vendors to play in the space, giving flexibility for schools to select solutions based on software scope or value add. Using collaborative purchase power to drive down costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project deliverables are highly dependent upon a level of data standardization never achieved across the 100s of K12 school districts in Nebraska.</li> <li>- It would be helpful to have more insight into how the investment return is calculated and where these funds are redirected too. If the resources remain in the districts working on other initiatives it should not be reported as a savings.</li> </ul>
Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal constitutes a systemic consideration of data gathering, warehousing, analysis and reporting.</li> <li>- Other states have implemented a similar model.</li> <li>- Strong use of open data standards and the resulting implementation flexibility are major strengths of this project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The greatest concern of the reviewer is achieving the operational success necessary to a leverage the functional capacity.</li> <li>- Availability of experienced and quality staff to perform the key functions.</li> </ul>
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The author provides a clear operational/functional roadmap while identifying key stakeholder partners.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The specific roles of stakeholder partners is vague and does not, in all cases, match their current capacities.</li> <li>- Recruiting, developing and retaining key talent at established salary levels.</li> <li>- There are a significant number of moving parts in this project and many of the critical milestones have external dependencies beyond the control of the project team. The project plan as proposed does make nominal attempts to plan around these risks, but the critical date issues could easily compound and place the project budget at significant risk by extending the implementation by a significant margin.</li> </ul>
Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Risks have been identified and key dependencies recognized.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dependencies associated with the work of stakeholder agencies cannot be fully mitigated</li> </ul>

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	- Risks are well identified.	within the context of the proposed project. This is less a failing of the proposed and more a recognition of the difficulties associated with interagency projects. - Hiring and Retaining Key talent. - The mitigation strategies for external risks (vendor responsiveness to implementation timelines) seem to be optimistic enough to put the project at significant risk.
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Costs and overall budget is clearly defined. - If all goes well, the budget seems very reasonable.	- Proposed salaries for key personnel look very low and will make attracting qualified applicants difficult. - Detailed Justification of Staffing levels and source for Compensation benchmarks. - If the project is significantly delayed by external risks, additional funding could be required to extend the project timeline.

**TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS**

Technical Panel Checklist				Comments
	Yes	No	Unknown	
1. Is the project technically feasible?				✓
2. Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?				
3. Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?				

Project #	Agency	Project Title
13-03	Department of Education	Instructional Improvement Systems

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)**

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: [http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project\\_proposals/2015-2017.html](http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html) ]

The recent Nebraska Education Data Systems study, in response to Legislative Resolution 264, found that Nebraska spends an estimated \$100 million annually for technology systems, software systems, and accountability data submissions by the public school districts and the Nebraska Department of Education (NDE). The systems and applications are largely focused on satisfying Federal and State accountability reporting requirements and do not directly contribute to supporting teaching and learning. The districts submit annual collections of data to support accountability to the state using a combination of automated and manual methods. An estimated 655,200 hours are spent by districts preparing the required collections for each year's accountability data submission.

Each district has selected its own set of administrative, teaching and learning, and back office applications and there is a large disparity in the number of applications available in small districts versus larger districts due to budget, staff, and capacity. Outside of Nebraska's largest districts, the digital tools are poorly integrated, there is little support for data-driven decision-making, and modern tools are not available to support instructional improvement necessary for the state's education initiatives of blended learning, teacher and principal evaluation, career readiness, and continuous school improvement.

Nebraska's network of Educational Service Units (ESUs), the ESU Coordinating Council (ESUCC), and Network Nebraska are all contributing to improving the capabilities and the efficiencies of the data systems for the districts. However, the coordination, support, and access for systems can be dramatically improved and serves as the basis for this multi-faceted approach to develop a statewide data system that builds long-term capacity, efficacy, and efficiency for the system of education. The study established 10 recommendations that included five work streams; leverage work conducted using the federal \$4.3 million SLDS grant scheduled to end June 2015.

