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ABSTRACT

The need to uniformly, precisely and successfully implement software programs within a company is a necessity that is nearly universal. A company’s desired outcome must be defined to be sufficiently attained. A company’s directive for such an implementation must be clear and concise, with a finite description of the desired goal. Specific procedures and exact goals are required to be organized and effectively communicated. Through applied research, the purpose of this project is to analyze the creation, implementation and goal achievement of a unique logic model for a case study company. An analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of a logic model utilized in a specific context is presented. Part of the company’s mission throughout this project is to maintain or increase end user satisfaction and through this tool, an in-depth review of the inclusion of end user satisfaction throughout the implementation is also offered.
SECTION I. INTRODUCTION

The search for a successful process regarding any project (starting a new company or creating a new industrial plant) demands intimate pre-planning, organization, communication, involvement, and commitment regarding all aspects of the project, specifically with performance measurement and evaluation tools. Previous research shows preparing for projects increases the success of the project (Andone, 2009; Buhovac & Slapnicar, 2007; Markland, Butters & Brophy, 2007; Neely, Gregory & Platts, 2005; Sole, 2009). Specific interests in certain elements of the processes of project management are also surfacing in recent research. Elements include participation, efficiencies, participatory satisfaction, and project effectiveness, and these factors directly relate to the foundation of performance measurement and evaluation theories.

A local non-profit educational foundation (further referred to as NP) was unable to perform all necessary service functions due to their dated technologies. Their previous software, Legacy, was developed specifically for their uses in 1985. The Legacy software developers are no longer in business and the sole support for the software lies with the daughter of one of the original creators. The software was incompatible with most other software programs with a few exceptions, such as Microsoft Excel. It was not congruent with any online programs or services, such as online banking software. The Legacy system was extremely limited in its ability to capture all pertinent data. The software system was not designed for nor could it be redesigned for a large amount of individual account information. This organization incurred rapid financial growth, which in turn increased the size of their staff (five years previous to this project) and
desperately needed both the new accounting system to maintain their service requirements, as well as qualified human resources software.

The public educational institution NP served was a large, state-funded university, established approximately 140 years prior. Due to its public status, the university had strict accounting limitations regarding its funding, expenditures and income. NP was created to serve the university in various functions, mostly as a financial unit for funding not allowed through the state-managed university. This included investments, gifts and real estate. To better serve the university, NP decided to enhance their capabilities by purchasing a new, more advanced financial and human resources software system.

For the purpose of this project, NP, a Midwestern, non-profit, public educational foundation agreed to serve as the case study during the implementation of software. The additional financial processing requirements and rapid growth of employees caused chaos, confusion and uncertainty, therefore, NP decided that a timely, detailed, specific planning mechanism must be created to reach its goals. NP allowed for a logic model to be designed for its specific use during the software implementation. NP also granted participation and subsequent surveys and interviews to supplement the use of the logic model goals of the implementation. A detailed analysis of the specific and unique logic model created for the software implementation, its use, function, and implementation is presented in this paper.

A. **Statement of Problem**

As knowledge-based jobs are ever-increasing with the concurrent growth of work-related technologies, the workplace will change rapidly, day by day. Along with these changes come financial repercussions a company must learn to adapt to, which, at the very least, provides
stability. Knowledge-based work and positions cost companies more money than hourly employees and their manual functions. Because many positions are knowledge-based, utterly dependent on technology and global by nature, preparation in whatever project or endeavor a company intends to take is considered crucial.

The previous software utilized by NP caused delayed work response, inefficiencies and reporting errors. The output of work by NP staff lacked timeliness, accuracy and flexibility due to the age and design of the previous Legacy software. A new software system needed to be identified and implemented to alter work results and outcomes. To accomplish this, NP required a structured planning tool be used to assist in the implementation of the new software, as well as maintain focus on their goals. The identification of specific goals through the structured planning tool contributed to goal achievement.

B. Significance of Problem

As mentioned earlier, the influx in knowledge-based management is ever-increasing. According to Neely, Gregory and Platts (2005), knowledge-based management and their subsequent activities are as much as 40% of the cost of a product. The old adage of ‘time is money’ is true more now than ever and companies are becoming increasingly aware of their human assets and how vital they are to the company’s bottom line.

It remained to be seen then, how to properly plan? Understanding the importance of precise movements and the need for them is considered crucial when planning projects. Performance measurement and evaluation systems and tools allow a company to investigate and give attention to the qualitative aspects of their business (customer service and internal employee satisfaction) and links those aspects directly to time-based and financial reporting information
that affects a company’s fiscal health. Both financial well-being and internal satisfaction are vital to a company’s future successes. If properly designed and implemented, performance measurement and evaluation systems will increase the “effectiveness and efficiency” (Neely, Gregory, & Platts, 2005) of the company’s functions.

C. Statement of Purpose

The case study company NP pursued direction and assistance with the financial and human resources software implementation. A specific, unique logic model was designed and implemented with the direction, approval and support of NP. The author designed the logic model with indication of specific goals and implemented its use along with the actual software. Once the implementation was completed, the author analyzed the strengths and weaknesses of the logic model and concluded whether the variables within the logic model were met.

D. Definitions

Performance measurement and evaluation systems: “process of quantifying action, where measurement is the process of quantification and action leads to performance” (Neely, Gregory, & Platts, 2005) and through these processes a product of “greater efficiency and effectiveness” (Neely, Gregory, & Platts, 2005) which will create routine evaluations driven from quality analysis (Longo, 2002; Hernandez, 2000). It was also noted by McDavid and Hawthorn (2006), performance measurement was intended to be a means rather than an end in itself. This was indication that performance measurement was a tool or system, not just a product.

Logic models: a specific graphically depicted tool designed by individuals or a group of individuals for a explicit requirement utilizing performance measurement and evaluation systems
concepts while identifying all needs, resources, activities and outcomes of a project (Engel-Cox, Van Houten, Phelps & Rose, 2008; McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006; Neely, Gregory, & Platts, 2005; W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2004).

Knowledge based work: intellectual capital created from the human aspects of service and productivity which includes knowledge creation, utilization, sharing, and distribution as well as work responsibility to improve the strategic mission of a company, project or organization (Andone, 2009; Walczak, 2005).

E. Assumptions

Assumptions are intrinsic to research and the following assumptions are identified as part of this project:

- The need existed to provide additional supporting evidence that performance measurement and evaluation systems and tools increase project success rates and overall participant satisfaction.

- The participants gave their unbiased opinions and truthful answers to the surveys and interviews conducted without interference from employment status or feelings regarding the implemented system.

- The participants participated in the survey from their own desire and not an implied requirement from the endorsement of upper management.

- The survey and interview mechanisms were properly designed to elicit direct, concise, clear and unbiased answers and did not give any direction to estimated outcomes.

- This project was utilized for implementation of a logic model during
a software upgrade.

F. Limitations

Limitations are identified as part of this project:

- The research conducted was a single case study of one non-profit foundation with approximately 100 employees.

- The researcher was a participant and decision maker of the implementation, which possibly created a narrow or limited viewpoint with some inherent bias.

- Some participants may not respond; other main contributors have since left the NP and may not have completed the survey and or interviews.

- All connections of theories and previous research to logic models were a delineation of performance measurement and evaluation systems. Therefore the proposal also applied necessary research of performance measurement and evaluation systems parallel to and in conjunction with logic models.

G. Summary

The project has been introduced, along with the statement of problem, significance of the problem and statement of purpose. Section I reviewed definitions, assumptions, and limitations. In Section II, a review of the pertinent literature is exhibited.
SECTION II. REVIEW OF PERTINENT LITERATURE

Through Section II a review of various literatures pertaining to performance measurement and evaluation systems is exhibited. It begins with an overview of performance measurement research and studies, and then explores the areas of weakness in these types of evaluations. It concludes with a detailed investigation into logic models as a program evaluation tool and how that applies to the case study at hand.

A. Literature Review Background

Performance measurement and evaluation is a rather new field of study. Academic research emerged in the mid to late 1960’s and early 1970’s and then re-emerged strongly in the late 1980’s and early 1990’s. In most cases, the research presented was qualitative in nature based on field research, observations, case studies, and surveys. In the studies that are quantitatively based, the data collected was derived from significant production of goods or services and relative financial data, without accounting for other variations in business or the market. When investigating various facets of efficiency, customer satisfaction, internal organizational fulfillment, and the like, quantitative data was not as useful as a qualitative analysis of these intangible and somewhat financially-distant but equally important company attributes.

There are several different forms of performance measurement and evaluation tools, such as balanced scorecards, logic models and dashboards. These tools are drawn from performance
measurement and evaluation theories as the foundation of their existence. As shown going forward, a logic model was developed; the intent of which was to employ, examine, investigate and analyze. Due to the similar characteristics of these tools, all variations of performance measurement and evaluation systems concepts and the many features (tools) that are contrived from these theories.

An objective review of various journal articles and academic books regarding performance measurement and evaluation systems, as well as its progeny of balanced scorecards, logic models, and dashboards determined the direction of review and case study. The literature review then becomes the function and application of analysis for the case study and research.

B. Applications of Performance Evaluation and Measurement Systems

Performance measurement and evaluation systems are created and utilized to facilitate the processes and procedures, the actions if you will, to the desired outcomes and goals. Performance measurement and evaluation systems are useful and unique to other applications, due to the ability of the specifically designed system(s) to measure both tangible and intangible variables; whereas measurement systems typically used either measure one or the other asset (Neely, Gregory & Platts, 2005). The ability to design a specific performance measurement and evaluation system, while flexibility and variations of performance measurement and evaluation systems fit both requirements of quantifiable and qualified attributes. With ever-increasing technology advancement and need in conjunction with equally-increasing knowledge-based management, measurements of both financial progress as well as human capital performance and process functionalities are important to the overall health of a project or organization. Neely, Gregory and Platts (2005) indicated performance measurement and evaluation systems are
primarily used to indicate effectiveness and efficiency of all facets of business and projects, but can be specifically created to collect data regarding the intangible variables such as customer service, volatility of the market share, the efficiency of processes and satisfaction of internal clients regarding their own job knowledge, job performance and the company’s interest in their successes. The involvement in the process of creating a performance measurement and evaluation system itself can increase internal job satisfaction (Neely, Gregory & Platts, 2005). When including internal customers in process planning, development of future applications and or forecasting programs to be implemented, job satisfaction increases as well as the satisfaction one has with their company (de Lancer Julnes, 2001).

Utilizing performance measurement and evaluation systems can also affect the company’s well-being. If performance measurement and evaluation systems are designed with the company’s strategic mission in mind, the performance of the company was affected positively (Buhovac & Slapnicar, 2007). In research presented by Buhovac and Slapnicar (2007), there was a strong correlation between utilizing performance measurement and evaluation systems (with company mission as the core strategy) and increased positive company performance. Performance measurement and evaluation systems are used to assess benefits of a program and can be used as a process audit to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of current processes and programs in place (Neely, Gregory & Platts, 2005).

Research indicated programs reviewed by tools of performance measurement and evaluation systems are evaluated against other programs (Markland, Butters & Brophy, 2007). Identified strengths and weaknesses of both programs together illuminate certain aspects to further improve the functionality of process and program systems. These uses are important in professional business settings for market analyses and research for product development. Neely,
Gregory and Platts (2005) indicated that as much as 40% of product cost can be related to overhead costs, the intangible aspects of product creation.

Implementing performance measurement and evaluation systems or using performance measurement and evaluation systems to audit current functions would reduce cost, providing more effective and efficient processes (Markland, Butters & Brophy, 2007). The usefulness and positive aspects of performance measurement and evaluation systems are seen in many ways and have yet to thoroughly saturate academic research and assessments or business industries.

C. Design of Viable Performance Evaluation and Measurement Systems

The fundamental quality of a performance measurement and evaluation system revolved around its ability to be designed specifically to the meet need of implementation, assessment or functionality. Performance measurement and evaluation systems are only applicable and viable if they have been uniquely designed for a particular, direct, intended purpose. There are endless angles and avenues that could drive the design and production of a performance measurement and evaluation tool.

