NORTH DAKOTA UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

ConnectND

Post-Implementation Report

December 2005

Report Prepared by:
Rich Lehn
NDUS Project Oversight

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Post-Implementation Report contains an analysis from the Post-Implementation Survey sent to various project team members. This survey was sent to the individuals who were most heavily involved in or performed a major role in project implementation. They included members of the Executive Steering Committee (the Executive Steering Committee would later be succeeded by an Executive Oversight Committee), Executive Oversight Committee, module leads team, Data Center staff, and developer staff. In an attempt to solicit the most returns, the survey was sent to forty individuals. Eleven (27.5%) surveys were returned.

Survey questions were rated on a scale of 1 to 3 with 1 being low and 3 high. Results were calculated based on all responses that were not listed as N/A. The rating was derived from the responses (1, 2, or 3) to each question answered divided by the total number of respondents. Each section was then scored based on all the questions answered in the section with a 1, 2, or 3 divided by the total number of respondents. The rating gives an indication of satisfaction and defines areas where improvements are needed.

Attached as an appendix (Appendix A) is a sample copy of the survey that was distributed to key project team members. This survey is being used on all projects to determine the effectiveness of project management. While the NDUS will use this survey on current and future IT projects, this ConnectND project was managed in part by Maximus, a private consulting company that was hired to be the implementation partner. Maximus provided the bulk of project management and its responsiveness is also reflected in the rating and comments.

Throughout this document, comments from respondents are included. Not all comments are included separately if a similar theme was expressed by multiple respondents.

A. SYSTEM EFFECTIVENESS

Perceptions of ConnectND project effectiveness range widely. Some individuals rated this section low while some others rated this section much higher. The perception (perception is reality to the individual) appears to be influenced by what involvement individuals (respondents) had in the project and for how long the individuals or their campuses had been live on the system. There is a steep learning curve to this project and it takes time to adjust. For some, the new system takes considerable more effort to use;

whereas, some others have already seen the benefits in the information that can be generated from the data that exists in the system.

The ConnectND project will take time to learn before productivity begins to climb. This was pointed out in earlier reports to the Executive Steering Committee and senior council members. An example of where this was pointed out is the Return on Investment document. There is an understanding among the senior management that this will take time as every individual, whether faculty/staff/student, is impacted. The legacy system took years of development to its level of functionality before the ConnectND project replaced that system. Everyone needs to keep in mind that with the new system there was a need to revise business practices and change functionality in order to make use of the system. While there was a change in hardware and software, the major change was in the way faculty/staff/students use ConnectND. Change management was less a hardware/software issue and more of a human interface issue.

To point out the varying perceptions, the following are a few comments from respondents to this portion of the survey: "A work in progress." "As a pilot campus, Mayville had lots of unmet needs, but as the implementation has gone system-wide, things are much better." "Planning was done with diligence and reasonableness." Another respondent commented "Most processes worked well, with the exception of Grants and ancillary interfaces. Reporting continues to challenge us." Also stated was "Staff is tired. We were not prepared/staffed for this level of time consumption. Staff members are beginning to realize the time commitment is not temporary & looking to move on." "Central consolidation and access of information from Web based system meets the cutting edge of business functions for higher education and places the NDUS in an elite standing among many national institutions of higher learning." "Basic functions were well met, many functions, probably considered as enhancements are yet to be tested and implemented. Legacy system was replaced with minimum customization allowing financial and human resource integration at various levels between higher education and government; the vendor database set up in Higher Education and State Agencies is successful." "Fast tracking for a project of this size and scope was a high priority for those not in the trenches; this gave a push to 'get the project' done – no matter what. The job was accomplished, but there could have been so much more done to have a really good system and for end-users, especially in the academic – educational environment, the training was inadequate, particularly when implementation members – accepted and endorsed by the consultants – to take over…without understanding the implications that the final training involved some final system testing as well as educating the people designated as the trainers for the campuses. This has resulted into much more post production work which had hindered

further implementation of other system features. With that said the system is fantastic and meets expectations of processes."

Comments from some of the technical/development staff included: "There is too much technical work that is not yet done. This creates additional stress on tech people who are trying to get this work done, trying to learn the new system, and trying to keep production up and running." "Technical resources were inadequate, and this was known at the beginning of the project." "It is totally amazing what we did with the resources that were available; however, we didn't have enough resources, and continue to struggle because of this." "The project was done in too short a time frame to build missing functionality so much is still missing. New development is still not possible because the majority of the developer's time is spent on Production support. As a result, more shadow systems have been developed by the campuses to cover the missing functionality." "This (ConnectND) is/was not a mature system."

Comments from others included: "The goal for consistency was thrown out the window when the final four campuses came to go-live. They got whatever they wanted." "I would say very few if any of the objectives in the Project Charter were met." "Other than being a new administrative system and web-based, it appears it may have missed the needs of the institutions. We appear to have taken a huge step back concerning integration and efficiency. It is very slow and very manual. Meaning it takes excessively more people input and it is very unforgiving. We will continue to struggle for years due to a lack of understanding of the fit-gap process, the configuration process, the appropriate testing of the integration process and a lack of knowledge concerning PeopleSoft." "The turn around time is unreasonable."

Overall Survey Rating:

1.78

- Scale of 1 – 3, with 1 being low and 3 high
- Results are based on all responses that were not listed as N/A. Rating derived from points awarded divided by total number of respondents for this section of the survey.

B. COST, SCOPE, SCHEDULE, AND QUALITY MANAGEMENT

Throughout this project, project management processes were used to manage the costs, scope, schedule, and quality. Change control forms were

used for changes and a Changes, Risks, and Issues Log was regularly maintained to track such items.

Project Cost

The project cost for the NDUS as of June 30, 2005, was $31,642,694 with an estimated at completion cost of $32,382,697. While a bond of approximately $20M was approved for implementation of PeopleSoft (ConnectND Project) to be used by the state and NDUS, the bulk of the NDUS repayment burden and the continued operations rest on fees assessed to students.

	Original Budget FY'01 – FY'05	**Revised – Last on May 2005**	**6/30/2005 Actual**	**Estimated Actual Costs At Completion**
Environment Hosting – Data Center	$2,230,475	$2,484,212	$2,255,636	$2,484,212
Implementation Costs – (Maximus)	$6,975,879	$9,795,349	$9,679,822	$9,795,349
PeopleSoft Software	$180,000	$168,515	$168,518	$168,518
Staffing Costs (Direct bill to Project)	$5,606,951	$5,529,909	$5,336,929	$5,529,909
Training/ Travel	$1,166,037	$861,537	$810,046	$861,537
Other Funded Costs (Note 1)	$6,632,132	$6,634,794	$6,483,262	$6,634,794
Total Project Funded Budget	$22,791,474	$25,474,316	$24,734,213	$25,474,319
Staffing Costs (Not Billed to Project)	$6,933,287	$6,908,378	$6,908,378	$6,908,378
TOTAL Project Budget	$29,724,761	$32,382,694	$31,642,591	$32,382,697

Note 1 – Other funded costs includes items such as repayment of note, cost to issue bond, contingency, customization, maintenance costs, implementation site cost.