The proposed implementation roadmap for the Nebraska Education Data System estimates a three-year investment of \$41,960,110, roughly evenly split across the three years. The rollout plan targets a phase in process over three years that could include 50 districts the first year, 150 the second year, and 245 during the third year resulting in cost savings and efficiencies that will also provide a financial return from substantially-reduced accountability costs and from reduced technology costs to districts. The projected cumulative net return for the investment over five years is \$44.8 million. However, the primary benefits from the recommended investments will come from a greatly improved instructional system that improves student performance leading to greater student success.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

[Next page]



**PROJECT SCORE**

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	7	11	11	15
Project Justification / Business Case	20	15	24	20	25
Technical Impact	18	10	18	15	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	6	6	7	10
Risk Assessment	8	6	6	7	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	18	0	15	11	20
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>70</b>	100

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Detailed plan that accounts for systemic change by increasing human, technical and fiscal resources. The proposal has clear goals, technically feasible deliverables and a rich set of milestones to gauge project progress.	- The scope of the project is considerable requiring a great deal of communication and stakeholder involvement that has not been historically in evidence. - Essentially a replica of Educational Capacity proposal
Project Justification / Business Case	- The proposal delineates three credible benefits including reduced accountability costs through standardization of data exchange, reduced technology costs through an enterprise approach to data warehousing/business intelligence and improved decision support through the equitable provision of data analytics to all school districts.	- The project deliverables are highly dependent upon a level of cooperation and agreement upon instructional methods not previously in evidence across the 100s of K12 school districts in Nebraska. - Same justification as Educational Capacity proposal
Technical Impact	- The proposal constitutes a systemic approach to engaging learners and instructors in a digital environment that honors teacher effectiveness as the key to gains in student achievement. The model calls for the foundation of guaranteed and viable curriculum supported by solid instructional design and evaluated through assessment for learning and of growth.	- The greatest concern of the reviewer is achieving the operational success necessary to a leverage the functional capacity. Moreover, this constitutes a fundamental shift in instructional delivery that represents 2nd order change for nearly all K12 teachers. It won't come easily, it won't come quickly, it won't come without leadership and it won't come without professional casualties. - Essentially a replica of Educational Capacity proposal
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- The author provides a clear operational/functional roadmap while identifying key stakeholder partners.	- The specific roles of stakeholder partners is vague and does not, in all cases, match their current capacities. This is especially true in the area of professional development. - Essentially the same as Educational capacity proposal
Risk Assessment	- Risks have been identified and key dependencies recognized.	- Dependencies associated with the work of stakeholder agencies cannot be fully mitigated within the context of the proposed project. This is less a failing of the proposed and more a recognition of the difficulties associated with interagency projects - Essentially the same as Educational capacity proposal
Financial Analysis and Budget	- Costs and overall budget is clearly defined.	- Proposed salaries for key personnel look very low and will make attracting qualified applicants difficult. - Essentially the same as Educational capacity proposal

[Note: Reviewer 3 gave the same scores for both projects 13-02 and 13-03, with no comments on 13-03. The reviewer noted the similarities between the proposals and commented that they appear to be two facets of the same proposal.]

**TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS**

Technical Panel Checklist				Comments
	Yes	No	Unknown	
1. Is the project technically feasible?				✓
2. Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?				
3. Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?				

**NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION**

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet  
2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Project #27-01  
Page 1 of 3

Project #	Agency	Project Title
27-01	Department of Roads	Mainframe Migration

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)**

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: [http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project\\_proposals/2015-2017.html](http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html) ]

The mainframe has been a valuable tool for the NDOR over the last 40 years. But as with all technologies, things change over time and organizations should evaluate the state of their applications; are we providing our users the functionality they need, are we doing it in a cost-effective manner and are we able to support these needs not just over the next few years but in the next 10 years or possibly longer.