To design the optimum performance measurement and evaluation tool for a cause, research indicated employment of these basic fundamentals in the design process: validity, legitimacy and functionality (Bouckaert, 1993). In review of Bouckaert’s (1993) research, validity was defined as “the internal strength of a mechanism, a theory, a system, a classification” (p. 31). Validity must entail logic, reason, have justification, and be expounding and rational (Bouckaert, 1993). When developing the validity of performance measurement and evaluation systems, one must be specific with direction of action, focus and phrases utilized to direct the conclusion or heighten the desired outcome. For instance, if the desired outcome was
to increase customer satisfaction, the performance measurement and evaluation tool must use documents, data and internal knowledge to create a valid series of inputs and resources to implement or improve customer satisfaction, such as customer surveys.

Legitimacy of performance measurement and evaluation systems refers to a broad scope of the situation at hand. The legitimacy was directly correlated to the situational need and how it applied to the corporation as a whole (Bouckaert, 1993). Using the prior example, an increase in customer satisfaction may not be a legitimate concern for private care physicians. As part of the foundational triad design of performance measurement and evaluation systems, the legitimacy of performance measures for a private care physician might be weak and therefore weaken the entire performance measurement and evaluation tool. The functionality aspect of a performance measurement and evaluation system design referred to the intention and purpose of measurement (Bouckaert, 1993). What measurable action can be reviewed, altered and re-created for a more effective and efficient outcome? Again, referring to the customer service example, the functionality of the customer surveys; how the surveys are created, distributed, retrieved and analyzed.

Validity, legitimacy, and functionality affect one another and alter the usability, sustainability or general quality of the performance measurement and evaluation tool (Bouckaert, 1993). If one aspect of this trio was weak and it was directly correlated to another variable that was more important, the performance measurement and evaluation system could be rendered less effective. Research existed regarding the proper balance, variations, and affects of these three variables on one another, but was beyond the scope of this paper.

According to Neely, Gregory and Platts (2005), versatility in performance measurement and evaluation systems was crucial to system viability of becoming a complete and adequate
tool. When creating a performance measurement and evaluation system, the ability to alter, design, and formulate it to any given situation or industry was a central part of a performance measurement system existence and uniqueness of the field. The ability to measure both tangible and intangible frequencies was important to the elementary aspects of measurement systems. In that same rite, versatility must be present to provide the ability to use performance measurement and evaluation systems across different industries (production oriented versus service oriented) as well as internally for an organization with both areas of production and service. The use of performance measurement and evaluation systems tolerated measurements of both quantitative and qualitative to be interconnected and fused together and relate directly to the goals of the organization. This allowed for collaboration between the different internal environments to produce one encompassing measurement system that services the organization and its overall strategic mission.

Lastly, data collection and the role of stakeholders regarding the design was an important element in the creation of performance measurement and evaluation systems (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006). Understanding an array of angles and aspects of a situation required many versions of the same scenario be critiqued. Each participant should have a relatable interest, duty or specific knowledge of the process at hand to be able to serve the creation of an operable measurement system (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006). Research has shown too many or not enough diverse stakeholders can affect the productivity of the creation of the model, the functionality of the model itself or, at the very least, the satisfaction levels of stakeholders that were not involved in the process (both with regard to the process or the end result of the measurements) (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006). Gathering the proper knowledge base provided
the measurement system with wholeness; such a neglected factor could taint the integrity of the model or measurements themselves.

D. Limitations in Performance Measurement Tools

The main limitation of performance measurement and evaluation systems related to the qualitative nature, both in theory and in form. Some arguments indicated an inability of quantitative and qualitative variables to coexist simultaneously for the result of a comprehensive and conclusive outcome (Jarrar & Schiuma, 2007). Researchers deduced tangible assets cannot directly relate to intangible aspects of an organization (Jarrar & Schiuma, 2007). Some identify the design methodology as a flaw with regard to performance measurement and evaluation systems, as well as the principle of implementing systems for the sake of implementing something (Bouckaert & Peters, 2002).

There was also a ‘placebo effect’ (Bouckaert, 1993) that has been identified with the simple action of designing a performance measurement and evaluation system; reactions occur that corrupt the outcomes. For example regarding a customer service project, the customer service representatives hear of an initiation of review regarding measurements of service and alter their performance, therefore changing the aspects of which stakeholders review processes, functions and directives. Lastly, Starbuck (2005) critiqued the usefulness of the qualitative methodology and data analysis of the qualitative values. Starbuck’s (2005) arguments stem from the fundamental inability to significantly or statistically be able to mathematically and conclusively delineate useful statistics from performance measurement and evaluation systems. His arguments are directed toward measurement systems. However, the nature of qualitative
research can be considerably different from quantitative research and Starbuck (2005) does not specifically identify how measurement systems differ from other qualitative facets of research.

E. Logic Models: Utilizing Comprehensive Aspects of Measurements

A logic model is referred to as a specific tool or variation of performance measurement and evaluation systems (W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2004). Alternatives of this tool can be created and modified, and different resources exist on content, design and style (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006; W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2004), providing the necessary versatility (Neely, Gregory & Platts, 2005). For the purposes of this project, the logic model was reviewed from five different aspects: Inputs, Activities, Outputs, Outcomes, and Goals. This relates to the case study later reviewed in this article.

![Logic Model Diagram](image)

*Figure 1. Logic Model*

The W.K. Kellogg Foundation’s (2004) guide demonstrates in Figure 1 the basic concept of a logic model. Inputs refer to the tangible aspects and physical assets of an organization or project (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006; W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2004). Activities are the actions that will occur with the use of the identified resources (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006; W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2004). Because of the relationship between Inputs and Activities, these two variables affect each other significantly and a change in one may create a change in the other (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006).
Outputs are what come from the union of Inputs and Activities. Outcomes are the differences that will, can, and have impacted the processes and functions for all aspects of the organization (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006; W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2004). Goals (Impact) relate to the organization’s overall mission and strategy. Goals should be the first aspect of the model identified (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006; Neely, Gregory & Platts, 2005; W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2004) and from this the methodology of design and development of the remaining variables should connect to this goal.

Depending on the project, organization or desired results, the design of the logic model can vary greatly, be more quantitative than qualitative or vice versa and provide directive action. This model encompasses the needs of validity, legitimacy, functionality and versatility required for strong performance measurement and evaluation systems. If likened to the idea of lean manufacturing, performance measurement and evaluation systems and logic models can be the mirror version of lean analysis. Whereas lean manufacturing investigated quantifiable data to reduce motion, time, and use of materials and increase efficiencies, performance measurement and evaluation systems and logic models can qualitatively adjust time, response, satisfaction and marketability. Both results affect the organizations bottom line independently as well as cohesively.

F. Summary

Performance measurement and evaluation systems are used as a unique tool to evaluate both tangible and intangible characteristics of a company or project. They are valuable in providing a methodology of unifying quantitative variables to qualitative variables to provide a full picture of a company’s health regarding financials, productivity, validation of the strategic
mission and service needs such as satisfaction, market analysis and top down product
development. Performance measurement and evaluation systems are utilized at the beginning of
projects and can be used as a functional audit for current processes. They are evolutionary and
can be altered to accommodate changing markets and projects. The use of performance
measurement and evaluation systems and their implementations indicated increased company
performance (Markland, Butters & Brophy, 2007).

The creation of viable performance measurement and evaluation systems included
validity, legitimacy and functionality as well as versatility. Creating the performance
measurement and evaluation systems with these qualifications allowed for a sustainable and
reliable tool. One or many of these variables can affect the other, also affecting or adulterating
the results of the measurements. Understanding these variables and how they affect one another
remains pivotal to a well balanced, effective measurement tool. The very creation of a well
designed performance measurement and evaluation system needs to include input from the
stakeholders, both internal and external. The need to have diverse understanding and knowledge
base of a situation provides a plethora of information to make complete, concise, and
comprehensive decisions regarding the creation and design of a measurement system.

Weaknesses of performance measurement and evaluation systems involve qualitative
issues, with relation to tangible versus non-tangible means, methodology and the overall
qualitative nature of research to develop useful statistics.

The efficacy of a logic model related a specific way of managing both tangible and
intangible aspects of a product, service or the combination of both. It was contrived from Inputs,
Activities, Outputs, Outcomes and Goals. If designed and managed accordingly, the logic model
can produce viable and useful information to give direction to a company regarding both its
physical and non-physical capital assets. This concept is pursued in the following section regarding methodology of research.
SECTION III. FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the project conducted with regard to intent, design, and the specific nature of data collection. First described are the purpose of the project and a detailed explanation of the methodology detailing why these types of methodological approaches were chosen. At the end of the section, a conclusive review of analysis and final summation is presented.

A. Framework

The work of this applied research intends to supplement current research through a mixed methods case study regarding the use of performance measurement and evaluation systems and the implementation of a software system (IFAS) in the non-profit sector. Previous research regarding performance measurement and evaluation systems indicated the proper use of a measurement tool increases project success (Andone, 2009; Buhovac & Slapnicar, 2007; Markland, Butters & Brophy, 2007; Neely, Gregory & Platts, 2005; Sole, 2009). Some studies also reveal that participant satisfaction increased with the use of a measurement tool that was properly implemented (de Lancer Julnes, 2001; Neely, Gregory & Platts, 2005). The project explored this field by providing supporting evidence to the claim that measurement tools both increase project success and increase participant satisfaction, two goals developed by the case study company.

The author was a participant (and inadvertently an observer) in the IFAS software implementation project and created a measurement tool, the logic model, which was used during the implementation. The desired end results are found through data analysis of accomplishments of project goals; goals regarding applications, results provided to stakeholders, budgetary
management and timeliness of the project.

In many cases, participant satisfaction during project implementations is given little or no attention. Participatory satisfaction is a variable of projects; however, no conclusive evidence has shown participatory satisfaction alters the project’s success when united with the use of performance measurement tools (logic models).

In this case study, the pursuit was to indicate all facets of the logic model that functioned as intended, as well as identify the areas of limited or failed results with regard to software implementations for non-profit foundations. The case study company, NP, also has a specific interest in participant satisfaction; attempting to determine if participant satisfaction plays a role in overall project success.

1. Design of Logic Model

Initially, the case study company required a logical and versatile plan be identified for the IFAS implementation. Based off of previous information and Figure 1, and after researching a number of options, NP decided the logic model tool would be the most sufficient and useful for this type of project. It is the most useful tool when working on a project that has specific time needs (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006). Once the logic model was identified as the tool to measure performance (the implementation), a draft of the model was created. According to previous research, primary focus must start with the end result or goal of the project (W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2004). Executive management at NP defined the goal based on early estimates of the IFAS implementation. By identifying the initial goal, a draft logic model was created. In total, several drafts were presented to NP’s executive management and a final draft was approved. During the course of this process, all areas were refined, including the final goal. Each developed area of the logic model is explained in detail below.
a. Inputs

Inputs are referred to as resources or assets of a project (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006; W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2004). These are the tangible, measurable, mostly financial variables that initialize a project. This characteristic enhances or diminishes the project abilities. The more resources available to the project, the goal can be more readily attainable. A limited number of resources can affect the achievability of the goal; however, if all resources are identified in the Input phase, the project can work within its limitations and means. The case study company indicated four main areas of Inputs or Resources by priority: Money, Equipment, People and Location. The first three Inputs were considered critical and the final input, Location, was considered important.

The variable of Money consisted of the budget for the software and hardware per the contractual agreement with the vendor, cost for additional client specific work that was unknown at the time and cost of travel for the vendor consultants to assist in the IFAS implementation.

Equipment was the next variable that was held as a major priority. Equipment was defined as software and hardware, dedicated scanners, printers and laptops for training. Other items were considered to be included as Equipment and may have fit the category, but it was decided to categorize by priority of obtaining the end result of the goal. The additional variable of Location was added as the design evolved.

The next resource was People or the staff. This area was visited and re-visited several times by the executive management team as to the best division of human assets within Inputs. Conclusive agreement was made, creating four teams of approximately five staff members each. These groups would be utilized as the communication sources to end users and assist in the testing, training, documentation and procedural reviews. Six vendor consultants were included,
as well as an onsite internal project manager that was entirely dedicated to oversee and manage the entire IFAS implementation. Also included in the People Input variable was three months of intense training with required overtime, a total of approximately 100 end users, management leadership, support from executive staff and the Board of Directors and finally external and internal stakeholders, such as the university.