Comments expressed by respondents to the survey regarding budget included: "The hardest thing for a small campus was for the need to add personnel that we couldn't afford. We are not alone in this process. The backfill money helped for a while, but the permanent costs for people is still

a struggle. Resources are never adequate in a system like ours." "The budget for this project was inadequate for what needed to be done. Campuses are now paying the price by hiring additional staff, etc. to manage the work-arounds." "The costs do not reflect the total project cost. The campuses contributed significant amounts of funding (consultants) and resources. Also, the project team was not paid on an hourly basis."

Project Scope

Numerous change Requests were approved by the Executive Steering Committee during the life of this project. The broad sense of the project's scope of replacing the legacy system while adding other functionality and a web based interface were met. When looking at the project management triangle of scope, schedule, and cost (budget), scope was the one with least change.

Comments from respondents regarding the change control process included: "I don't think it was done well. What was the change control process? Maximus left a lot to be desired in terms of both communications and management of the project." "I was unclear with the Change Control process, it seemed that everyone was doing it differently. While some university project team members tried to follow the guidelines provided by Maximus, the Maximus staff chose to many times ignore those guidelines. As a developer, we are now paying for the lack of enforcement of the technical standards. Upgrades are becoming increasingly expensive because those standards were not followed or development requests were not written at all or poorly written."

Project Schedule

The comparison summary of the baseline schedule against the actual schedule is normally analyzed in this section. Documentation in the repository does not include the completed project schedule for the entire project (completion of go-live for Student Administration at the final four campuses). Requests were made from the Maximus project manager; however, a reconstructed schedule was not provided to date. The original intent for the project was to implement ConnectND at two campuses as pilots along with the state Office of Budget and Management. After these were implemented, the next phase was to add the remaining nine campuses and add other functionality that was not part of the pilot institutions. State would implement ConnectND at all its other agencies. For the NDUS, the

second phase did not roll out as originally planned. Due mostly to a problem with the Grants/Contracts module, the decision was made to delay go-live of MiSU, MiSU-B, NDSU, and UND until the Grants/Contracts module was modified sufficiently for these campuses to implement ("sufficiently" meant could work around and meet Federal requirements). Five campuses went live with the Financials and HRMS modules in July 2004 and the four delayed campuses followed on January 1, 2005. The Student Administration system had to proceed with go-live based on the academic calendar; however, all campuses were live on the new system as of July 2005.

Project Quality

Quality of the project was brought to fruition by the individuals involved in the project. When asked about how effectively the Quality Management Plan was applied during Project Execution and how effective the quality assurance process was, comments included: "Teams were effective and they communicated." "No time to do true quality management testing." "Tech standards were not adhered to by the consultants, and therefore, by us. Due to this fact, we will be cleaning up the mess for YEARS." One respondent indicated that they were unaware of the Quality Management Plan while another stated, "If there was a Quality Management Plan we would not be struggling at the institution level as we are today. It must be flawed due to the struggles going on at the institution level." Once again, this points out the difference in perceptions depending on project involvement, how long a campus has been live on the system, and possibly the "buy-in" (acceptance of change) into the project.

When asked how effective the utilization of best practices was from prior projects in the NDUS and institutions, comments included, "I was disappointed that the consultants did not come equipped with more knowledge on 'best practices' in higher education. Many times I felt we were starting from scratch on processes that had already been implemented at hundreds of other campuses." "Best practices could not be applied in this project (if they could even be identified) with the short timeline. Most IT projects I have worked on in the past had each task identified up front. This was not possible with a project of this scope." "The concept of best practices went quickly out the window as we had more campuses going live. Only the two initial campuses actually had to change their policies and practices to fit into best practices." "If we captured any Best Practices in PS (PeopleSoft) it was purely by chance. When your implementation partner doesn't understand or know your business nor understand PS 8.4 you're left trying to do what you think is best."

Overall Survey Rating:

1.63

- Scale of 1 – 3, with 1 being low and 3 high
- Results are based on all responses that were not listed as N/A. Rating derived from points awarded divided by total number of respondents for this section of the survey.

C. RISK MANAGEMENT

Risks were managed through identification by the project team and tracked through use of a Risk Log. Risks that had been identified and during the course of the project became a reality were moved to an Issue Log where they were tracked, assigned to someone to resolve, and included the resolution or actions taken. Additional "issues" had been logged that were not identified risks; however, this is normal as the Issue Log allowed for closer tracking of those items.

Comments from respondents to this section of the survey included: "Good communication and planning." "Risks were not communicated very well. We were often not aware there was a risk until there was a problem identified after implementation." "Communication was poor." One respondent indicated being unaware of the Risk Log. Another stated: "Very rarely were the risks brought forward to the Executive Steering Committee, they were minimized and overlooked to make the project look better." A respondent who worked on the Grants module stated: "The whole grants management area was struggling with the five modules due to a lack of consultant (Maximus) knowledge. This situation was not addressed until July or August of 2004 when the Huron Consulting Group was hired."

Overall Survey Rating:

1.61

- Scale of 1 – 3, with 1 being low and 3 high
- Results are based on all responses that were not listed as N/A. Rating derived from points awarded divided by total number of respondents for this section of the survey.

D. COMMUNICATIONS MANAGEMENT

Several methods of communications were used on this project. A "kick-off" meeting laid out the process early in the project so that team members had an idea of what to expect. Listservs were established for the different Teams and the Executive Steering Committee. Additionally, a website was created so anyone could access information about the project, its status, and other pertinent information related to the project. A monthly ConnectND newsletter communicated project news and highlights and provided links to informational resources. And, the Interactive Video Network (IVN) was used regularly, prior to implementation, to communicate project status to those interested in attending those sessions (many sessions were either taped, web streamed, or both).

The Project Management Team kept the implementation teams informed and status reports were used to keep all stakeholders informed.

Comments regarding the effectiveness of informational materials and their availability for orienting team members included: "Written materials were not available for the majority of what we did. Any written materials were created primarily by the project team." "What materials?"

When asked about satisfaction with the kick-off meetings they participated in, comments included: "A lot of fluff and cheerleading, not much substance." "The kick-off meetings were helpful, but that's about where the communication stopped. That should have been where communications started!" "We all went in thinking we were going to move the institutions forward, we had no idea what it was going to take or what we needed to accomplish that goal." "It was keeping the participation up after the kick-off that was difficult."