That is what the NDOR is doing. We talked with our users about their current systems and their future needs and then looked at our current workforce and the ability to support this environment in the future as we face retirements and the ability to find the skills necessary to support the environment. We determined that the best course of action for the NDOR is to migrate our applications off of the mainframe to a platform we believe provides the functionality our users are looking for and also something that we are able to support in the future. Our plan is to create an RFP to hire an outside source either re-host or convert our mainframe applications to a technology centered on Microsoft and hosted by the Office of the CIO. An RFI has been completed that received two responses, which helped us in determining what we should budget for this project.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

	Prior Expended	FY2015 Appr/Reappr	FY2016 Request	FY2017 Request	Future	Total
<b>1. Personnel Costs</b>						\$ -
<b>2. Contractual Services</b>						
2.1 Design			\$ 300,000.00	\$ 300,000.00		\$ 600,000.00
2.2 Programming			\$ 700,000.00	\$ 700,000.00		\$ 1,400,000.00
2.3 Project Management			\$ 200,000.00	\$ 200,000.00		\$ 400,000.00
2.4 Other						\$ -
<b>3. Supplies and Materials</b>						\$ -
<b>4. Telecommunications</b>						\$ -
<b>5. Training</b>						\$ -
<b>6. Travel</b>						\$ -
<b>7. Other Operating Costs</b>						\$ -
<b>8. Capital Expenditures</b>						
8.1 Hardware			\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00		\$ 50,000.00
8.2 Software			\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00		\$ 50,000.00
8.3 Network						\$ -
8.4 Other						\$ -
<b>TOTAL COSTS</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000.00	\$ 1,250,000.00	\$ -	\$ 2,500,000.00
<b>General Funds</b>						\$ -
Cash Funds			\$ 1,250,000.00	\$ 1,250,000.00		\$ 2,500,000.00
Federal Funds						\$ -
Revolving Funds						\$ -
Other Funds						\$ -
<b>TOTAL FUNDS</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000.00	\$ 1,250,000.00	\$ -	\$ 2,500,000.00

**PROJECT SCORE**

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	10	13	12	15
Project Justification / Business Case	20	15	23	19	25
Technical Impact	15	15	18	16	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	7	8	7	10
Risk Assessment	6	8	10	8	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	15	13	20	16	20
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>78</b>	100

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The goal of consolidating application platforms and languages does help with staffing by limiting skills required by staff.</li> <li>- Clearly states goal and the objectives of the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The expectation that this can be done with an existing COTS tool is not reasonable. The more likely outcome is the rewrite or replacement of the business system.</li> <li>- Measurement and assessment methods could use some fleshing out.</li> </ul>
Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Based on the age of their applications, it is appropriate for NDOR to be exploring this to ensure they are where they need to be as an Agency in regards to their applications.</li> <li>- The plan recognizes the need to replace or update aging business systems.</li> <li>- Clearly defined tangible benefit of a significant cost savings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This might be a difficult project to determine tangible benefits due to the size of it and not knowing if NDOR has already mapped out interdependencies between applications to see when and how all applications are tied together.</li> <li>- The return on investment will be 4 years using the \$1.4M estimate, 7 years if the costs are \$2.5M. I do not think the all of the cost to convert these applications has been identified and the ROI will be much longer.</li> <li>- Still evaluating other solutions - no mention of any solutions being rejected.</li> </ul>
Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NDOR understands the implications of staying where they are unless something is done in the way of training and teaching students to ensure these applications can be supported in the language they are currently written in. This project could potentially have a huge technical impact on the users within NDOR as there might be a need for extensive training for their staff.</li> <li>- When completed technology will be consolidated for DOR applications.</li> <li>- Clearly describes replacement of technology / platform that is growing increasingly difficult to support due to limited available resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Unless applications are rewritten, you are just trading one dependency for another.</li> <li>- Complete reliance upon a single-vendor proprietary technology / platform. Does not address security related to the project objectives.</li> </ul>
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NDOR has spent a considerable amount of time preparing for this possible change by issuing the RFI and researching as much as possible.</li> <li>- RFP has not been completed, but clearly describes intended plans, teams, resources, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Understand no timeline yet but NDOR needs to make sure they recognize all of the potential interdependencies with a project of this size and have strong project management. Still so early in the project it is difficult to tell if the plan for implementation is solid.</li> <li>- Many of the resources required for this implementation are the same ones mentioned in other plans. Are there adequate staffing to implement this solution in a timely manner.</li> </ul>
Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reasonable examination of the risks.</li> <li>- Good description of possible barriers and mitigation strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pretty generic risk assessment statements. Do not know how much time NDOR has spent on uncovering specific risks to any of their Division's as a result of this change.</li> <li>- There are multiple variables that could impact this project and many of them are outside of the control of the agency.</li> </ul>
Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RFI has been issued, some details have been identified.</li> <li>- Very clear, easy to understand, and quite reasonable to see the anticipated cost savings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Because it is so early in the project, it is difficult to say for sure what the financial benefits will be or the costs may be once interdependencies are determined.</li> <li>- All costs have not been identified and details on what technical solution (convert or translate) will be implemented are not clear.</li> </ul>

**TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS**

Technical Panel Checklist				Comments
	Yes	No	Unknown	
1. Is the project technically feasible?				✓
2. Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?				
3. Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?				

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet  
2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Project #27-02  
Page 1 of 3

Project #	Agency	Project Title
27-02	Department of Roads	Stock Supply System

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)**

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: [http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project\\_proposals/2015-2017.html](http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html) ]

The existing supply system application is mainframe based and has been in production for over 15 years. This has been a useful tool for the Procurement section of the Operations Division and it has made it easier for all Divisions and District to order supplies necessary for them to do their day to day operations.

As with all software applications and with hands on day-to-day operations, there comes a time when users determine new needs, see opportunities to make improvements and take advantage of newer technologies. Moving applications off of the mainframe is but one of the Business Technology Support Division's (BTSD) goals. NDOR is a Microsoft based shop utilizing newer technologies such as C#.NET and SQL Server 2012 while our software development methodology follows the Agile practice.

The goal of this project is finding or developing a system to provide for a warehouse management system (WMS) of supplies that will replace the legacy Supply Inventory System (SUP). The goal is to have a system that will allow for inventory control/monitoring of stock, ordering, receiving, picking, replenishments, shipping and returns while utilizing Radio Frequency Identification (RF) devices or other similar electronic scanning functionality. The WMS should also provide substantial reporting features that will help with overall WMS management. I have attached a Business Process Modeling report produced in-house which outlines the current Stock Supply system and describes what NDOR had envisioned to be a suitable replacement for the current system.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

	Prior Expended	FY2015 Appr/Reappr	FY2016 Request	FY2017 Request	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs						\$ -
2. Contractual Services						
2.1 Design			\$ 75,000.00	\$ 75,000.00		\$ 150,000.00
2.2 Programming			\$ 75,000.00	\$ 75,000.00		\$ 150,000.00
2.3 Project Management			\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00		\$ 60,000.00
2.4 Other						\$ -
3. Supplies and Materials						\$ -
4. Telecommunications						\$ -
5. Training						\$ -
6. Travel						\$ -
7. Other Operating Costs						\$ -
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.1 Hardware			\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00		\$ 40,000.00
8.2 Software			\$ 100,000.00	\$ 100,000.00		\$ 200,000.00
8.3 Network						\$ -
8.4 Other						\$ -
<b>TOTAL COSTS</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 300,000.00	\$ -	\$ 600,000.00
General Funds						\$ -
Cash Funds			\$ 300,000.00	\$ 300,000.00		\$ 600,000.00
Federal Funds						\$ -
Revolving Funds						\$ -
Other Funds						\$ -
<b>TOTAL FUNDS</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 300,000.00	\$ -	\$ 600,000.00

[Note: After the project proposal was submitted, NDOR received responses to their Request for Information (RFI) relating to this project. Costs estimates from the responses ranged from \$200,000 to \$1,400,000 for the project.]