Lastly, the Input of Location was included, although it was defined as important, not critical. NP established early in discussions that if budgetary constraints became an issue, the designated training and meeting rooms would be up for negotiation and it would not be deemed imperative to achieving the end goal. Location included software installs and hardware location, dedicated training room fully equipped for testing, as well as a dedicated meeting room for the groups and vendor consultants. More detail is provided in Figure 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Money</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 for software and some hardware</td>
<td>$30,000 Licensing costs of Software and Hardware</td>
<td>4 Project Teams of 5 staff members each</td>
<td>Software installs and hardware location based on compliancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional $145,000 for incidentals (new modules, special scopes to vendor, implementation, program, etc)</td>
<td>$10,000 Scanners and Printers for training and long term use</td>
<td>~100 end users that will need precursory training</td>
<td>Dedicated training room to include 10 working stations with all needed materials and equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$76,500 Cost of travel: $1700/trip average with approximately 45 trips in 18 months</td>
<td>$40,000 Computers for dedicated training laptops</td>
<td>6 trainers and 1 project manager between vendor and company</td>
<td>Dedicated meeting room for work and group meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 months prior to GO LIVE team members to dedicate extra man hours

Management leadership

Support from board and executive staff

Involvement or information to external and internal stakeholders

**Figure 2.** Inputs of the Logic Model
b. Activities

As described by McDavid and Hawthorn (2006) and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation (2004), Activities are the actions used to make the logic model function or functional with use of the Inputs (or Resources). Five main Activities were developed based on the needs of the project: Develop, Prepare, Create, Communicate and Function. This variable was where the majority of the planning was done and accomplished. Activity was the main function of the dedicated project manager, in respect to verifying all work had been delegated and completed in a timely manner.

Develop in the category of Activities included completion of the contract with the vendor (timeline, costs, resources, etc.) and development of a core group of decision makers and how they would determine their decisions and express them. A communication plan was developed that included scope of work, reports and any foreseen issues that might arise. Lastly, measureable aspects of the Develop variable within Activities were noted. These included the budget and time frames for reporting purposes, as well as specific timelines, calendars and schedules.

The variable Prepare included loading and testing the new system with various training equipment, testing all environments and initial set up for beginning tests and preparation of training and meeting rooms with physical needs such as furniture and equipment. The Prepare phase was time-consuming and labor intensive for several staff members and notably the least favored.

Create, as the next variable in Activities, included creation of communication tools. These communication tools included weekly meetings, weekly reports (both core group and internal groups), shared electronic files and SharePoint®. At this phase, it was determined there
would need to be a hierarchy of accountability, therefore an organizational and task chart was created that included reporting to executive staff, as well as division of the groups and the reporting structure for issues within the groups. As incentive to stay on task, motivational themes, events and activities were developed to keep the staff members engaged in the implementation.

The Activity of Communicate was dedicated to ensure proper documentation, reporting, and overall understanding permeated the IFAS implementation. This included guidelines for the implementation staff to follow regarding monthly and weekly meetings (budgets, progress, scopes, issues, etc), as well as communication between executive staff and team leaders on team progress and morale. The training of the staff was outlined in this section, although sections and details of this area were vague due to the unknown factors of the implementation at the time of the logic model design. Lastly, the Communicate variable was the resource to use when attempting to resolve issues, whether it was a staff or software problem.

The last variable of Activities was Function. Function encompassed the revolving and continuing aspects of the IFAS implementation process, such as monitoring IFAS and its functionality; forethought of future storage needs, development of electronic filing systems and long-term security; and tests designed to further improve the IFAS system, such as other modules, future uses and post GO LIVE items to address. The table below, Figure 3, indicates these various Activities.

c. Outputs

Outputs, Outcomes and Goal(s) are the product of the Inputs and Activities (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006; W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2004). Outputs are the direct and immediate product of the previous sections. In this case study, the Outputs were both tangible in nature as
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Develop</th>
<th>Prepare</th>
<th>Create</th>
<th>Communicate</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract with specifications for entire project: time, cost, resources, responsibilities, etc.</td>
<td>Load and test new system on 10 laptops</td>
<td>Create SharePoint site as a communication tool. Post all project information on site</td>
<td>Monthly budget updates, weekly timelines, scopes and progress and issues between vendor and staff</td>
<td>System running, Identify and report any bugs to be fixed and/or how to work around them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay for contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core group of decision makers and how group decisions are to be made</td>
<td>Test environment and equipment for mass use. Assign passwords and security</td>
<td>Organizational chart and task responsibilities for project. Identify tasks by assigned group and due date</td>
<td>Between staff and team leaders - overall morale of staff</td>
<td>Group think re: storage, support, builds, different duties, assignments and reports that go external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and work plan, Scopes of work, reports and issues, Identify internal and external users</td>
<td>Dedicated training and meeting room: tables, chairs, projector, storage, equipment, training, materials, etc</td>
<td>Motivating incentives and theme for implementation. Plan for 'fun' activity once per month to keep staff motivated</td>
<td>Train staff for daily use. Show ability and differences of new system vs. old system</td>
<td>Test and consider modules that help growth and use of new system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and time frame for project reporting both internal and external. Have plan in place for overages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline, calendar and schedules for GO LIVE dates. Work backwards from GO LIVE date with training and task dates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Activities of the Logic Model

well as process oriented. The two identifiable Outputs that developed were Changes and Services. This is depicted in Figure 4 below.

Within the Change category, several primary work functions were proposed to be
affected. First, new job duties, responsibilities, processes and descriptions would be assigned. Initially, the accounting department would review job changes and adjust staff to duties with which they were most compatible and most skilled. Many, if not all, positions would be altered at some level regarding processes. Along with new job assignments, new accounting methods would evolve as part of Change. As the system would develop and be customized, several actual accounting methods would require alterations and adjustments to provide for new business models being utilized. Following these two main changes to functionality, other areas were included in Change.

Communication, both internal of the accounting department as well as externally from accounting to other departments, would change drastically. The new system allowed for departmental control and involvement. This would include much communication between departments regarding budgets, coding and processing of accounts that did not exist previously. Parallel to inter-departmental communication, the reports structure, needs and availability would need to be reinvented. Prior to the IFAS implementation, accounting reports were distributed on excel sheets from the accounting department to other internal departments. With the new system, any report would be available (to certain secured staff) at the time the report was desired with live, up-to-date, accurate data. Secured staff would be trained on reports, report retrieval and report reading. The final two Changes would be philosophical shifts in previous thinking and cause more time in adjustment.

The second variable of Outputs was Services. This category was derived from the new or improved services the IFAS software system would allow. First and foremost, daily (work) service processes would improve such as new reporting capabilities. This would affect both internal reporting activity as well as external reporting capabilities. The availability of data
would be altered; the intention was to allow access to reports and data based on module or by individual user. NP staff outside of the accounting department would have availability to the IFAS software and data; prior to IFAS these same users had no access. Response time to internal and external requests would improve, due to the increase of technological efficiencies. All data would be available electronically, as reports would process more efficiently and be sent electronically. Inefficiencies in data entry would be reduced with the use of timely uploads. Data retrieval and intra-software data sharing abilities would increase efficiencies, as well as abilities to share data avoiding re-entry. The new IFAS system would allow for a layering of data. With IFAS, reports can show totals and final numbers. If more details are needed, the final number can be electronically exposed and the details of the final summary numbers are shown transaction by transaction. This individual feature alone could reduce hours of searching for transactions and entries to determine the composition of bottom line numbers.

Training departments outside of the accounting department regarding IFAS would reduce accounting staff work load. Staff would be able to search and query for information for which they have security clearance, providing a reduction in the amount of time accounting staff spend on departmental requests, in turn, providing an increase in time on for the accounting staff to spend on accounting procedures. Lastly, documentation would be created and distributed. Prior to IFAS, there was no documentation on how to use the Legacy system. Manuals on how to use the system in each module with standardization requirements would be documented. This would provide for more efficiency for incoming staff members by reducing training, questions, and errors readily seen prior to IFAS. Documentation would also assist the accounting department in the annual audit. This would be instituted in the accounting policies manual that is annually reviewed by the Board of Directors. Outputs are displayed below in Figure 4.
OUTPUTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New job duties, responsibilities and descriptions</td>
<td>Ability to report quick and accurate information to the University, President and Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication within accounting department and between other department changes</td>
<td>Train other departments to understand and work with the accounting system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different reports, reporting structures and changes for the receivers of the reports</td>
<td>New manuals for staff, new users and incoming employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New accounting methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4. Outputs of the Logic Model*

d. Outcomes

Outcomes are the affects of the Inputs, Activities and Outputs and are typically seen within the following one to three years after a project, identifiable as short term goals (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006; W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2004). The intent was for Outcomes to be beneficial to the end result or Goal(s). In this case study, the decision makers wanted their Outcomes to be more fluid and long term, based on foundational and knowledge-based investment into the company’s human capital. They considered tangible, financial evidence as Outcomes as well, but after careful and long discussions on various options of financial results, the group decided on the less rigid approach of categorizing the Outcomes as service-oriented variables. The two main variables created were More and New and shown in Figure 5 following this section.
The Outcome More described the general abilities of the staff to do and provide more; more reporting, more options, and more work. A priority for the decision makers (in the More category) was a usable, functional, technologically-sound system. This was the main catalyst behind implementing a new system from the beginning and the decision makers wanted this theme to be constant and consistent throughout the program. Along with a stable system, the decision makers estimated IFAS would allow for staff to accomplish more daily tasks, due to the aforementioned efficiencies. The efficiency in time management would provide for an additional one hour per day per staff, increasing their ability to be assigned additional tasks. In tandem with this thought process, it was also concluded that with the utilization of additional technologies the staff would save an additional three-fourths hour (.75 hour) of staff time by reducing the redundancy of re-entry into multiple systems. Finally, the More category included a variable for retention of staff. The decision makers estimated that the updated, efficient IFAS system would retain current staff because their job satisfaction would increase and an advanced work system was easier to use.

The second Outcome to be defined was categorized as New; new processes, new abilities and new methods. IFAS allowed for several areas of support and different anchors versus the Legacy system that no longer had vendor support and was currently managed by the daughter of the previous system designer. These included internal staff as well as the vendor of the product, which is internationally recognized. New accounting procedures, processes and methods were intended with the use of IFAS, as well as the collaboration throughout the internal departments to use the system for their own reporting needs. New abilities included more training and documentation support, which would lead to more job satisfaction and ability to complete more daily tasks. A table of Outcomes is shown in Figure 5.
## OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usable, functional, 'normal' system</td>
<td>Several anchors and areas of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More work is accomplished due to efficiency of system; saving 1 hour/day/staff</td>
<td>New accounting methods used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More technologies are utilized because of new system; saving .75 hr/day/staff</td>
<td>More satisfaction with job and ability to complete more work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain more employees with new system</td>
<td>Easier to learn and train new employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widespread use of system throughout departments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5. Outcomes of the Logic Model*

**e. Goal**

Lastly, Goal can also be referred to as Impact and was the main desired affect. It was the long term outcome that changed the scope of foundational thought, process or skill within a community or organization (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006; W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2004). Again, the decision makers created several drafts of their desired goal. It was determined that financial results or benefits should not be considered as a goal. This would provide for future assessments of the logic model. The decision makers intended to review the logic model in subsequent years after the completion of the implementation and assess whether the Goal was still being met. This was a major reason the decision makers choose the logic model tool. The main and primary goal of the project was to replace an antiquated system that had little support
and that was technologically available to other systems. The Goal of the project is shown in Figure 6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable, Functional, Technologically Advanced, User Friendly Accounting System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 6. Goal of the Logic Model*

**B. Methodology**

Various research methods were applied, due to feasibility and accessibility. It was determined that case study methods would be most appropriate for the investigation of a logic model used during a software implementation. The case study company, NP, was chosen as the candidate for the case study for several different reasons, primarily because it was in need of a software implementation. The company was also a manageable size for the project, was in agreement with this type of project, and was in a favorable location.

A variation of methods was utilized during the implementation of the case study project. Due to the nature of the project, a mixed methods approach was incorporated. In this instance, it was both applied and action research as NP employed the tools provided and allowed for investigation of the IFAS implementation. Because the author was employed by the same company at the time of the IFAS implementation and was an active participant in the project implementation, a phenomenological approach is added to the research design. The main focus was to determine the application, functionality and usefulness of a logic model while implementing software (IFAS) in a non-profit company. Additional interest was based on the desires of the case study company. These included experiences and exchanges of participants interacting with performance measurement and evaluation tools, and the search for patterns and consistencies between participant experiences specifically regarding their levels of satisfaction.
The phenomenological approach increased opportunities of exploration and explanation of the use of logic models, as well as individuals' characteristics and their relationship to logic models. It also included an in-depth, internal and comprehensive view to the project itself. This brought its own unique and interesting variable to the research, as the author is not only a participant but a researcher simultaneously. This is addressed previously in the assumptions and limitations section of this project.