There were several questions on the survey regarding communications with different groups that were part of the project team (team Leads, stakeholders, etc.). Comments on this group of questions included: "Excellent communications. Early stages were tougher than later. Much better now (comment regarding frequency and content of information conveyed)." "In the future, do not keep each module in a vacuum. All discussions need to cross over to the other modules, even if you think it does not affect them. We have suffered from the lack of discussion, system-wide." "Universities were always saying that they could not afford to release staff to participate in the project. However, these same Universities were the first ones to complain when something didn't work after implementation. Everyone needs to be involved from the start." "Everyone was so busy, due to inadequate staffing on the project, many times communication was not

adequate, because there just wasn't time." "We should have had more technical meetings, and didn't. Technical standards were requested to be changed, and after repeated attempts to get the issue discussed, I finally quit asking. Other team meetings were useful, but some were too broad, and involved people when they probably shouldn't have been (to save time)." "Communications were very poor throughout the entire project. Team members should have regularly been receiving the project plan and we should have been reviewing the statement of work. It seemed that we were flying by the seat of our pants way too often. I often wondered if we even had a project plan." "While some campuses were quite involved, others balked at every request for help or information." "As the project went on and everyone became more busy with additional duties, the communication decreased." "While we had team meetings, I don't believe we fully understood what we were doing or where we needed to go. A lot of ambiguity was shown to individuals who raised concerns." "They (progress reports) were provided but not necessarily by the functional leads. Some were on time, some were late due to lack of staffing, some were submitted without any input from the institutional functional leads." "Too few stakeholders were involved. Truly the stakeholders were kept on the outside, they were not informed of problems and concerns as the project moved forward. Problems were shared with these stakeholders by informal means (e.g., campus staff sharing thoughts after exposure to the system during training, etc.)." "I felt communications was very poor, and the project status and the project issues were downplayed and overlooked to make the project appear in better shape than it was." "'The best and brightest' were most often chosen, yet the stakeholders didn't always recognize it." "Those representing councils were not always members of the councils. This made communication more difficult." "The issue was that the information (frequency and content of information conveyed) was not always believed."

Comments regarding the format/content of the Project Status Report and usefulness of the project repository included: "Even more data than necessary." "Very difficult to navigate and use (repository)." "It (FileNet) is a great document repository, but you can't find anything unless you know exactly what you're looking for and where it was put. To me, that is useless." "The tool chosen to access and edit the project repository was cumbersome and difficult to use. Most people tried to avoid the project repository because of that issue. As a result, the repository was not utilized as it should have been." "There should have been a reporting structure where the functional members had direct access to the Executive Steering Committee on a quarterly basis, etc. This would have provided everyone with more useful information." "I didn't use it (repository). I used the web site."

Overall Survey Rating:

1.77

- Scale of 1 – 3, with 1 being low and 3 high
- Results are based on all responses that were not listed as N/A. Rating derived from points awarded divided by total number of respondents for this section of the survey.

E. ACCEPTANCE MANAGEMENT

The use of a formal process for signing off on deliverables is a must for ensuring that a project deliverable was tested and met the needs of the project members.

Once again, respondent's perceptions influenced comments made. Those who were involved in the sign-off process did perform due diligence on these tasks.

Comments from respondents regarding the effectiveness of the Acceptance Management processes included: "The Board should probably have been more involved with struggles that the campuses were having…they could have eased the project team's work by reiterating that this is the way that things were going to be. Project team members seemed to spend a fair amount of resources doing this."

When asked "How prepared were you to accept project deliverables," comments included: "Due to lack of understanding at the project level, we ended up going live without a fully functional product. We are still experiencing and finding things that should have been decided at the fit-gap stage." "A brief discussion acknowledging the documentation was provided, then if it was ok, sign off was needed."

Comments regarding how well defined the acceptance criteria for project deliverables was included: "No real check list of criteria, a review of deliverables was made and it was hoped nothing was missed." "I would say very poorly defined as the acceptance was based on a political decision instead of a functional or user decision."

When asked if sufficient time was allocated to review project deliverables, comments included, "Technical standards were never a consideration in reviewing the work that was done. It will take years to clean up the stuff that wasn't done right the first time." "Absolutely not, when the possibility of

another go-live delay loomed, project members, consultants, and the Steering Committee were brought together to discuss what items were still missing for implementation." "No, there were times we have only hours to review documents. At one point I did not sign off as I did not agree on some of the points…the consultants were not pleased with that, but it was necessary that our project's expectations were fulfilled." And, one commented, "We relied on the project managers."

Asked how closely deliverables matched what was defined within Project Scope, one respondent commented: "We were led to believe the new system would be as efficient and provide us even more information than legacy. Clearly that has not happened." Another answered, "Quite close."

Regarding the question of how complete/effective were the materials you were provided in order to make a decision to proceed from one project lifecycle phase to the next, respondent's comments included: "The materials to make an informed decision were not available. Someone would need to understand our business and what PeopleSoft can do to evaluate if we were ready to proceed." "At times we just moved from process to process to keep getting things done. There was no formal transition as time did not allow that luxury." "Except for in the beginning, MAXIMUS didn't discuss phases with us."

Overall Survey Rating:

1.86

- Scale of 1 – 3, with 1 being low and 3 high
- Results are based on all responses that were not listed as N/A. Rating derived from points awarded divided by total number of respondents for this section of the survey.

F. ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE MANAGEMENT

Preparing an organization for the change a project will have on them is one of the more challenging aspects of project management. Respondents rated this section lowest of all sections rated on this project.

When asked how effectively and timely was the organizational change impact identified and planned for, comments include: "While change impact may have been identified, again some campuses refused to change and still haven't really changed." "A bit too fast for pilot campuses." "Time frames were too short to do this effectively on the campuses, which were short-

staffed because their personnel were working on the project. Everyone did the best they could." "This never happened. If it had the project and the institutions would be better staffed to deal with the consequences of PeopleSoft." "Project provided at the onset fit/gap sessions to identify business changes which was referred to during configuration and implementation."

Respondents comments on how pro-active the organizational Change Management Plan was included, "As a tech, team training was sorely out of touch with the timing of needing the training. From that perspective, change management was sorely lacking." "To my knowledge, an organizational change management plan didn't exist." "Project could only provide the goods…the proactive state was set by each campus." "The Plan was intended to be pro-active, but often turned into being reactive, due to lack of time to plan and outline what needed to be done, prior to the implementation."