**PROJECT SCORE**

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	12	15	14	15
Project Justification / Business Case	21	25	25	24	25
Technical Impact	17	15	18	17	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	7	8	8	10
Risk Assessment	9	7	10	9	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	15	15	19	16	20
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>87</b>	100

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It would appear a significant amount of time has been spent on documenting and determining what is needed internally by NDOR.</li> <li>- Project team has identified requirements and business users were involved.</li> <li>- Clearly defined goals, objectives, and expected outcomes. Measurement and assessment methods are in line with real world system functions, and seem reasonable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Large systems with many users.</li> </ul>
Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The justification is appropriate that if NDOR is able to successfully procure the right solution, the benefits they have listed are what should be realized. Department of Correctional Services is using a module in E1/JD Edwards for the same purpose so it might be beneficial to talk with them.</li> <li>- Time for mainframe solution to be replaced to enhance functionality.</li> <li>- Tangible (cost savings) and intangible benefits (better interface) seem reasonable and clearly defined.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At this point, it does not appear that NDOR is able to determine an economic return on investment with this project.</li> <li>- Requirements definition may be more challenging than described, limited internal resources to complete the project</li> </ul>
Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is appropriate for NDOR to be considering updating this based on the age of what they currently have and its apparent inability to meet their internal needs. Would encourage them to work with OCIO for the placement of any hardware into the State Data Center as well as using the wireless access points that the State has standardized on.</li> <li>- Team has spent time collecting business flow and some requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to minimize the number of interfaces into the State ERP system so would encourage NDOR to utilize E1 if possible.</li> <li>- Technical interfaces with multiple financial systems will be complicated and require ongoing coordination and maintenance</li> <li>- Solution has not been selected, so technical descriptions are somewhat vague. Does not address security.</li> </ul>
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The team that has been assembled to work on this project is diverse and represents NDOR business needs</li> <li>- Project team has worked with business clients to identify some requirements.</li> <li>- Teams and sponsors clearly defined.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Although the RFP has not been completed, there should be a reasonable timeframe that can be established to get this implemented.</li> <li>- Finding vendor with solution to meet needs without modification will be difficult.</li> <li>- No RFP issued yet, so details somewhat lacking in terms of plan, etc.</li> </ul>
Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project team has worked with business clients to identify some requirements</li> <li>- Possible barriers, and mitigation strategies are clearly defined.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Solution is complex and requires interfaces to multiple systems.</li> </ul>
Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Financial information seems sufficient and reasonable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pretty generic estimates.</li> <li>- Cost estimate is seems low for application of this size.</li> </ul>

**TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS**

Technical Panel Checklist				Comments
	Yes	No	Unknown	
1. Is the project technically feasible?				✓
2. Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?				
3. Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?				

**NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION**

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet  
2015-2017 Biennial Budget

Project #27-03  
Page 1 of 3

Project #	Agency	Project Title
27-03	Department of Roads	ARMS Enhancements

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)**

[Full text of all proposals are posted at: [http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project\\_proposals/2015-2017.html](http://nitc.nebraska.gov/commission/project_proposals/2015-2017.html) ]

ARMS stands for Automated Right-of-Way Management System. In the late 90s, the head of our Right-of-Way (ROW) Division had this idea of a workflow solution to handle the ROW process from the time preliminary plans came to the Division until the purchasing of ROW had been completed and the project was to be archived. They worked with developers at NDOR to design a system that used Lotus Notes as the base, since at that time it was the e-mail system that was used by most State Agencies. In 2008, the Office of the CIO (OCIO) began to implement a statewide e-mail system based on Microsoft Outlook. Agencies were to eliminate other mail systems, which meant NDOR had to get rid of Lotus Notes. That being the case, we began work on developing an RFP to find a vendor who could provide a Commercial off the Shelf (COTS) system to replace ARMS. All of this, including the award of the RFP, was completed prior to the decision to implement OnBase as the Enterprise Content Management System (ECMS) for the State.