A logic model was created and given to the case study company for edits and final approval. Field documentation that was reported on a monthly basis was used as the main chronological reference of the implementation project. These field reports are retained internally with project files and are referred to in the analysis of the project (see Appendix A).

One year after the implementation, an online survey was distributed to the accounting staff and users. The survey was developed using mostly Likert scale questioning methods, with some open-ended response questions (see Appendix B). The survey searched for themes, patterns and connectivity of the logic model to accomplishments and satisfaction. It revolved around the satisfactory rating of the structured planning method utilized (logic model) and the individual’s feelings on goal setting and satisfaction in general. Once the data was retrieved from the online survey, the emergent theme or themes were then used for an in-depth focus group interview. A focus group was identified and consisted of the major decision makers and integral participants. The original decision makers of the project, a total of five members participated in the focus group interview. This focus group was invited to participate in a one hour open discussion lead by the author regarding specific questions stemming from the online survey data. The in-depth focus group interview was used to elaborate on the themes and patterns presented through the online survey. The interview data was then analyzed for further
themes and patterns, and specific areas of perceived successes, failures or areas of improvement regarding the logic model.

The final analysis included the review of all aspects of the application of the logic model and the end result for the case study company. With data accumulated, the author pursued common themes and related the themes to current applicable research regarding use of logic models. Per the case study company’s request, the author also pursued satisfactory levels of the use of logic models, involvement of the end user and their satisfaction in the overall IFAS implementation.

C. Research Setting

This section describes the case study company and the participants involved for a clearer understanding of the research.

1. Environment and Company

The case study was a non-profit foundation, NP, which served a state-funded university. Its mission was to assist the university in whatever capacity needed, mostly fiscal and staffing resources. The NP was located in the Midwest section of the United States and was founded in 1930. Since 1985, NP had facilitated and managed the same accounting software (Legacy) and was in desperate need of an upgrade to remain competitive and functional with surrounding technological advances. NP managed approximately one-half billion dollars in assets with a staff of approximately 100 employees in five different locations. During the time of the implementation, there were three remote offices and one corporate office. The majority of the employees were located at the corporate office where the IFAS implementation was implemented and managed. Within the corporate office, there were five main departments, three
of which were heavily involved in the implementation process. Again, NP was in agreement with its voluntary status as a case study due to its need to upgrade software, proximity, and its availability to participate in this study.

The culture of NP was emergent and progressive. At the time of the case study, NP led the country with high technology start-up companies through intellectual property developed from the university. NP, its staff, and its culture were in a normative state of flux. Projects, contracts, new technologies, new processes, additional endeavors were commonplace for NP on a monthly basis. The upgrade of a much-needed software system seemed long overdue and was openly welcomed by staff.

2. Participants

All accounting and human resources staff of NP were eligible to participate in the online survey. The focus group was specifically selected and consisted of the main decision makers who were invited to participate in the online survey as well. The participants were varied in age and all of the female gender. The average age of the entire staff was approximately 42 years of age and approximately 60 percent female. Some participants had a greater knowledge of the system, its implementation, its capabilities and overall use due to their respective jobs and locations. The staff members with the greatest understanding were the information systems and technology department and the financial department. The survey was endorsed by the Senior Vice President (SVP)/Chief Executive Officer (CEO)/Chief Operating Officer (COO) and participation was encouraged.
D. Data Collection

Several areas were incorporated to provide complete, strong, and conclusive evidence toward the problem statement at hand. The various aspects of research are identified in the following sections.

1. Researcher Participation and Field Documentation

The researcher was an active participant in the design of the logic model, IFAS implementation and decision making process. As a participant, the researcher participated in the implementation from a decision maker position and created monthly reports based on the implementation, which were presented to the remaining decision makers. The template report was generated from the vendor consultant that managed the implementation from the vendor aspect. These reports were reviewed by the group and revisions were made. The reports were combined to present to the SVP/CEO/COO for an update on the project’s status. This made a collective effort and joint agreement of the project status, identified and documented issues that existed. The decision makers discussed the denoted issues and proceeded with corrective action based on the timeline, resources, and Inputs of the logic model. The monthly reports indicated the overall completion rate of the implementation, as well as percentage of goal completed, staff morale, budgetary review and other various aspects of the project implementation. NP documented, recorded and referred to these monthly reports as a primarily source of project completion. Because these reports were internal to the company and the vendor, and used primarily for their purpose, an inductive analysis of these recorded documents is presented in the analysis section of this paper. The reports described are the main source of field documentation
and referenced throughout the analysis, and are located in Appendix A. As requested by NP and required by IRB, identifying information and names have been removed.

2. Survey

All accounting and human resource staff of NP were selected and invited to participate in the online survey created through an online survey tool (Qualtrics Survey Software) through the subject university. The survey consisted of 40 questions. Approximately 25 questions were based on perceptions regarding goal setting, importance of goals, and satisfaction using the Likert scale. The questions focused on individual perspectives and beliefs, and pursued commonalities between professional and personal experiences. The questions were designed to develop a basis of importance of goal setting from the participant’s perspectives, and whether the importance of goal setting provided levels of satisfaction. The directives of the questions involved understanding the IFAS implementation process, communication functions and overall satisfaction of the project. Four questions were based with regard to time and demographics. The remaining 11 questions were specific questions indicating frequency of different types of communication or open ended questions for general comments and responses. See Appendix B for survey in its entirety.

The survey was distributed via a link through blind copied email to the selected sample group. The required Institutional Review Board (IRB) consent language was presented in the body of the email, as well as the initial question of the survey requesting consent. A participant accepted the terms of the consent and proceeded with the rest of the questionnaire. The survey consisted of two to three questions per electronic page. Radio buttons, rating scales, and opened ended parenthetical answers were the choices available to complete the survey. Both the author and the university advising faculty had access to survey results. The case study company’s
SVP/CEO/COO and several executive staff requested results of the survey as well. The survey availability lasted for two weeks and two reminder emails were sent to participants requesting completion of the survey. The data were downloaded from the electronic surveying system and retained with the author for analysis for the remainder of the project. Upon completion of the project, the final documents are retained by the university advising faculty. An inductive analysis of the survey is presented in the analysis section of this project.

3. Focus Group Interview

A focus group interview was included in this project for continued qualitative case study research into themes, patterns and content of the completed survey. A revision request was requested and approved through the IRB to continue research in this particular subject area. The five main decision makers referred to as the focus group were invited to participate in a one hour discussion. The focus group directed the implementation as a whole and made decisions regarding all aspects of the project. A conference room was prepared with proper lighting and seating, and the discussion was video recorded for later review and thorough analysis.

The discussion began with participants reading and verbally consenting to the IRB required consent language. Each member of the focus group received a copy of the interview topics to review prior to beginning the discussion. Eight topics (see Appendix C) were identified as priority from the original survey and altered to facilitate the focus group discussion. The topics were utilized as conversation conductors. The focus group was allowed and encouraged to discuss openly their experiences, feelings and interpretations of the IFAS implementation. The intent with this type of open-ended, mildly directed discussion was to wholly facilitate the inductive nature of analysis. Each of the eight interview topics were utilized throughout the interview; however several questions were discussed only briefly based on the interest and
response of the focus group. The discussion was lead by the author. The intent was to ask probing questions to comments and responses, as well as present new topics. As the focus group was decision makers, they were also a representative for their reporting staff. Specific questions regarding their views and opinions of their staffs’ opinions were pursued as well. This type of questioning would assist the final analysis with regard to themes and patterns, as well as the project as a whole. The focus group has the unique perspective of absolute and full comprehension from all angles of the project, from end users to middle management and through the expectations of the SVP/CEO/COO and board members.
SECTION IV. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The analysis pursued and investigated the true use of the logic model application as well as its limitations. The data was evaluated through a mixed methods analysis by way of case study methods, utilizing phenomenology. Analysis of the data was interpreted by searching for relatable theories through previous journal articles and research in the field of performance measurement and evaluation systems. Initially, the statement of problem was addressed through the case study analysis. An inductive analysis approach regarding the field documentation, survey and focus group interview was utilized. This approach searched for common themes, phrases, content and experiences, and examined and pursued data variables to add to current research literature and create new undiscovered content to investigate further. This was provided through the examination of monthly reports, the online survey data and focus group interview responses as to the application and or limitations of the implementation through the vehicle of the logic model.

A. Review: Statement of Problem

As a review, the Legacy software utilized by NP caused delayed work response, inefficiencies and reporting errors. The output of work by NP staff lacked timeliness, accuracy and flexibility due to the age and design of the Legacy software. IFAS was identified as the new software to be implemented to alter these negative work results and outcomes. NP required a
structured planning tool be designed and incorporated to direct in the implementation of the new software, as well as maintain focus on their goals. The performance measurement tool, a logic model, was created and designed specifically for the purpose and use of NP, as described in detail in Section III. The executive staff and decision makers of NP made alterations to the logic model and gave final approval of its design and use.

The logic model was implemented in 2008. The performance measurement tool provided direction and reference throughout the project. The intent of this project and case study was to create a planning method to assist in the implementation of the software system IFAS; design and implement the planning method and analyze and review the use of the logic model.

Process strategies are directly linked to project conditions and desired outcomes via a logic model (Hernandez, 2000). The use of the logic model, in this case study and previous research, created consensus and agreement among decision makers regarding direction, use of resources and attainment of the goal (Hernandez, 2000). The use, implementation, and result of the logic model provided for a complete analysis of the project in totality, not limited by financial or quantitative metrics (Barclay & Osei-Bryson, 2009). The goal itself was not quantitative, but a qualitative definition of desired results. The goal was the fundamental objective of the stakeholders. With the creation and implementation of the logic model, the specific goal designated by NP was met.

B. Use of the Logic Model - Case Study Perspectives

The following section reviews the case study’s specific use of the logic model. The appraisal of the use of the logic model with the implementation of software at NP is followed by the evaluation of the logic model design itself. This section concludes with a detailed review of
the collected data through field documentation, survey and focus group interview assessment regarding participant involvement and their satisfaction with the process.

1. Case Study NP and the Logic Model

An imperative aspect to improved performance and accountability was the incorporation of performance measurement systems (Andone, 2009; Sole, 2009). After the investigation of several performance measurement and evaluation tools, the logic model proved to be the most pertinent to NP’s needs and implementation. The executive members chose the logic model due to its usability before, during and after the implementation. They determined it would be utilized after the implementation (or parts thereof) to measure continued achievability of the goal.

Performance measurement systems are intended to be a means rather than an end in itself (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006). Both in this case study and previous research, the logic model presented the usability for organizational, team and individual involvement and assessment (Sole, 2009).

Research indicated the involvement of stakeholders was key to the success of a project implementation (Andone, 2009; Barclay & Osei-Bryson, 2009; Sole, 2009). In the case of NP’s implementation, several stakeholders (SVP/CEO/COO, board of directors, the university and external customers) were greatly removed from the process. The SVP/CEO/COO’s role in the implementation was receipt of the monthly reports and providing comments some of the time. The board of directors was involved in the approval process of the budget for the software, informed of the chosen software vendor and was updated with the project completion and the final budget outcome. The university and external customers were not informed of the project until after its completion and obvious changes and results. These stakeholders should have been
removed from the logic model, identified as limited stakeholders, or the logic model processes should have further pursued their input.

The perception and perspective of staff regarding knowledge management and their ability to participate in their own direction was crucial to individual success (Andone, 2009; Sole, 2009). Intangible variables, such as satisfaction, also play a role in the organizations overall culture and success (de Lancer Julnes, 2001; Kaplan & Norton, 2001; Neely, Gregory & Platts, 2005). These variables indirectly, or sometimes directly, affect the financial bottom line of a company. The logic model utilized with NP’s implementation suggests these characteristics of individual participation in direction and company concern of staff satisfaction were critical to the end result of a successful implementation. It remains plausible to consider these characteristics indirectly influenced the financial outcome of the project in a positive manner. Within this case study, the notion that participation and satisfaction are relatable to positive outcomes is found and proven to be relevant.