Was sufficient advance training conducted/information provided to enable those affected by the changes to adjust to and accommodate them? Respondent's comments included: "Training was done too far in advance. Tech staff didn't have time to 'play' with the new tools before we were using them in production. The consultant tech people, in general, were no more knowledgeable on the tools than we were, so they were unable to give much helpful advice. We struggled together." "Training was done as best as it could have been done under the circumstances. With the short project timeline, there was no other way to do it. As a result, the campuses did not get enough training and that made their jobs even more difficult. The best training possible would be to repeat training over a longer period of time. With repetition, 'light bulbs' start to turn on and things become easier." "Training was always last minute and the documentation not detailed enough." "Training varied depending on needs, but overall it was available for most when needed." "No, training was minimal to none. The end users, those most affected by the changes learned on the job under fire." "Training was limited." "This was provided by the project as scheduled with a set agenda. The exception was the last implementation where the schedule and agenda content was campus driven."

When asked, "Overall, how effective were the efforts to prepare you and your organization for the impact of the new system?" respondent's comments included: "Pilot was a bit tougher, but full implementation was good." "Very, very poor." "Some modules were more prepared than others." "Project provided documentation, training, support and continues with post production support to assist in troubleshooting. As time allows additional functions/processes are ongoing and will continue with associated testing, training, and documentation."

Respondent's comments when asked "How effectively were the techniques used to prepare you and your organization for the impact of the new system?" included, "Too little training, too late." "There were no techniques used to prepare us, we were trying to 'go-live' with no training and a non functional system." "Campus implementation teams helped as the campuses became more involved in the process from that point forward."

Overall Survey Rating:

1.49

- Scale of 1 – 3, with 1 being low and 3 high
- Results are based on all responses that were not listed as N/A. Rating derived from points awarded divided by total number of respondents for this section of the survey.

G. ISSUES MANAGEMENT

Identified issues were tracked through on an Issues Log. This log is a critical project management tool to ensure that someone has been assigned to resolve the issue, report on progress of the issue, and maintain a vigilance that the issue has been acted upon to resolution.

During the lifetime of the project implementation, numerous issues were logged with each having been either resolved or a work around process developed prior to "go-live."

When asked how effectively issues were managed and resolved before escalation was necessary, respondent's comments included: "I think from the issues that I saw, the NDUS project team did a great job. I am not sure that this translates to project management (Maximus) doing the same." "The issues were downplayed to make the project appear in better shape than it was." "I think that some issues were not clearly defined with background information (presented by mostly complaining) and requirements (i.e. Grants/Projects) by the Project Lead, and not fully met with adequate software and training until escalated to others outside the project. This impacted many of us. In general, most issues were identified, explained, accepted and added to the work load and successfully resolved." "With very limited resources, many issues took too long to resolve – we still have numerous unresolved issues."

If escalation was required, how effective were issues resolved without impacting the Project Schedule or Budget? That question drew the following comments: "It depends if you want a political solution or if you want a functional solution. One appears good on paper, the other appears good for the users. The project schedule was pushed through whether issues were resolved or not." "Spent time on issues to get them resolved, other work was put aside. Most issues were a part of work and completed by added hours from the project staff." One respondent stated, "No, the implementation schedule was pushed back." Yet another commented, "This is one of the strengths of the project."

Overall Survey Rating:

1.88

- Scale of 1 – 3, with 1 being low and 3 high
- Results are based on all responses that were not listed as N/A. Rating derived from points awarded divided by total number of respondents for this section of the survey.

H. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND TRANSITION

The transition from implementation to operational phase of this project had a number of concerns to overcome. This could be attributed to the enormity of the project and the number of individuals that were either involved or impacted by this project. Most involved on this project worked diligently to make the project "go-live" a success.

This section of the project had varying comments, again, based on the respondent's level of involvement.

When asked how effective the documentation they received with the system was, respondent's comments included: "This continues to be a work in progress." "I was campus trained." "We developed our own." "All documentation was created from scratch by the Project Team. Minimal items were brought to the table by the consultants and minimal documentation was written by them. The necessary time was not allotted to do a good job at the documentation." "Project Team had access to PeopleBooks, other site implementations which served as resources to accomplish documentation for ConnectND."

Regarding how effective the training was in preparation for using the system, respondent's comments included, "This was minimal, we needed to

bring in expertise (July or August 2004) to do almost all of the configuration and conversion for the grants module, it didn't leave much time for training." "Training should have been just in time but that never seems to happen so as a result, a lot of time was wasted trying to figure out how a tool/application worked long after training took place." "More training and more people from campuses should have been involved in the training." "Project team provided training: hands-on, testing of requested scenarios, feed-back if needed, training manual, scripts, and WebEx."

How useful was the content of the training you received in preparation for the use of the system? This question generated the following comments: "The content was entry-level. We would have planned for people to go to the training, learn the basics, work with them a while, then go back to training so that they could start asking the right questions and understand the stuff we didn't get the first time through. So often, I heard other tech people say that it sure would be nice to go back to training again – now that we know something else about the toolset than we did the first time through." "Very poor for many times the system was not robust enough for testing."

Concerning "timing of training", respondents commented saying: "Way too early. The project management here was done very poorly. They managed the tech team as a single resource. Everybody got training before the project began, regardless of our roles on the project. Some people never even used the training for a year or more, because they didn't support PeopleSoft right away…they were needed on the mainframe. Other people that were trained got trained for stuff they never used, but didn't get training for the stuff they needed." "Training should have been at a minimum three months and more like six. When utilizing a package that is labor intensive, inefficient and very unforgiving you truly need extensive training to understand what is happening." "Training in many areas was done too early." "Just in time training is not the way to go." "Too much training to accomplish in a small time frame." "Last minute training is never a good idea. Time frame for the project was too short." "Right before go-live so less time was given between training and using the system. Project worked on schedules to accommodate campuses accordingly."

When asked about the support received during implementation, respondent comments included: "Limited resources hurt the support." "It is difficult to determine, when you go live with a non functional product, everything appears to be unsupportive. The institutions (Minot, NDSU, and UND) relied heavily on Huron (consulting company) for this support." "Support? Maximus didn't have any commitment from the majority of their employees to stay with us during the project. People came and left. I am still seeing names of people who worked on the project for Maximus that I didn't even know were

working for us. As tech people were replaced (for Maximus), they didn't always replace them with the same responsibilities (like, for example, helping US learn the system), so we got some support from the first people that were here, and some of it was great, but as they replaced people that left, roles changed, and we didn't get any help, because their 'tech lead' was replaced with somebody who just wrote code, and didn't have the responsibilities to support our staff."

Overall Survey Rating:

1.64

- Scale of 1 – 3, with 1 being low and 3 high
- Results are based on all responses that were not listed as N/A. Rating derived from points awarded divided by total number of respondents for this section of the survey.