As with a number of software implementations, as the work was being done a number of enhancements arose once the ROW Division began testing the software. We also discovered a number of items that we overlooked in the RFP that should have been included. Also, change in leadership along with other key members in the Division has led to changes in their processes which need to be taken into account in the system. The implementation has been going on for over two years and final sign-off for the RFP is planned in June, 2015. Once that is done, we will be in maintenance mode and any enhancements or additional work must be done as separate statements of work. That is the reason for this project.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

	Prior Expended	FY2015 Appr/Reappr	FY2016 Request	FY2017 Request	Future	Total
<b>1. Personnel Costs</b>						\$ -
<b>2. Contractual Services</b>						
2.1 Design			\$ 75,000.00	\$ 75,000.00		\$ 150,000.00
2.2 Programming			\$ 100,000.00	\$ 100,000.00		\$ 200,000.00
2.3 Project Management			\$ 75,000.00	\$ 75,000.00		\$ 150,000.00
2.4 Other						\$ -
<b>3. Supplies and Materials</b>						\$ -
<b>4. Telecommunications</b>						\$ -
<b>5. Training</b>						\$ -
<b>6. Travel</b>						\$ -
<b>7. Other Operating Costs</b>						\$ -
<b>8. Capital Expenditures</b>						
8.1 Hardware			\$ -	\$ -		\$ -
8.2 Software			\$ -	\$ -		\$ -
8.3 Network						\$ -
8.4 Other						\$ -
<b>TOTAL COSTS</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ -	\$ 500,000.00
<b>General Funds</b>						\$ -
Cash Funds			\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00		\$ 500,000.00
Federal Funds						\$ -
Revolving Funds						\$ -
Other Funds						\$ -
<b>TOTAL FUNDS</b>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ -	\$ 500,000.00

**PROJECT SCORE**

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	10	15	12	15
Project Justification / Business Case	20	19	22	20	25
Technical Impact	15	16	15	15	20
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	6	7	6	10
Risk Assessment	7	6	10	8	10
Financial Analysis and Budget	15	13	18	15	20
			<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>77</b>	100

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New systems moves away from Lotus notes and uses enterprise content management solution.</li> <li>- Clearly defined goals, objectives, outcomes, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is not clear on the division of work to be done in the ROW application or ECM.</li> </ul>
Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The justification is appropriate.</li> <li>- Project makes use of enterprise solutions.</li> <li>- Automation and improved records management are reasonable justifications for a project such as this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It would appear that this project is a result of missing items in the original RFP that was issued for the replacement of their automated ROW system. NDOR needs to ensure that this second attempt they are making will be all inclusive of their needs.</li> <li>- Scope of work is not clear</li> <li>- No indication of other solutions evaluated.</li> </ul>
Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DOR has experience with solutions to be implemented.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NDOR needs to ensure they have a clearly defined scope to their "definition of change" comment otherwise this could become quite costly for them.</li> <li>- Scope of work to be implemented in ROW and ECM not clear.</li> <li>- Overall technical impact is vague. Does not address security.</li> </ul>
Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teams and sponsors clearly identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Because the initial project is not completed, it is hard to evaluate the implementation for the phase 2 part of this project. It would appear, based on the comments in the executive summary, that strong project management needs to be put into place to ensure the deliverables are well defined and delivered in a timely manner.</li> <li>- Current project not completed scope of work not well defined.</li> <li>- No identification of plans.</li> </ul>
Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It looks like NDOR has a contingency plan to ensure that they are able to complete this project.</li> <li>- Reasonable description of possible barriers and good mitigation strategies identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ROW projected not implemented and ECM work not defined.</li> </ul>
Financial Analysis and Budget		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not too much detail - these are pretty generic categories.</li> <li>- Without scope of work defined, cost cannot be estimated. Information provided is a ball park number?</li> <li>- Difficult to judge the financial aspect when technical impact is vague, but seems likely reasonable with the provided information.</li> </ul>

**TECHNICAL PANEL COMMENTS**

Technical Panel Checklist				Comments
	Yes	No	Unknown	
1. Is the project technically feasible?				✓
2. Is the proposed technology appropriate for the project?				
3. Can the technical elements be accomplished within the proposed timeframe and budget?				