Several departments within NP were not directly involved in the implementation, but would be greatly impacted by the changes in the outcomes. The lack of forethought, preparedness and communication regarding the implementation to these departments caused dissention, confusion and added to the amount of time IFAS was learned and accepted. The result of this oversight caused additional time and resources spent toward further training, communication, and knowledge investment of IFAS.

2. Evaluation of the Logic Model Design

The final product was created and approved within the executive staff and decision makers. Once it was approved, the logic model shown and was explained to the staff that would be most intimately involved with the implementation. The team leaders were encouraged to
review, understand, and refer to the logic model with their team members during their training.

The logic model in its entirety is presented in Figure 7 below.

![Figure 7. NP IFAS Logic Model](image)

After careful examination and scrutiny regarding the variables of NP's logic model, notable variables were essential, while other variables were disregarded creating partial desecration of the model in its entirety. The most crucial aspect of the model was proper identification and definition of the Goal (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006; W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2004), which NP successfully created. Their intent was to create a Goal with no financial measures and to be completely a ‘progressive, functional and forward-thinking’ Goal. Another primary variable was Input. Input(s) limit the model’s ability to perform wholly. As the design of the logic model was in progress, one variable was purposefully excluded, eventually causing unclear and unconfirmed direction. The variable of Time should have been included
with the Input variables of Money, Equipment, People and Location. The executive staff chose
to exclude Time as a variable, due to the inability to forecast the true need and metrics. During
the IFAS implementation, identification of Time would become essential and was a major part of
the implementation. Time included the timeline on tracking progress, time of staff, time of
training and adjustment of time from the Legacy system to IFAS, as a few examples. This
oversight forced the decision makers to manage Time needs as they became apparent. This
hindered progress during the implementation while Time needs were addressed.

The Input development of teams with leaders created four teams which was pivotal to the
overall success and communication during the implementation. Each team had a specific area of
expertise and it was the leaders’ jobs to lead, train, question, create documentation and act as a
liaison between the staff and decision makers. They were also responsible for reporting on
progress or variations in the timeline that would require adjustments. The appropriate facilitation
of the team leaders assisted the management of the logic model, specifically when deciphering
Inputs and Goals.

In the same accord as the discussion above, the variable Activities required more
specification than what was published. Again, at the time of the creation of the logic model the
executive staff was inconclusive about detailed delegation of duties, roles and responsibilities.
They felt it would be better to create and adjust delegation during the implementation. It would
have benefited the logic model and implementation to have delegated Activities to certain
individuals, teams or departments. For instance, the Activity of ‘budget and time frame for
project reporting both internal and external. Have plan in place for overages’ (Figure 3, p. 24
and in Figures) went without action until the project manager indicated this would need the
SVP/CEO/COO's involvement. Identifying the initial responsibility would have prevented such oversights.

The metrics of hours saved in Outcomes was unsubstantiated. This variable indicated an approximate reduction of one and three-fourths (1.75) hours of work time per staff per day. This was an unrealistic calculation of time spent and saved. In hind sight, the committee may have believed one and three-fourths (1.75) hours per week instead of a daily hourly reduction, which was more reasonable. The thought behind the worked time reduction revolved around the absence of manual manipulation of transactions, as the new technologically advanced system provided accounting information in publishable form. In that same area of concern, the Outcomes did not account for the increased downtime, slowness or technological issues that occurred with the new system. IFAS was completely internet based, indicating interruptions in service via technology would be prevalent and outages more frequent. The Legacy system was maintained from an in-house server with a back up generator, resulting in consistent access.

Lastly, the Outcomes variable referred to the retention of staff. This too was an unsubstantiated characteristic. Retention of staff in the accounting department was not an issue prior to the IFAS implementation. The indication of retaining more employees with IFAS was unclear. The creation of this variable regarded the issue of the Legacy system being extremely incompatible, hard to learn and embarrassing out-dated. This variable does not indicate the staffs' desires for a new and upgraded system. As an indicator this variable was flawed post implementation, the accounting staff had one team leader and one vital participant resign as a result of the implementation, and they directly referred to the implementation as the catalyst for their departure.
3. Collected Data Analysis

The implementation itself was successful; the defined goal was met by the original determined deadline and the project (through its completion) ended under budget by approximately $100,000 dollars. The executive stakeholders (SVP/CEO/COO and board of directors) were satisfied and pleased with this outcome. The goal of the project was to provide a sustainable, functional and technologically advanced user friendly accounting system. To date, this goal is still applicable and continues to be attained.

a. Field Documentation

The initial examination of field documentation provided the same conclusions as previously stated regarding the implementation as a success due to goal accomplishment, completion date and reduction in final project costs. The notable exception was the morale notations. After examination of the morale section of the monthly field documentation (see Appendix A), common and repeated concerns of time, stress, anxiety and negative attitudes pervade the Morale section. Negative attitudes hindered the tone and morale of the project. The negative attitudes cultivated doubts and concerns and sidetracked otherwise productive meetings and training sessions. The negative attitudes also ignited more stress and anxiety on other staff members, some of which asked to be moved to other groups to avoid the negativity. Nine of the 11 monthly field documented Morale sections referred to unrest and concern. Much of the unrest resulted from the unknown and feelings of being uneducated or uninformed. Although this was reported to the vendor, NP was assured its progression was appropriate. Many of the tasks and details were in chronological balance and could not be attempted until the suitable time during the implementation. Satisfaction was a researched and proven characteristic of project success and had substantial impact on the Outcomes as well as the achievability of the Goal (Andone,
2009; Said, HassabElnaby & Weir, 2003; Sole, 2009). During this project, the field documentation indicated satisfaction was non-existent. It was later discovered through the use of survey and focus group interview (and discussed in the subsequent findings within this paper) the staff did feel satisfaction after the implementation was completed.

b. Survey

The survey of the staff's perspectives provided significant indication of goal accomplishment and satisfaction of achieving the goal. The response of 96% of all staff believed setting goals was an important part of their work directly related to 97% of the staff feeling satisfied after a goal was accomplished indicates and substantiates the correlation of these variables (Andone, 2009; de Lancer Julnes, 2001; Neely, Gregory & Platts, 2005; Sole, 2009). Interestingly, when asked about personal goal setting the outcome was the same, indicating a possible personality trait may be an underlying variable worth further investigation. With the indicators of 'agree or strongly agree', 100% of the staff felt a structure plan aided in the accomplishment a project goal, although only 97% felt utilization of a structured plan provided them with satisfaction. The survey indicated 92% of staff involved in the implementation fully understood the intended Goal. An indication of the need for better communication was signified by a 67% positive response rate to the question regarding the staff feeling informed of the progress being made during the implementation. From this result, it seems apparent the programmatic monthly reports documentation presented to executive management should have been altered and distributed for staff review as well. The results showed 75% of staff believed the implementation was a success, without giving a finite definition of success in this instance and only 50% believe they could track their individual or team progress with the logic model.
To conclude the survey, participants were asked to provide open-ended comments regarding main points they felt contributed to the success of the implementation, as well as comments regarding poor planning or failure of the implementation. Successful themes and patterns with relation to project teams and communication emerged, as well as consistent mention of project management, project manager and project advocate. The staff responses mentioned communication within and between teams, as well as the SharePoint® tool, meetings and activities were an integral part of the success of the project. There was also consistent mention of a project manager and the management of the project as a whole contributing to the success of the project.

Indications of failure included the lack of inclusion of departments not involved in the implementation, earlier planning phases, and response to issues. As indicated in the previous analysis section, the disregard of including other departments through the logic model became apparent and through the survey, was noticeable to the staff as well. Planning earlier was directly relatable to the field documentation that corroborates the feelings of unsettledness, unpreparedness and general lagging behind the desired project status. The vendor indicated progress was on track and certain duties could not happen outside of the chronological design. The comments of response to issues were in regard to the attentiveness of the vendor to specific systematic failures. As the product was new and NP was the first client on this version, there were several software issues that caused more work, delay in progress, staff concern and distrust, and an overall uneasiness with the IFAS product. The logic model as a whole proved successful; however, the results of the survey indicate a more detailed, thoroughly described and communicated plan and progression report was needed to allow participants more involvement in the implementation.
c. Focus Group Interview

Lastly, the focus group interview was conducted and video recorded, and later inductively analyzed for themes, patterns and content both within the interview itself, as well as in association with the field documentation and survey results. As cited through the various works of Andone (2009), Engel-Cox, Van Houten, Phelps and Rose (2008), McDavid and Hawthorn (2006), Neely, Gregory and Platts (2005), Said, HassabElnaby and Weir (2003), Sole (2009), and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation (2004), specific, definable goal setting was critical to successful planning.

The focus group reiterated this point throughout the hour long interview. One participant indicated disappointment with the lack of measurability with the project Goal, but also stated ‘it wasn’t my call’. With the discussion of Goals, the focus group conferred in detail their individual feelings of satisfaction in creation of the Goal and small Goal milestones. They also discussed the ability to review their progress and reflected on how far they had come from the beginning of the project. The capability to review their progress and accomplishments via the logic model held value with the majority of the focus group. They indicated they felt a sense of empowerment with the accomplishment of the Goal, one participant indicated ‘it gives you a sense you can do anything’. An interesting insight provided by the eldest member of the focus group (and longest employed) indicated the project meant something at a personal level. This participant stated ‘[this project] provides me with pride, ownership, something good that needed to be done...like leaving part of my legacy in my professional life. It was like being part of something bigger than myself and being part of [NP’s] history’. The final phase of the Goal discussion, the participants conversed about the relationship between personal and professional goals. One participant indicated ‘professional goals are personal’, and several participants
expressed, in agreement, they value professional goals more than personal goals. They contended professional goals have a ‘greater good’ and contribute to more than personal goals that only benefit one or two individuals.

The next phase of the focus group interview pertained to planning, structured planning and the importance (or lack thereof) of such strategies. Each participant had their own unique angle of planning for a project. One participant indicated an ample amount of time spent in private thought and mental preparation regarding a project was imperative, then ‘bouncing ideas off of others’ to see if the planning strategy is appropriate. Another participant mentioned appropriate, finite goal setting was primary to planning strategies. Yet another mentioned deadlines and resources as planning strategies, without which it was simply unknown of what truly can be accomplished. The discussion was then directed to the area of satisfaction and how proper planning increased satisfaction. This was evidence of research presented by Andone (2009) and Sole (2009) and confirmed their claims. Mention of the lack of planning with regard to the involvement of other departments and the issues that ensued thereafter led the group to conclude the lack of planning directly affected satisfaction. The group also agreed dissatisfaction interfered with the satisfaction of the accomplishment as a whole.

The conversation was guided to the planning methods and the groups’ feelings on performance. The focus group discussed by utilizing the logic model, staff kept focused on the project and not individual training or processing methods. All were able to function in their own way, but toward one end result. The group spent much time in discussion about the incorporation of a full time project manager. They discussed how the logic model was useful and effective; however, the project manager ‘gave it life’ and made the model ‘3D and movable at some level’. They also indicated the project manager made the project seem more effective,
due to the constant referral to the logic model and planning strategies. Without the ‘live logic model version’, they implied the logic model would have been less used, less effective and ‘just another piece of paper’ contributing to the project.

The discussion turned back toward the topic of satisfaction, in this instance regarding staff satisfaction. The focus group spoke of their understanding the implementation was hard on the staff while they maintained their daily tasks, although they also mentioned they themselves were required to ‘double duty’. They discussed that satisfaction was related to the involvement, decision making abilities and ownership staff felt. They suggested the middle and upper management that participated in the project decisions received more satisfaction than those that had less input on the project planning and choices. For those staff members (mentioned earlier) that had negative attitudes, the focus group implied nothing would have changed the outcome of their attitudes. The negative attitudes were ineffective, inefficient and unsatisfactory to the entire staff and project as a whole, and not reflective nor related to the project or planning strategy.

Within this segment of topics, the group spoke of the satisfaction of accomplishment and stated ‘it’s not about money or promotions, it’s about job satisfaction’. After a few moments of lively discussion regarding the negative attitude of staff members, one participant stated ‘satisfaction provides for the long term efficiencies’. This was an indication that attitude, satisfaction and preparation all played a role in the project implementation’s success.