I. PERFORMANCE OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION

This section of the project survey focused on the performance of the NDUS and the institutions. Fewer comments were expressed in this section; however, those that were expressed are listed below.

When asked how effective and consistent sponsorship for the project was conveyed, respondent's comments included, "Pretty rare." "If you mean were the students given credit for financing the project? I would have to say no." "Sponsorship was consistently conveyed but not sure how effective it was. Some campuses consistently caused problems for the project and the project team was consistently beaten up."

Asked how smooth the transition of support from the project team to the NDUS and institutions was, comments included: "Very poor, when you do not plan appropriately (not knowing what it will take to support the system) and train appropriately you are doomed to major problems." "Go-Live 1 and 2 went well, the last go-live seemed less smooth as the campus implementation teams were allowed involvement which decreased final system testing (to be done at last 2 training sessions)." "As most of the project team was NDUS staff, the transition was fairly smooth. The project staff had been doing production support for some time before the project completed."

Regarding whether the project team adequately planned for and prepared the Institutions for their ongoing responsibilities, respondents commented:

"Attempts were made but again some campuses refused to accept those responsibilities." "Hard to prepare when many in the project didn't know the answers to critical issues." "This absolutely never happened. Truly this should have started at the fit-gap to identify the business process and identify the needs of the institutions. Once these were addressed and it was determined what direction we were going, the configuration should have started. This would have allowed the institutions to start addressing and planning for their needs." "Training sessions were held and the campuses were prepared, but they did not feel prepared due to limited timeframes." "As much as time allowed."

Overall Survey Rating:

1.73

- Scale of 1 – 3, with 1 being low and 3 high
- Results are based on all responses that were not listed as N/A. Rating derived from points awarded divided by total number of respondents for this section of the survey.

J. PERFORMANCE OF PROJECT TEAM

The efforts put forth by some of the project team members, vendor personnel, and the project management team (project director, NDUS project managers, etc.) made this a successful implementation. This project had an aggressive time line and limited budget. It was the efforts from all that made this succeed. While there are remaining hurdles to overcome, the system is operating at all eleven NDUS institutions.

While there wasn't a wide range between sections rated by respondents, this performance section received the highest rating.

When asked to rate the overall effectiveness of the project manager's performance, respondents commented: "Was this project managed?" "Again, project managers need to get the teams talking, prior to making decisions that impact everyone. Making decisions in a vacuum, created many difficult situations upon implementation." "Limited resources is a big factor." "There appeared to be a lack of effective leadership. It seemed as if the project was planned, implemented and declared ready by Maximus for Maximus." "Grants and contracts was a sticking point." "With all the responsibilities, Project Manager remained interested and supportive of all aspects of the project; staff, work, accommodations (!), and knowledgeable of our responsibilities."

Asked how well the project team understood the expectations of their specific roles and responsibilities, comments included: "Although, most of us had not worked on such an involved project, the roles/responsibilities were provided, but the expectations were immense due to the volume of work and time involved." "I understood the roles and responsibilities, but you need the appropriate resources to accomplish the objective of having an efficient functioning product." "This left a lot to be desired. Planning was done at a high level, but NOT at any detailed level from what I can tell. Nobody ever seemed to review the time it was taking to do tasks, and adjusting the schedule based on these facts."

Regarding how well respondent's expectations were met regarding the extent of their involvement in the project (effort time, commitment, etc.), they stated: "Once the project was over – the expected time commitment is very confusing. One day we are supposed to work regular 8 hours days and get back to normal and the next we're supposed to work until the job is done. This conflicting communication is causing a great deal of stress in the office." "I expected to be 100% on the project and my involvement exceeded that percentage." "I would have liked to have learned more." "When I agreed to be on the project, I assumed there would be some long days, never did I imagine that all days would be long and that working weekends would be a norm. This project consumed all of my personal life, of which I am still trying to get back. In the future, staffing should definitely be given higher priority." "The effort and time commitment was expected, but I expected a much more successful product after committing so much time." "The (shortsighted) requirement of my original campus that I continue working on site each week took a toll on me personally which lessened the effectiveness I could give to the project…thankfully this was eliminated for the last 6+ months of the project."

When asked how effective each project team member was in fulfilling their role, respondent comments included: "We worked and worked hours and hours to get the job done." "Depends on whose perspective. Too much was asked of too few. In fulfilling one obligation, another wasn't always completed." "You need to be given the tools to succeed. Without a knowledgeable mentor and appropriate staffing you are going to be hard pressed to fulfill a role." "I didn't know what everybody's roles were." "Some team members gave 300+%, some should have been replaced but that was not possible due to lack of campus support."

And, when asked about the effectiveness of training team members received, comments were: "It would have been more effective if just-in-time training was done. A lot of training I received was a waste of dollars as I had

forgotten most of it by the time I got to use it." "My training was PeopleSoft 7.5…not too good, but that was all that was available at that time." "Team member training from a PeopleSoft class perspective was very good. I put a 1 (rating) down because most of the training should come from your consultants. You need knowledgeable partners to provide the knowledge transfer."

Overall Survey Rating:

1.90

- Scale of 1 – 3, with 1 being low and 3 high
- Results are based on all responses that were not listed as N/A. Rating derived from points awarded divided by total number of respondents for this section of the survey.

K. KEY PROJECT METRICS

Cost

The original budget, as of July 2003, had a total project funded budget estimate of $22,791,474 and when the in-kind staffing costs were included, the total project budget was $29,724,761.

In May 2005 a revision was made to the project budget which changed the total project funded budget from $22,791,474 to $25,474,316. Adding in the in-kind staffing costs changed the total project budget from $29,724,761 to $32,382,694. The majority of this cost increase ($2,819,470) was due to extending the contract with Maximus for the expected delay with bringing the final four campuses onto the system. Maximus would assist with configurations and modifications of the Grants module to where the final four institutions could use it although the module would still require considerable manual work to input data or required other "work around" processes to allow campuses to manage the Grants area on their campus.

Actual costs of the project on June 30, 2005 included a total project funded cost of $24,734,213 and when in-kind staff costs were included, the figure was $31,642,591. Not all invoices had been submitted for payment by that date and the estimated at completion cost was $25,474,319 with a total cost of $32,382,697

Schedule

The schedule was adjusted with approval of the Executive Steering Committee and the State Board of Higher Education as necessary to ensure that the project would be implemented in a manner that was workable for the majority of departments at all eleven institutions.

The project schedule had been changed as the Executive Steering Committee and the State Board of Higher Education approved holding off go-live at the "final four" (MiSU, MiSU-B, NDSU, and UND) institutions. This delay was approved to give additional time in modifying the Grants/Contracts module.

