

Project Lessons Learned Form

General Information					
Project Name				Date	
NeSIS PeopleSoft Campus Solutions ADA Compliance				9/19/2014	
Sponsoring Agency					
University of Nebraska					
Contact		Phone	Email		Employer
Jim Zemke		402-472-5195	jzemke@nebraska.edu		UNCSN
Project Manager		Phone	Email		Employer
Don Mihulka		402-472-8344	dmihulka@nebraska.edu		UNCSN
Project Start Date		08/01/2010	Estimated End Date	12/31/2011	Project End Date
					09/01/2014
Key Questions				Explanation	
1. Did the scope of the project change? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No				<p>This project began as an effort to assess the level of ADA compliance for the Campus Solutions Student Information System and evolved into a project to also address the compliance short comings that were discovered.</p> <p>Staff were assigned to complete a comprehensive ADA compliance review of Campus Solutions to include not only the base Oracle Campus Solutions system but also all UN/State College system modifications and enhancements. A visually impaired student worker was also hired to assist in this evaluation and he was able to provide unique and very valuable insight into usability and access issues.</p> <p>Modifications were implemented to better align Campus Solutions with UN ADA compliance policy. Additionally, compliance guidelines were established to continually monitor both vendor distributed Campus Solutions system modifications and to guide future system development and modifications to insure future compliance.</p>	

2. Did the project meet the expectations of the stakeholders? X Yes	Yes. The initial expectation was completion of an assessment of the level of Campus Solutions compliance. That was achieved. The project then moved forward to also address the compliance issues that were discovered and to put in place procedures to insure ADA compliance is addressed on a continual basis in the future.
3. Did the project costs exceed the budget provided? X Yes	No specific budget was established for this project at its outset since the scope of the project could not be determined until the assessment of the level of compliance was determined. Oracle/PeopleSoft, the Campus Solutions vendor, had stated that Campus Solutions was, in their opinion, fully ADA compliant but that was their own subjective opinion. Our analysis did reveal some problems with the base Campus Solutions system when measured against what we (i.e. the University of Nebraska and the State Colleges) felt was a reasonable level of ADA compliance. That, in turn, led to extending the scope of the project to also address these issues and problems and put in place processes and procedure to insure a reasonable level of compliance was maintained in the future.

Significant Project Milestones Insert additional lines as necessary.					
Milestone	Met	Not Met	Original Date	Actual Date	Impact (if late)
Phase I - perform initial ADA compliance evaluation – base Campus Solutions system and core functions.	X		12/31/2011	12/31/2013	
Phase II – perform ADA compliance evaluation for in-house implemented base system modifications (i.e. campus portals, identity management/authentication, online admissions application, etc).	X			3/1/2014	

Phase III – perform ADA compliance evaluation for all in-house developed system modifications and enhancements and ancillary components (i.e. guest access, student dashboards, admin/staff dashboards, etc)	X			6/1/2014	
Develop mitigation strategy and implement modifications and enhancements to improve ADA compliance.	X			9/1/2014	Work continues to migrate the mods and enhancements that have been developed to address identified compliance issues into our production environments.
Put in place processes and procedures to continually monitor ADA compliance and insure future Campus Solutions modifications and enhancements meet the UN/SC reasonable level of ADA compliance standards.	X			9/1/2014	

What went wrong during the project and recommendations to avoid similar occurrences in the future
Provide a summary of what went wrong during the project, including the problem or issue, the impact and the recommendation to avoid those occurrences in the future.

This project evolved over time which resulted in significant scope creep. However, that occurred because once the initial assessment of compliance was completed it was obvious that we needed to implement changes to address the issues and problems identified during the evaluation phase. In hindsight, this project could've been broken down into multiple separate projects aligned with the project phases organized around the project milestones noted above.

Progress was slower than we would've liked due to a number of issues. Staffing constraints and a general lack of knowledge concerning how to best go about evaluating ADA compliance was an issue initially. Additional staff were added to the project to address the staffing issue and time was spent researching and becoming familiar with the testing and evaluation tools and techniques required. We also employed a visually impaired student worker to assist in the evaluation process which was very beneficial. Once we began the analysis we realized the definition of ADA compliance and "reasonable accommodation", which is institution specific, required clarification. That is, the ADA statutes are quite vague concerning any specific evaluation criteria. Considerable time was spent on research and establishing UN/SC evaluation criteria and finding appropriate tools to assist in the evaluation process. Evaluation of compliance was then found to be a very time consuming process. The vendor's position that Campus Solutions was ADA compliant complicated our ability to address some of the compliance issues that were exposed during our evaluation process since we have a policy to minimize modifications to any vendor supplied base system functionality. We did report the findings of our evaluation to Oracle, the Campus Solutions vendor, and they have agreed they will attempt to address the compliance issues we identified in future releases.

What went right during the project and how similar projects may benefit from this information

Provide a summary of what went right during the project, including the success or accomplishment, the impact and how future projects may benefit from this information.

Although this project did take much longer to complete than initially anticipated that was largely because the scope of the project was extended from evaluation of ADA compliance levels of the base Campus Solutions system to the actual implementation of modifications, enhancements, and processes and procedures to address compliance on a long-term basis for the entire Campus Solutions system and all associated additional components.

As noted above it may have been appropriate to break this entire effort down into multiple smaller projects with more distinct objectives. However, it is doubtful that would have resulted in any time or cost savings.

NITC Reporting/Process Improvements and Recommendations

Use this section to insert NITC Enterprise Reporting improvements and recommendations.

If it is desired that the monthly project status updates are cumulative for the duration of the project it is suggested that each monthly entry for each section include a date/time stamp and the initials of the person entering the update for tracking purposes and improved readability.

Additional Comments

Use this section to insert comments / concerns not included in any other section.

Monitoring and insuring ADA compliance is an ongoing issue. Not all of the modifications and enhancements required to address identified compliance issues identified to date have been fully implemented in all production environments.