When asked for concluding comments, the discussion was open to any final statements, summations or inferences by the focus group regarding primary variables to their project planning and implementation success. The group collectively agreed that goal setting was critical, crucial and ‘ultimate failure’ if not prepared properly, as also cited by Andone (2009), Engel-Cox, Van Houten, Phelps and Rose (2008), McDavid and Hawthorn (2006), Neely,
Gregory and Platts (2005), Said, HassabElnaby and Weir (2003), Sole (2009), and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation (2004). Satisfaction played a major role in the implementation, both as a project, for teams, as well as individuals. They indicated project satisfaction was both personal and professional. They were also in agreement that negative attitudes were given too much thought, concern, and eventual power. Negative attitudes decreased the satisfaction level of the accomplishment for those affected. The group mentioned the project was not a short term goal, but a long term enhancement to NP. Lastly, the group indicated the project would not have been successful without the fully dedicated project manager. The involvement of the project manager kept the group focused, on track and motivated. Again, they referred to the project manager as the 'live model' and the project was 'given a face' for the staff to work with and with whom they related.

In summation of the analysis of the data variables, several themes and patterns emerged. First and foremost, goal identification was a key criterion in two of the three collected data points. The survey and interview indicated a strong need for a clear and concise goal. Secondly, satisfaction is relevant to project planning and implementation. Satisfaction affected the individuals, teams and project as a whole, as shown through the survey and indicated throughout the focus group interview. This was also prevalent through the field documentation and the focus group interview in reference to negative attitudes. Lastly, the need and use of the project manager maintained the logic model as a focal point, kept focus on the project and maintained satisfaction.

C. Areas of Future Research and Interest

Upon conclusion of analysis, several areas of future research became apparent. The thought and development of the logic model at point of creation may or may not be all inclusive.
The possible need to re-create a logic model post implementation or project completion is of interest. Typically when a goal is accomplished, the goal is the basis of the project and all that is considered. However, it would be of some interest and future use to create and incorporate a logic model (similarly to NP’s implementation) and, in hindsight, re-create the same logic model with the post-implementation information gained. It would be interesting to see the evolution of the logic model and how different or similar it may become. This re-creation may also benefit future uses and models with suggestions for a complete and comprehensive development of logic model; previous, present and post an implementation.

Secondly, with numerous references to satisfaction and negative attitudes, it would be worth further investigating the impact that negative attitudes have with regard to satisfaction of project implementations. With the effects of the negative attitudes within the implementation of NP, it provides a quandary to the power of negative attitudes and how they affected the satisfaction of others, affected the implementation as a whole or in some cases, would alter goal achievement.

Lastly, each area of data collection referred to leadership in some sense. In the presented field documentation, several comments recorded regarded staff members acting as leaders and those that were becoming leaders during the implementation. Leadership was crucial in the design and installation of effective performance measurement and management systems (Sole, 2009). In the survey and throughout the focus group interview, the reoccurring theme regarded the facilitation of a project manager in conjunction with the logic model. Further research is needed in this area, to relate and join the use of project managers directly with performance measurement tools or, more specifically, logic models. Much research has been done in these
individual areas of project management and performance measurement systems; however, little to no research has been presented directly correlating project management to logic models.

As shown through this case study, goal setting, satisfaction, and project management was critical to the success of NP's software implementation. In the area of performance measurement systems, several areas regarding pre and post logic model design, review and post implementation development, implications of attitudes regarding implementations, and the development of logic model project managers is in need of further research.

D. Triangulation

Several different research types are incorporated to provide the most inclusive and thorough collection of data. Incorporating both action and applied research by utilizing a case study and employing a phenomenological approach through the use of survey, interview, and participation; an attempt to facilitate numerous angles of the project was developed by design, to provide as much data possible. This type of research increased the viability of the research results.

E. Summary

This paper provided details into the investigative process for this directed project. The main facets concerned the statement of problem and significance of the problem, as well as the statement of purpose. Included in this manuscript were definitions, assumptions, limitations, and a literature review. The document concluded with the framework and methodology of the case study, research settings and research conducted, followed by the analysis. The intent of the project was to facilitate the need of the case study company and provide additional research and literature to the field of performance measurement systems and logic modeling.
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APPENDIX A

Field Documentation
Project Status Report

Client: [Redacted]
Prepared by: [Redacted]
Date Prepared: November 3, 2007
Distribution List: [Redacted]

Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Financials</th>
<th>HR/YP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live Dates</td>
<td>July 1, 2008</td>
<td>January 6, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Date Probability</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Budget</td>
<td>$446,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Actuals</td>
<td>$13,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget</td>
<td>$433,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Totals</td>
<td>$433,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accomplishments/Issues

Project Management Track

1) PLAN

A) Completion of Project Management Documents

- will use Sharepoint as a mechanism to communicate internally in addition to email, etc.

- Project Calendar – still in progress and will be incorporated into Sharepoint; plan to complete by end of Nov 2007; will use the Project Calendar in lieu of a Project High and Detail Plan

- Logs
  (a) Issues Log – ready and will be incorporated into Sharepoint
  (b) Tickets Log – ready and will be incorporated into Sharepoint
  (c) Business Process Improvements Log – ready and will be incorporated into Sharepoint

- Project Organization Chart – in draft form; being reviewed
- Project Authority Statement – in draft form; being reviewed; then will be sent to all employees
- Communications Plan – in draft form; being reviewed
Budget Plan – ready and will track [redacted] costs as well as internal costs of the project

Project Summary – reviewed suggested initial file structure to maintain documents, communications, trip reports, etc.; this file structure will be setup in Sharepoint so that everyone will have access to the information

Ontrack Training – [redacted] reviewed the Ontrack Methodology and folders with ...

Development Track

1) PLAN
   A Scope Documents
      □ ELF, Data Conversion, Interfaces – briefly discussed needs for PHASE 1 only; [redacted] will finalize these 3 lists

Functional Track

1) PLAN
   A [redacted] has completed GL100 and GL200 trainings; working on chart of accounts structure in spreadsheets at the time of this report

Technical Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE
   A [redacted] has installed [redacted] 7.7.2 in a temporary configuration which includes the use of VMWare. [redacted] has plans to change the configuration of the environment to incorporate an additional server
      □ The [redacted] software will be tested in near future by [redacted]

Training Track

1) PLAN
   A No activity at this time

Help Desk Tickets

1) None at this time (One ticket related to Firewall issue will be handled by [redacted])

Project Management Summary

Go-Live Plans

July 1, 2008 – Financials
January 6, 2009 – HR/PY

Actual Project Delays

None at this Time
Anticipated Project Delays

None at this Time

Risk Analysis

Risk #1:

The 7.9 release contains very desired Endowment module. The software release is planned for March 31, 2008. Plan to go-live on 7.9 in July 2008. The project calendar reflects various decision dates for moving forward with 7.9 or planning to go-live on 7.7.2

Morale

and are taking in all the information is sending them currently and adjusting to new terminology. This is the consultant's first visit so much of it was spent getting and giving information. Several staff wants to see the product but it won't be ready to view until basic set up for the ledgers are completed.

Assignments

1) Project Management Activities
   A. to finalize and Distribute Project Authority Statement to Employees of
   B. to finalize and Distribute Project Organization Chart
   C. to finalize Communications Plan
   D. to setup Sharepoint with (include contact info for )

      i. 800-851-4800 phone
      ii. 530-891-4816 fax
      iii. @com email

2) Development Activities
   A. to finalize ELF, Data Conversion, Interface Scope Documents with staff (Ignore Modifications Tab) PHASE I only
   B. to organize teams to begin adding to the Report Scope Documents PHASE I only

3) GL Team – Complete homework assigned by (Chart of Accounts)
4) to test software on hardware

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Cap</th>
<th>Invoiced to Date</th>
<th>% Invoiced</th>
<th>Amount Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>$368,100</td>
<td>$13,650</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$354,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>76,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$78,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$446,700</td>
<td>$13,650</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$433,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$?</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
<td>?%</td>
<td>$?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Status Report

Client: [Redacted]
Prepared by: [Redacted] Project Manager
Date Prepared: November 30, 2007
Distribution List: [Redacted] Project Manager
[Redacted] Director of Information Systems
[Redacted] Project Manager
[Redacted] Director of Consulting Services

Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Financials</th>
<th>HR/ PY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live Dates</td>
<td>July 1, 2008</td>
<td>January 6, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Date Probability*</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated Probability of occurring

- Project Budget: $553,800
- Project Actuals: $23,150
- Remaining Budget: $530,650
- Projected Total Cost: $553,800

Travel is included in the above totals

Accomplishments/Issues

Project Management Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE
   A  Met with the Project Team to discuss the project organization chart, communication methods including the use of Sharepoint, groups decided team names, etc. Two meetings were scheduled to accommodate schedules:
      - November 9th
      - November 19th
   B  Completion of Project Management Documents
      - Project Calendar – consultant visits have been scheduled; details re: some topics (e.g. interfaces, data conversion) still need to be added; [Redacted] will use the Project Calendar in lieu of a Project High and Detail Plan
      - Project Organization Chart – ready
      - Project Authority Statement – in draft form; being reviewed; then will be sent to all employees
      - Communications Plan – is ready
      - Project Summary – [Redacted] prepared a file structure on the network and in Sharepoint so that everyone will have access to the information
**Development Track**

1) **PLAN, PREPARE**
   A. **Scope Documents**
      - finalize these lists: ELF, Data Conversion, Interfaces – PHASE I only
      - staff have been reviewing the ELF formats and providing feedback to
      - scheduled Discovery Call and Development Task for ELF AP Check
        (Ticket #392580 – call 1/24/08 at 11:30am EST)
      - identified which data conversion and interface activities would be
        completed by **and**; there are a few more that need to
        be discussed with **See “PRF Scope Documents 11.30.07 pm”
        color coded for who is responsible for which conversion and interface**

**Functional Track**

1) **PLAN, PREPARE**
   A. has been working on chart of accounts structure in spreadsheets and uploading
      to **at the time of this report**
   B. learned about the offerings via **INSIDER, as well as
      how to create and follow tickets through Support Online**
   C. created the **User Ids for the attendees of the next GL Training so
      they can log in as themselves. **showed **how to create a Job Class
      to restrict certain masks (e.g. NUUPCD, NUUPUS) from most users**
   D. loaded the standard CDD Reports from the **7.7.2 Build 67 DVD in
      order to have these available for next week’s class; moved the reports into the “all
      reports” folder; assigned all of the users that she had created to the “full access” CDD
      role so they can see the reports**
   E. **and **learned how to remove modules that has not licensed
      from the menu (** provided documentation**)

**Technical Track**

1) **PLAN, PREPARE**
   A. has installed **7.7.2 in a temporary configuration which includes the use of
      VMWare. **and **RSP Team will change the production
      configuration to incorporate a new server(s) the week of December 17th**
   B. The **software was tested by** for Phase I modules (Phase 2
      modules still need to be tested)

**Training Track**

1) **PLAN, PREPARE**
   A. **and **discussed who would be trained in Budgets, AP, AR, CR, FA, BK, and JE within the Foundation. Most of the activities are done
      centrally within Accounting. **and **will discuss with **whether
      any of the functions will be: decentralized prior to go-live July 2008 OR decentralized
      after July 2008 OR remain centralized. The results of those discussions will
      determine if we need to add days/weeks of End User Training for Phase 1 (Phase 2
      still needs to be discussed)
Help Desk Tickets

1) None at this time that are outstanding

Project Management Summary

Go-Live Plans

July 1, 2008 – Financials
January 6, 2009 – HR/PY

Actual Project Delays

None at this Time

Anticipated Project Delays

None at this Time

Risk Analysis

Risk #1:

7.9 release contains the desired Endowment module. The software release is planned for March 31, 2008. Plans at this point to go-live on 7.9 in July 2008. The project calendar reflects various decision dates for moving forward with 7.9 or planning to go-live on 7.7.2

Risk #2:

Consultant knowledge of the new Endowment Module as well as business process(es); the Consultant's ability to provide guidance to structure's Chart of Accounts to accommodate the new module.

Morale

Many technical things were reviewed during this visit. Main participants seemed comfortable and a little overwhelmed. Staff seem a little nervous when asked to provide information because they don't know how it will be used. 's presence also increases nervousness and staff wants to talk with her about directives.