Scope

The original intent of the project, replacement of the existing legacy system to include new functionality and a web interface, had been met. Originally, the project was expected to be implemented over a thirty month period but this was not met and while it has impact on the scope, its true impact was on the schedule and the budget.

Quality

Quality of the product was not the level that it could have been had there been more time and a more knowledgeable implementation partner assisting with the project. While the product has been implemented and is being used at all of the eleven NDUS campuses, had a more knowledgeable implementation partner and more time been available, additional improvements would have been realized.

While improvements can be made in the future, not having them now detracts from the good things that have been implemented. Reality is that we have replaced the functionality of the legacy system with many areas seeing an improvement, and have replaced legacy with a system that offers the building blocks for the future. For some, the perception that they did not see an improvement in their area leaves them with the feeling the system is not functional.

From an Enterprise perspective, much has been gained. Having a system that has combined the NDUS and state processes, where ever possible, has been a major accomplishment with benefits to be realized for years to come. This project has laid the foundation for future improvements and enhancements.

One additional item to keep in mind is "growth" experience individuals that were involved on the project have gained. Not only the growth experience of how the project process and the product itself functions, but the growth experience gained from working with other individuals, campuses, and the state in a collaborative and collegial manner. This growth experience should not be forgotten and too will benefit the Enterprise for years to come.

L. LESSONS LEARNED – SURVEY RESPONDENTS

Three questions asked of the team members reflected on lessons learned. These questions are listed below and comments are included with each.

What were the most significant issues on this project?

"INADEQUATE KNOWLEDGE of the CONSULTANTS."

"Poor planning, a lack of leadership, an implementation partner that had no higher education background or any experience or training on PeopleSoft 8.4."

"Acceptance that this new software was happening and legacy was really going away…it surprised me that some system staff just didn't get it."

"Too little time. Too few people resources."

"Lack of understanding on the part of the project management about how long and how many people a project of this size takes. This project could have been much more successful given appropriate time table and staffing."

"Inadequate resources. Poor communication. Poor project management. The staff dedication to this project is the only reason it succeeded. Too many people put their lives on hold and sacrificed dearly. That's the only reason why it worked. Staff still cannot use their vacation. Heaven help us if any of us get sick. Vacation and sick leave were not considered in the project planning. People NEED a break, especially when they are so deeply involved in a project as this."

"Lack of Communication. Poor project management. Lack of cooperation from the larger campuses."

"Academic structure, Biodemo issue in campus community, duplicate EMPLID's, processing time issues, IGPA."

"Grants and Contracts issues, training, system performance, student Portal functionality, lack of reports/reporting environment, no plan to move the campuses forward after implementation, lack of basic functionality, control issues, and failure to listen to the expertise at the campus level."

"Queries, institutional GPA, costs to implement."

"The project timeline, quality of the contractors, training of the end users, and the lack of true priorities (everything was #1)."

What were the lessons learned on this project (from things that didn't go well)?

"PROJECT OVERALL: The project was underfunded, understaffed, and had unrealistic deadlines. As a result, the communication that should have taken place between the three modules did not take place. This was also true between the ancillary systems and the three modules. Decisions were made on processes that affected other systems without adequate input. The impact felt by UND was after implementation when we started using the systems and discovered the problems. Many of the consultants were inadequate and did not have the knowledge and expertise necessary to assist with implementation. They were learning at the same time the project team was instead of being able to provide assistance."

"You need to do your work upfront. Identify what other institutions have needed to do when implementing the software, what will the staffing requirement be for implementation and for post production support, identifying implementation partners that understand your business and the software. You also need to manage the project to insure that the functional leads on the consultant side have the appropriate experience."

"Some professional and administrative folks who come from an academic setting where implementation of many sorts and change are a part of their daily lives demonstrated real problems working with a system wide project; was disheartening at times."

"Fastracking is not always the best route to go as it seems we are picking up the pieces a lot through post production work. Some campuses want the good shiny product without the effort of support and staff…yes, they had to work with less staff too, but the big picture and future would dictate the need to get with the program."

"Consultants schooled in higher education needs would have provided more benefit for our Project Team…we had to do some educating of them to steer them in the direction to getting the system to meet our needs…we had some quite adaptive consultants, though."

"As terribly as we want to accomplish something in as little time and for as little cost as possible. The price is still there. In this case, our people: project team and campus paid the price. It's not fair what we asked. We will continue to pay as they begin to leave us."

"In retrospect, did we ask enough of MAXIMUS when we allowed them to change leadership early in the process?"

"Need for more staffing, need for longer timetable, extensive communication between modules, more training - better training manuals – earlier prior to implementation, get a buy-in from campuses that include dedication of key personnel to the project."

"Acquire the resources required to do the project before it starts. If resources are not available, adjust the schedule accordingly! Plan for vacations, sick leave, etc."
"Communicate better. Plan the project at a detailed level, not just the pie in the sky level. Review the tasks being done, and the time it takes to do them. Take the time to follow the tech standards. Take the time to share with each other what everybody learns along the way. In the long run, this would have saved lots of time."
"Make sure the consultants are doing what we need them to do. We are paying for them. If they are not knowledgeable, make sure the staff knows this."
"We put too much faith in the consultants to help us. In more cases than not, they hardly knew any more than we did. We should not pay so much for this 'service'."
"The project timeline is not something you pull from a hat. It should be built based on the number of resources you have and the available budget. In this project's case, the timeline was used to get the budget."
"Once goals are set in place, they should not be abandoned just because the road to those goals is getting rough. Top down support is essential to the success of the project and it must be very visible."
"Lack of proper consulting and project resources will hurt ND in the future."
"Need to assess people needs and related institutional costs."
"You get what you pay for (Maximus), more end user involvement was needed, more training was needed, and the NDUS programmers should have all been located at the NDSB for the entire implementation."

What on this project worked well and was effective in the delivery of the system?