Assignments

1. Project Management Activities
   A Finalize the following and send to and
     - Project Org Chart (this is final – just need to send)
     - Project Authority Statement (also provide to employees)
     - Communication Plan

2. Functional Activities
   B GL Visit #3 with
☐ Update GL Configuration Decisions
☐ Update the Agenda Template with initials and dates of completed objectives
☐ Review Scope Document
   (a) Interfaces
   (b) Data Conversion for GL Trust YTD Transactions

C ✅ will download ✅ documentation from ✅ Insider to a network Drive for Version 7.7.0

D Prior to the Discovery call on January 24th regarding the AP Check:
   (i) Select the AP Check (decide if the check you select will have modifications)
   (ii) Decide on AP Check stock and order (get samples to test with of actual stock)
   (iii) Decide if an envelop will be uses (definitely needed if not using pressure seal checks; may want one for inserts for pressure sealed checks)
   (iv) Send a couple of samples of the check stock AND envelopes to ✅ to give to developer

3. Technical Activities
   E ✅ to verify printing portrait and landscape is functional after hardware move week of December 17th (verify landscape and portrait using GLREFLPT - Fund)

4. Development Activities
   F Prepare the Report Scope Binder for Phase 1 by listing needed reports; prioritize (High, Med, Low)
   G Obtain Bank Record File Layout for Checks, Deposits, Fees, etc
   H ✅ and ✅ will work on preparing the Vendor files for upload and prepare data conversion specs for the AP and BK transactions in December

5. Training Activities
   I ✅ to meet with ✅ to determine training needs for Phase 1 and discuss results with ✅ the week of Jan 22, 2008

6. ✅ to setup Phase 1 Development Tasks for:
   - Data Conversion (identified so far) – schedule Discovery Calls for week of January 26th
     • Outstanding Checks
     • Accounts Payables – Jan – Jun (6 months) for 1099s
   - Interfaces (identified so far) – Schedule Discovery Call for first week in February
     • ✅ Advance System (#5 in Interface Scope Doc)
     • IPP (#7 in Interface Scope Doc)
     • Prosystem Extract (#11 in Interface Scope Doc)

7. ✅ to setup RSP Tasks for creating a 7.9.0 Test Account the week of March 31, 2008

8. ✅ to test Phase 2

9. ✅ will help fix double space problem with tall sheets during next visit

---

**Budget Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Cap</th>
<th>Invoiced to Date</th>
<th>% Invoiced</th>
<th>Amount Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>$ 368,100</td>
<td>$ 19,350</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$ 348,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>78,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>78,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$ 446,700</td>
<td>$ 19,350</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$ 427,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel</th>
<th>$107,100</th>
<th>$3,800</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>$103,300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(63 onsite visits; 59 scheduled at time of report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$553,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,150</strong></td>
<td><strong>4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$530,650</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Status Report

Client: [blank]
Prepared by: [blank] Project Manager
Date Prepared: December 28, 2007
Distribution List: [blank] Project Manager
                      [blank] Director of Information Systems
                      [blank] Project Manager
                      [blank] Director of Consulting Services

Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Financials</th>
<th>HR/PY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live Dates</td>
<td>July 1, 2008</td>
<td>January 6, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Date Probability*</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated Probability of occurring

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Budget</td>
<td>$ 553,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Actuals</td>
<td>$ 35,850.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget</td>
<td>$ 517,949.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Total Cost</td>
<td>$ 553,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel is included in the above totals

Accomplishments/Issues

Project Management Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE
   A Completion of Project Management Documents
      □ Project Calendar – consultant visits have been scheduled; details re: some topics (e.g. interfaces, data conversion) still need to be added; [ ] will use the Project Calendar in lieu of a Project High and Detail Plan
      □ Project Organization Chart – ready
      □ Project Authority Statement – ready
      □ Change Management Plan – ready
      □ [ ] continues to update SharePoint so that the team is kept informed
   B Training Room – [ ] has training room and conference room ready for the project training in January -- GREAT JOB!!
Development Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE
   A Scope Documents
   - finalized these lists: ELF, Data Conversion, Interfaces – PHASE I only
   - staff have been reviewing the ELF formats and providing feedback to
   B successfully uploaded the Vendor file December 27, 2007
   C and reviewed the upload specs for AP (1099) and BK transactions;
   is writing the programs to convert this data in order to save money so
   can write some interfaces

Functional Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE
   A [redacted] has completed the chart of accounts structure and uploaded to [redacted] there are
      5 GLs and 3 Jls – EXCELLENT WORK!!!

Technical Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE
   A [redacted] and [redacted]’s RSP Team installed the production
      configuration with new server(s) the week of December 17th
   B [redacted] verified printing portrait and landscape is functional after hardware move
      week of December 17th

Training Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE
   A [redacted], [redacted], [redacted] and [redacted] discussed who would be trained in Budgets,
      AP, AR, CR, FA, BK, and JE within the Foundation. Most of the activities are done
      centrally within Accounting. [redacted] will discuss with [redacted] whether
      any of the functions will be: decentralized prior to go-live July 2008 OR decentralized
      after July 2008 OR remain centralized. The results of those discussions will
      determine if we need to add days/weeks of End User Training for Phase 1 (Phase 2
      still needs to be discussed)

Help Desk Tickets

1) None at this time that are outstanding

Project Management Summary

Go-Live Plans

July 1, 2008 – Financials
January 6, 2009 – HR/PRY
Actual Project Delays

None at this Time

Anticipated Project Delays

None at this Time

Risk Analysis

Risk #1:

The 7.9 release contains the desired Endowment module. The software release is planned for March 31, 2008. Plans are at this point to go-live on 7.9 in July 2008. The project calendar reflects various decision dates for moving forward with 7.9 or planning to go-live on 7.7.2.

Risk #2:

Consultant knowledge of the new Endowment Module as well as business process(es); the Consultant's ability to provide guidance to structure's Chart of Accounts to accommodate the new module.

Morale

Since last visit, many things were accomplished by[redacted], mostly[redacted], [redacted], [redacted] and [redacted]. They are feeling tired but happy with their accomplishments. Due to the holidays, several people have been taking time off but have maintained their work load as well as extra projects for [redacted]. It's starting to take shape! Staff still has questions and everyone wants to know what decisions are being made and how that affects them. Once decisions are made, they are shared but some decisions can't be made until a later date. It's hard to express that to the group and maintain their confidence and enthusiasm toward the project.

Assignments

1. Project Management Activities
   - Update Issue Log and sent to [redacted] and [redacted]

2. Functional Activities
   - B: [redacted] will download [redacted] documentation from [redacted] Insider to a network Drive for Version 7.7.0
   - C: Prior to the Discovery call on January 24th regarding the AP Check:
     (i) Select the AP Check (decide if the check you select will have modifications)
     (ii) Decide on AP Check stock and order (get samples to test with of actual stock)
     (iii) Decide if an envelope will be used (definitely needed if not using pressure seal checks; may want one for inserts for pressure sealed checks)
     (iv) Send a couple of samples of the check stock AND envelopes to [redacted] to give to developer

3. Technical Activities
   - D: [redacted] to provide ASAP to [redacted], [redacted], or [redacted] connection information to the new production server; [redacted] is not able to connect at this time
4. Development Activities
   E  Prepare the Report Scope Binder for Phase 1 by listing needed reports; prioritize (High, Med, Low)
   F  [Redacted] currently receives cancelled checks in a file from JP Morgan – determine prior to January 21, 2008 if PRF will pay to obtain deposit, fees, wires, etc in file from JP Morgan
5. Training Activities
   G [redacted] [redacted] to meet with [redacted] to determine training needs for Phase 1 and discuss results with [redacted] the week of Jan 22, 2008

6. [redacted] to Void Phase 1 Development Tasks and cancel discovery calls for ([redacted] will do these):
   - Ticket # 392916 Outstanding Checks
   - Ticket # 392911 Accounts Payables – Jan – Jun (6 months) for 1099s

7. [redacted] to have Development load the BAI format for Bank Reconciliation after [redacted] determines if they will load only checks or all bank transactions ([redacted] uses JP Morgan for banking)

8. [redacted] to test Phase 2

9. [redacted] will help fix double space problem with tail sheets during next visit

10. [redacted] to help determine where the YTD Trust Activity will be loaded (if the Endowment Module is implemented on July 1st or later)

11. [redacted] to request latest 7.7.2 build prior to January 11, 2008

12. [redacted] to load the latest 7.7.2 build prior to January 18, 2008 ([redacted] will let you know if the build must be applied to PCs running PC Tools – CDD, WF, etc)

13. [redacted] to get from [redacted] prior to January 15, 2008
   A. Update GL Configuration Decisions
   B. Update the Agenda Template with initials and dates of completed objectives
   C. Trip Report

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Cap</th>
<th>Invoiced to Date</th>
<th>% Invoiced</th>
<th>Amount Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>$368,100.00</td>
<td>$29,550.00</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$338,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>78,600.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>78,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$446,700.00</td>
<td>$29,550.00</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$417,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (65 onsite visits; 59 scheduled at time of report)</td>
<td>$107,100.00</td>
<td>$6,300.31</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$100,799.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$553,800.00</td>
<td>$35,850.31</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$517,949.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Status Report

Client: 
Prepared by: Project Manager
Date Prepared: January 31, 2008
Distribution List: Project Manager
Director of Information Systems
Project Manager
Director of Consulting Services

Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Financials</th>
<th>HR/PY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live Dates</td>
<td>July 1, 2008</td>
<td>January 6, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Date Probability*</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated Probability of occurring

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Budget</td>
<td>$ 553,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Actual</td>
<td>$ 42,590.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget</td>
<td>$ 511,209.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Total Cost</td>
<td>$ 553,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel is included in the above totals

Accomplishments/Issues

Project Management Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE
   A Completion of Project Management Documents
      □ Project Calendar – continues to be modified as needed
      □ continues to update SharePoint so that the team is kept informed

Development Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE
   A ELF AP Check Ticket #392580 - during the Core Financial Visit #1 it was discovered that 8 AP check formats would be needed. All eight checks would be the exact same layout with different logos A separate spreadsheet was created to track bank account#, bank fractional number, ELF code, Signers, etc. The AP Check Discovery Call with [redacted] was completed on January 24, 2008. [redacted] submitted a signed bid for the ELF Development on January 30, 2008. The AP Check will be developed first and tested prior to the other formats being created.
B Interfaces – the core team reviewed the interfaces for Phase I (11 interfaces in total) to determine which interfaces would be completed by (8 interfaces) and (3 interfaces). The 3 interfaces that would like to create are (there are no funds in the contract for these 3 interfaces):

(a) Ticket #392928: IPP Interface - Preliminary specs were created for the Discovery call scheduled for February 4, 2008. This interface will require specific posting strategies.

(b) Ticket #392927: Advance – a standard interface has been developed between Advance and for 7.7.2 and 7.9 versions. requires a SAP 36 character field (account number) that needs to receive and report back information to the university. will contact regarding the standard interface. has received email communication regarding the need for the 36 character field.

(c) Ticket #392930: Pro System Extract – is not needed for go live. CCH is tax software that prepares’s K-1s and form 5227 and 1041As. This is needed for ’s trusts calendar year reporting, and will need to print these in February 09. is checking on alternatives. Currently, uses a text file import of data from our legacy system to CCH. is investigating with CCH what other options for importing exist. A discovery call could be scheduled for later this spring.