"I started out on this project full of energy, ideas, and ideals. I thought we were going to be doing something to take the University System into the future for 20 – 30 years. After the first few months of the project, I was the biggest critic of PeopleSoft, the software wouldn't work, there was duplicative entry of data, and nothing flowed as a business process. The software was basically duck taped and bale wired together to try and replicate the grant process. I believe this is still true of the software; however, it appears PeopleSoft is attempting to make strides in this area in consultation with its customers (higher education)."
"The defined implementation plan was a good structure for the project, but the time to complete the project did not always go hand in hand with the plan. This may be due to so many unknowns and the need to work higher education and government together."
"NDUS has a great software product and it works! I am honored to be a part of this great undertaking and appreciate the opportunities that were given

me to work with such great people, to learn about project implementation, to gain skills on a software system so vital to NDUS, to gain additional cohesiveness with state agencies, and most of all, to understand the success this project has become."
"We once again proved that our people are great. They worked hard and they worked well. Most of the time they were successful."
"Without the dedicated and hard-working staff that were chosen to be on the Project Implementation Team, this project would have been a disaster. I witnessed many people giving 300% for long periods of time (years), and then be criticized for kinks and problems by institutions whose own employees were 'too busy' to get involved in the planning stages. Those people need far more recognition by the institutions they served and less complaining about what doesn't work in the system. The problems with PeopleSoft will be worked out, like they were in legacy, but no one will ever know all of the personal issues that those individuals on the project had to endure and are still enduring because of their dedication to making PeopleSoft work."
"Staff dedication. The staff was committed to making this happen at nearly any cost within their power (overtime hours beyond belief, sacrificing family time), but this shouldn't have had to happen."
"The only reason the system came up and on time was due to the diligence and hard work of the University project staff. Many staff members worked 100+ hours a week to get the system running. They gave up 3 years of their lives for the project (something no one should have to do)."
"The hard work of everyone involved without the resources and support required for a major ERP system. It's amazing how far we have come."
"Crisis management – the long hours put in by the project teams helped to minimize crises."
"The people who were located at NDSB worked well together (technical, functional, and project management)."

M. LESSONS LEARNED/OBSERVATIONS - EXECUTIVE STEERING COMMITTEE

Here's a summary of selected Executive Steering Committee comments made during the discussion at a meeting on March 4, 2005:
-- The Guiding Principles were particularly important during early stages of implementation.
-- While the first principle is improving service, user may not at this time think that's being achieved.
– In estimating project "costs," the Return on Investment document falls far short in assessing the human toll and loss of faith in the system.

-- The Steering Committee may have assumed the rosiest scenario and at times members weren't able to hear signals to the contrary.
-- Problems experienced weren't unusual but the compressed implementation schedule didn't provide adequate time to properly address them.
-- The systems had to be implemented as a "big bang" because they are so interrelated.
-- Implementation would likely have failed had it all been attempted as scheduled last July, rather than delayed on four campuses.
-- A review of a Microsoft/Great Plains alternative late in the planning process consumed valuable time and originally a vendor was to provide a data center rather than that being structured internally.
-- To many users the greatest frustration is that the production systems aren't always available when they turn their computer on.
-- Communication at all levels and managing expectations are both critically important.
-- Project management has been part-time and the right balance may not have been struck with the managing partner.
-- Early campus and user group ownership and involvement would have produced more "ownership" of the systems.
-- Project staff members were expected to know the software right away but they were absorbed in learning it.
-- Information and experience of the pilot campuses wasn't fully leveraged.
-- Responsibility needed to be better defined.
-- More and earlier awareness and involvement was needed among the campus vice presidents and CEOs.
-- A clearer understanding was needed of multiple realities reflecting how the project and issues look different from various perspectives.
-- People communicated well in an environment that was not adversarial.

N. CONNECTND ADDED STAFFING

The ConnectND project has impacted staffing needs across the North Dakota University System. In some cases, support for additional staffing came through new budget allocation while others were added using reallocation of existing funds. The table below indicates the staffing that was known to be added, or in the process of being added, due to the implementation of the ConnectND project. Keep in mind that the table does not reflect all the hours put in by exempt staff, nor the overtime by non-exempt staff. Additionally, there are many instances where decisions are being made at the department/college/division levels to reallocate and/or reassign funding or existing staff to address pressures resulting from ConnectND.

Campus Added Staffing Due to ConnectND Project			
CAMPUS	CAMPUS AREA	NUMBER OF STAFF - NEW ALLOCATION	NUMBER OF STAFF - INTERNAL REALLOCATION
BSC	Associate Registrar	1	
	Payroll Account Technician	1	
	Student Records Office Assistant	1	
	Query Writer	1	
	Assistant Business Manager	1	
DSU	Financial Aid		1.5
	Business Office		1
	HR Payroll		1.5
	Records Office		1
LRSC	Administrative Services Office		1
	Student Serivces Office		1
	IT Department		1
MaSU	Business Office - Account Tech	1	
	Financial Aid Office - Admin Assistant	0.5	
	Office of Adminssions and Records	0.9	
MiSU	Business Office - Grants Accounting Clerk		1
	Financial Aid Office - Financial Aid Clerk	1	
	HR Office - Human Resources Clerk	1	
	Records Office - Records Clerk, Degree Audit	Not filled yet at 1	
MiSU-B	Business Office		0.5
NDSCS	Business Office	1	
	HR/Payroll Office	0.5	0.75
NDSU	SEE NOTE		
NDUS	Financial Systems	2	
	HR Management System	4	
	Student Administation System	4	
	Data Center - 1/2 DBA, 1/2 Server Admin	1	
	Development/Security - 2 Develop, 2 Security	4	
	Help Desk - 1 at NDSU, 1 at UND	2	
	Production Control	1	
UND	Registrars Office	2	
	Grants and Contracts	3	
	Student Financial Aid	2 - 2.5?	
	Graduate School	1.8	
VCSU	Registrars Office	1?	
	Business Office	1?	
WSC	Student Finance		0.4
	HR		0.5

Notes and/or comments from campuses:

Bismarck State College – When adding staffing, the funding source is not identified. In the budget process, expenditures are balanced against funding sources (state support and tuition collections).

Lake Region State College – Based on the workload problems that have still not been adequately addressed, it is possible that we may need to add other staff as well.

Mayville State University – The Business Office had recruited for an additional .5 FTE Account Technician but budget constraints prevented filling the position. MaSU added a temporary 1.0 FTE Administrative Assistant in the Office of Admissions and Records.

Minot State University – The position in the Records Office for a records office clerk to handle degree audit has not been filled as of yet due to degree audit not being implemented.

Minot State University – Bottineau – In addition to adding a part-time position, we continue to pay overtime (or have exempt employees working additional hours) which is directly attributed to ConnectND. Adding staff is not he only cost associated with ConnectND.

North Dakota State College of Science – Concerns with the number of hours that are being put in by staff that are exempt status and the overtime put in my non-exempt employees who spent many hours of extra work with the ConnectND implementation.

North Dakota State University – North Dakota State University had not been able to provide their staffing data prior to submittal of this report.

University of North Dakota – The chart shows 2 – 2.5 FTE in the Student Financial Aid Office. The office had funding approved for staffing and it will be up to the office to determine whether they wanted to hire two professional staff or one professional staff and use the remaining approved funds to hire temporary, part-time or other staff.

UND wanted to make sure it was understood that the reallocation and/or reassignment of funding or existing staff was an important point to be made.

Valley City State University – Note that the Business Office here includes payroll, accounts receivable, accounts payable, and accounting functions, so it is hard to sort out what percentage is due to which process.

APPENDIX A

Purpose
The purpose of the Post-Implementation Survey is to collect feedback from project team members (the Steering Committee, core team, and technical team) about the success of the implementation. Survey responses will be summarized into a Post-Implementation Report, which will be available at a later date.

Instructions
1. Answer each question by entering a rating and comments. Please be honest and sincere. Your feedback will create valuable information for future NDUS projects and your individual responses will be kept confidential.
2. If you do not understand the question or it is not applicable to your role, enter N/A for a rating and N/A under comments.
3. There is a "General Questions" section on page 8 that is appropriate for general issues and lessons learned. This area should help you share information not covered in a specific question.
4. Contact Rich Lehn with any questions at 777-3756 or richlehn@mail.und.nodak.edu
5. Return the survey by **(DATE OF RETURN)** via email to Rich Lehn at richlehn@mail.und.nodak.edu
6. THANK YOU for your participation!!

Date:
Name:
Institution:
Department:
Role on Project:

Questions	Rating (1 – 3) 1 is low and 3 is high	Comments (What worked well? What could have been done better? What recommendations do you have for future projects?)
SYSTEM EFFECTIVENESS		
1. How well does the system meet the stated needs of the NDUS?		
2. How well does the system meet your needs?		

Questions	Rating (1 – 3) 1 is low and 3 is high	Comments (What worked well? What could have been done better? What recommendations do you have for future projects?)
3. When initially implemented, how well did the system meet the stated needs of the NDUS?		
4. To what extent were the objectives and goals outlined in the Business Case and Project Charter met?		
5. What is your overall assessment of the outcome of this project?		
6. How well did the scope of the project match what was defined in the Project Proposal?		
7. How satisfied are you with your involvement in the development and/or review of the Project Scope during Project Initiation and Planning?		
COST, SCOPE, SCHEDULE, AND QUALITY MANAGEMENT		
8. Was the Change Control process properly invoked to manage changes to Cost, Scope, Schedule, or Quality?		
9. Were changes to Cost, Scope, Schedule, or Quality, effectively managed?		
10. Was the established change budget adequate?		
11. As project performance validated or challenged estimates, was the change control process used when appropriate and were challenges effectively managed?		

Questions	Rating (1 – 3) 1 is low and 3 is high	Comments (What worked well? What could have been done better? What recommendations do you have for future projects?)
12. How effectively was the Quality Management Plan applied during Project Execution?		
13. How effective was the quality assurance process?		
14. How effective were project audits?		
15. How effective was the utilization of Best Practices from prior projects in the NDUS and Institutions?		
RISK MANAGEMENT		
16. How well were team members involved in the risk identification and mitigation planning process?		
17. To what extent was the evolution of risks communicated?		
18. How effectively was the Risk Management Log updated or reviewed?		
19. How comprehensive was the Risk Management Log? (i.e. did many events occur that were never identified?)		
COMMUNICATIONS MANAGEMENT		
20. How effective were the informational materials available to orient team members?		
21. How satisfied were you with the kick-off meetings you participated in?		

Questions	Rating (1 – 3) 1 is low and 3 is high	Comments (What worked well? What could have been done better? What recommendations do you have for future projects?)
22. How effectively were the project team meetings conducted?		
23. How effectively and timely were Progress Reports provided by Team Members to the Project Manager?		
24. How effectively were stakeholders involved in the project?		
25. Was communication with stakeholders (president, vice presidents, other directors, end users) adequate?		
26. How well were your expectations met regarding the frequency and content of information conveyed to you by the Project Manager?		
27. How well was project status communicated throughout your involvement in the project?		
28. How well were project issues communicated throughout your involvement in the project?		
29. How well did the Project Manager respond to your questions or comments related to the project?		
30. How useful was the format and content of the Project Status Report to you?		
31. How useful and complete was the project repository?		

Questions	Rating (1 – 3) 1 is low and 3 is high	Comments (What worked well? What could have been done better? What recommendations do you have for future projects?)
ACCEPTANCE MANAGEMENT		
32. How effective was the acceptance management process?		
33. How well prepared were you to accept project deliverables?		
34. How well defined was the acceptance criteria for project deliverables?		
35. Was sufficient time allocated to review project deliverables?		
36. How closely did deliverables match what was defined within Project Scope?		
37. How complete/effective were the materials you were provided in order to make a decision to proceed from one project lifecycle phase to the next?		
ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE MANAGEMENT		
38. How effectively and timely was the organizational change impact identified and planned for?		
39. How pro-active was the Organizational Change Management Plan?		
40. Was sufficient advance training conducted/information provided to enable those affected by the changes to adjust to and accommodate them?		

Questions	Rating (1 – 3) 1 is low and 3 is high	Comments (What worked well? What could have been done better? What recommendations do you have for future projects?)
41. Overall, how effective were the efforts to prepare you and your organization for the impact of the new system?		
42. How effective were the techniques used to prepare you and your organization for the impact of the changes brought about by the new system?		
ISSUES MANAGEMENT		
43. How effectively were issues managed on the project?		
44. How effectively were issues resolved before escalation was necessary?		
45. If issue escalation was required, how effectively were issues resolved?		
46. How effectively were issues able to be resolved without impacting the Project Schedule or Budget?		
PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION & TRANSITION		
47. How effective was the documentation that you received with the system?		
48. How effective was the training you received in preparation for the use of the system?		
49. How useful was the content of the training you received in preparation for the use of the system?		

Questions	Rating (1 – 3) 1 is low and 3 is high	Comments (What worked well? What could have been done better? What recommendations do you have for future projects?)
50. How timely was the training you received in preparation for the use of the system?		
51. How effective was the support you received during implementation of the system?		
PERFORMANCE OF THE PERFORMING ORGANIZATION (NDUS AND THE INSTITUTIONS)		
52. How effectively and consistently was sponsorship for the project conveyed?		
53. How smooth was the transition of support from the Project Team to the NDUS and Institutions?		
54. Did the Project Team adequately plan for and prepare the Institutions for their ongoing responsibilities for the product or service of the project?		
PERFORMANCE OF THE PROJECT TEAM		
55. Overall, how effective was the performance of the Project Manager?		
56. How well did the Project Team understand the expectations of their specific roles and responsibilities?		
57. How well were your expectations met regarding the extent of your involvement in the project (effort time commitments etc.)?		
58. How effective was each Project Team member in fulfilling his/her role?		

Questions	Rating (1 – 3) 1 is low and 3 is high	Comments (What worked well? What could have been done better? What recommendations do you have for future projects?)
59. How effective was team member training?		
GENERAL QUESTIONS		
60. What were the most significant issues on this project?		
61. What were the lessons learned on this project (from things that didn't go well)?		
62. What on the project worked well and was effective in the delivery of the system?		