C Data Conversion – there are several conversion needed

- Person Entity (): program has been written by a few modifications were required to the data based on the Overview class conducted during the week of January 22, 2008. will make the decisions/changes and then re-roll the data into

- General Ledger Transactions for 6 mos of Trust History (TBD): if going live on 7.9 – these transactions will be loaded into gtl_trns_dtl (balances as of ea FY - dollars and units), emt_trns_dtl (dollars and units) plus the table which defines donor_fund_id and pool_fund_id. If goes live in July on 7.7.2 – the gtl_trns_dtl table will be populated with the 6 months of Trust history; Determine transaction types (e.g, gifts, earnings, distribution)

- General Ledger Beginning Balances (TBD):

- Job Ledger Beginning Balances (TBD):

- Accounts Payable 1099 Transactions (): programmed a file to upload into ; needs expertise/assistance with SQL Server DBA skills to get this loaded into

- Fixed Asset Tables (): Discussion of the conversion will happen after the FA training

- Bank Reconciliation Outstanding Checks (): programmed a file to upload into needs expertise/assistance with SQL Server DBA skills to get this loaded into

D Report Scope – is making progress on the list and priorities. will review the status of all CDD Reports during the week of March 11, 2008

Functional Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE
A has completed the configuration decisions (PE, AP, AR, CR, FA) with during the week of January 22, 2008

B Workflow - has prepared current flowcharts of their processes. We discussed the Accounts Payable Approval process. This is the only workflow model that is planning to go live with in July 2008. Approval points are:
- AP Clerk <$1,000
- Staff/Sr Accountants >=$1,000 and <$5,000
- Directors >=$5,000 and <$100,000
- Senior VP >=$100,000 and <$500,000
- Board >=$500,000

C - would like to go-live with this entity on June 1, 2008 because its Fiscal Year is June 1 – May 31. There are very few transactions for the entity in a month (e.g. one or two transactions)

Technical Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE
   A Ticket #392586 – RSP to load 7.9 in Test Environment first week of April 2008

Training Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE
   A , , and discussed who would be trained in Budgets, AP, AR, CR, FA, BK, and JE within the Foundation. Most of the activities are done centrally within Accounting. and will discuss with whether any of the functions will be: decentralized prior to go-live July 2008 OR decentralized after July 2008 OR remain centralized. The results of those discussions will determine if we need to add days/weeks of End User Training for Phase 1 (Phase 2 still needs to be discussed)

Help Desk Tickets

1) None at this time that are outstanding

Project Management Summary

Go-Live Plans

    July 1, 2008 – Financials
    January 6, 2009 – HR/PY

Actual Project Delays

None at this Time

Anticipated Project Delays

None at this Time
Risk Analysis

Risk #1:

[redacted] 7.9 release contains the desired Endowment module. The software release is planned for March 31, 2008. [redacted] plans at this point to go-live on 7.9 in July 2008. The project calendar reflects various decision dates for moving forward with 7.9 or planning to go-live on 7.7.2

Risk #2:

[redacted] Consultant knowledge of the new Endowment Module as well as business process(es); the Consultant's ability to provide guidance to structure [redacted] s Chart of Accounts to accommodate the new module.

Morale

As we start the new year, activities are increasing. This is both exciting and overwhelming for the staff. It seems that the 'unknowns' that are part of a project like this are wearing on people, mostly the day-to-day task ( [redacted] ). They are unsettled about not knowing what they will be doing and how they will be doing it. The committee ( [redacted] ) are making decisions about final set up and ledger design. The [redacted] want to have a say in what happens as well, however, it's been decided that they don't fully understand the entire financial design of [redacted] and would only make limited comments based on their entry level skills. At this point, they are being asked to be patient.

Assignments

1. Project Management Activities
   A [redacted] - Update Issue Log and sent to [redacted] and [redacted]

2. Functional Activities
   B General Ledger
   - [redacted] - IPP Interface will require specific posting strategies.
   - [redacted] - Should the two checking accounts for [redacted] be pooled accounts similar to the general fund or just regular checking accounts used by several keys.
   - [redacted] - Review listing of types of JEs that are created
   - [redacted] - Are the posting strategies setup to handle discounts

   C Other
   - [redacted] - For [redacted] would like to go-live with this entity on June 1, 2008 because its Fiscal Year is June 1 – May 31.

3. Technical Activities
   D RSP to create Test Environment for 7.9 load during 1st week of April

4. Development Activities
   E Prepare the Report Scope Binder for Phase 1 by listing needed reports; prioritize (High, Med, Low)
F. Currently receives cancelled checks in a file from JP Morgan — determine prior to January 21, 2008 if will pay to obtain deposit, fees, wires, etc in file from JP Morgan
G. to create 8 interface file formats required for go-live

5. Training Activities
   H. to meet with to determine training needs for Phase 1 and discuss results with the week of Jan 22, 2008

6. to have Development load the BAI format for Bank Reconciliation after determines if they will load only

7. will help fix double space problem with tail sheets during next visit if still an issue

8. Activities for Trip during week of March 11, 2008
    B. Review status of IPP Interface
    C. Review status/assist with testing 8 interfaces being created by
    D. Review the status of all CDD Reports during the week of March 11, 2008
    E. Discuss status of Data Conversions
    F. Check on status of 7.9 Test Environment
    G. Create Workflow Test Plan for models that have been created
    H. Test Workflow Test Plan

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Cap</th>
<th>Invoiced to Date</th>
<th>% Invoiced</th>
<th>Amount Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>$368,100.00</td>
<td>$34,800.00</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$333,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>78,600.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>78,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$446,700.00</td>
<td>$34,800.00</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$411,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$107,100.00</td>
<td>$7,790.14</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$99,309.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63 onsite visits; 59 scheduled at time of report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$553,800.00</td>
<td>$42,590.14</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$511,209.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Status Report

Client: [Redacted]
Prepared by: [Redacted] Project Manager
Date Prepared: March 14, 2008
Distribution List: [Redacted] Project Manager
[Redacted] Director of Information Systems
[Redacted] Project Manager
[Redacted] Director of Consulting Services

Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financials</th>
<th>HR/PY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live Dates</td>
<td>July 1, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Date Probability*</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated Probability of occurring

Travel is included in the above Totals

Accomplishments/Issues

Project Management Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE
   A Completion of Project Management Documents
   □ Project Calendar – continues to be modified as needed
   □ continues to update SharePoint so that the team is kept informed

Development Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE
   A ELF AP Check Ticket #392580 – [Redacted] has begun development work on this in February 2008. The work continues – developing and testing.

   B Interfaces – the core team reviewed the interfaces for Phase I (11 interfaces in total) to determine which interfaces would be completed by [Redacted] (8 interfaces) and [Redacted] (3 interfaces). The 3 interfaces that [Redacted] would like to create are (there are no funds in the contract for these 3 interfaces):
(a) Ticket #392928: IPP Interface – Bid was signed by [redacted] on February 19, 2008. Work on this interface began on March 11, 2008. This interface will require specific posting strategies.

(b) Ticket #392927: [redacted] Advance – a standard interface has been developed between Advance and [redacted] for 7.7.2 and 7.9 versions. [redacted] requires a SAP 36 character field (account number) that [redacted] needs to receive and report back information to the university. [redacted] provided an addendum on March 4, 2008 for the standard Advance Interface.

(c) Ticket #392930: Pro System Extract – is not needed for go live and is on hold at this time. A discovery call could be scheduled for later this spring.

(d) 9 Interfaces will be developed by [redacted]:

i. 5 – JE Interfaces (interim payroll [redacted], GL, [redacted]; Monthly Rewrite to [redacted]; Chase Credit Cards, Mellon Custodial Reconciliation, Chase ACH file for Trust)

ii. 1 – CR Interface (PEP)

iii. 1 – AR and CR Interface [redacted]

iv. 1 – CDD Report [redacted]; Monthly Rewrite to [redacted] – part of Advance data

v. Bank Reconciliation – plan to use common codes to read this file if possible – otherwise will need to have [redacted] write the interface; still waiting for bank information to know and proceed

C Data Conversion – there are several conversion needed

- Person Entity [redacted]: conversion and clean up has been completed. Any new entries for the legacy system will be also updated in [redacted].

- General Ledger Transactions for 6 mos of Trust History (TBD): if going live on 7.9 – these transactions will be loaded into gtl_trns_dtl (balances as of ea FY - dollars and units), emt_trns_dtl (dollars and units) plus the table which defines donor_fund_id and pool_fund_id. If [redacted] goes live in July on 7.7.2 – the gtl_trns_dtl table will be populated with the 6 months of Trust history; Determine transaction types (e.g. gifts, earnings, distribution); work has not started for this version as of this report.

- General Ledger Beginning Balances (TBD):

- Job Ledger Beginning Balances (TBD):

- Accounts Payable 1099 Transactions (PRF): [redacted] programmed a file to upload into [redacted] needs expertise/assistance with SQL Server DBA skills to get this loaded into [redacted]; if [redacted] cannot load this file – it will need to become a Development task

- Fixed Asset Tables [redacted]: Discussion of the conversion will happen after the FA training

- Bank Reconciliation Outstanding Checks [redacted]: [redacted] programmed a file to upload into [redacted] needs expertise/assistance with SQL Server DBA skills to get this loaded into [redacted]; if [redacted] cannot load this file – it will need to become a Development task

D Report Scope – [redacted] is making great progress on the list and priorities. [redacted] will begin development work on this list the week of March 18, 2008.
Functional Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE – Phase I
   A has completed Beginning and Advanced CDD Training during the weeks of February 5th and February 26th respectively.
2) PLAN, PREPARE – Phase II
   A replaced as the on-site HR/PY Consultant.
   B completed most of the configuration decisions for HR and Payroll with on February 12 an 13, 2008
   C conducted distance learning sessions - one per day during the week of February 25th, 3 session during the week of March 3rd.

Technical Track

1) PLAN, EXECUTE, PREPARE
   A Ticket # 397896 – Load 7.7.2 Build 102 on Production
   B Ticket #392586 – RSP to create a 7.7.2 Test Environment (this should also be Build 102)
   C Ticket #401765 - RSP to load 7.9 in Test Environment (app/database server) first/second week of April 2008
   D Ticket #401766 - RSP to load 7.9 in Test Environment (web server) first/second week of April 2008
   E Ticket #402368 - RSP to upgrade Production Environment (app/database server) to 7.9.0 third/fourth week of April 2008
   F Ticket #402367 - RSP to upgrade Production Environment (web server) to 7.9.0 third/fourth week of April 2008

Training Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE
   A discussed who would be trained in Budgets, AP, AR, CR, FA, BK, and JE within the Foundation. Most of the activities are done centrally within Accounting. and will discuss with whether any of the functions will be: decentralized prior to go-live July 2008 OR decentralized after July 2008 OR remain centralized. The results of those discussions will determine if we need to add days/weeks of End User Training for Phase 1 (Phase 2 still needs to be discussed)

Help Desk Tickets

402418 – Closed to Task: When you run the GLUTRIJ process and would like the Set ID of the JE batch to be assigned by the system, you use the word ‘SYSTEM’ in the batch ID column in the interface file. Currently the system is not looking at the batch ID column in the interface file. The system asks the question "Please enter the name of the JE Set" which requires the response. The name given as the JE Set ID in response to this question overwrites the batch ID name used in the batch ID column in the interface file.

402399 – Open: BSI login should default to sbl/app/data instead of sbl/admin/data - When executing GLUTRIJ the system is looking for my file in admin/data instead of app/data – see attached example that you can try to see this. Production 7.7.2 Build 93 – SQL Server;
Status: Since the Telnet Tab for their IFAS connection uses the BSI user as the telnet user, the DATA directory will always be set the same for the BSI user and ADMIN users in Insight. The BSI user will be used to setup the telnet session no matter what user is logging in to Insight, so the BSI user's MPE_HOME will be set for any user logging in through IFAS. Let me know if that makes sense. We can either have the MPE_HOME set to /sbl/app or /sbl/admin.
Project Management Summary

Go-Live Plans

July 1, 2008 – Financials
January 6, 2009 – HR PY

Actual Project Delays

None at this Time

Anticipated Project Delays

None at this Time

Risk Analysis

Risk #1:

7.9 release contains the desired Endowment module. The software release is planned for
March 31, 2008. Plans at this point to go-live on 7.9 in July 2008. The project calendar
reflects various decision dates for moving forward with 7.9 or planning to go-live on 7.7.2

Risk #2:

Consultant knowledge of the new Endowment Module as well as business
process(es); the Consultant's ability to provide guidance to structure
’s Chart of Accounts to accommodate the new module.

Morale

Work is ramping up and some are complaining about not being able to keep up with current work,
training and extra duties re: IFAS. There is talk of OT or mandatory Saturday work to keep
everyone's head above water. The mandatory Saturday talk is making several people
very unhappy and causing a stir. It is tabled for now and the talk of Saturdays alone
has helped others prioritize and get the work done.

There is some dissention re: who knows what and has access to information. Without creating too
much confusion, only certain team captains are asked to contribute to final decisions (mostly in
processing, skill & task levels) and that is making other captains and staff feel left out and
unimportant. The committee agrees everyone has an opinion but only several really apply to the
decisions at hand. Staff is the group that is going through design, processes and training first –
due to the high priority of bill payments. This is making the staff feel left out.

Many people are uncomfortable with our current status and don’t think we can have all items needed
(on this report) in place by GO LIVE. This is starting to wear and worry the committee. We’ve been
told by and we are on track and some items just don’t happen until closer to the end.
As the system 7.9 is new, there are also some bugs we are working on that cause frustration for us.
The staff is VERY frustrated with this. As some are just getting into the system for the first time and
system errors occur that confuses them and upsets them. These errors also cause delays and
wastes time. We are going to push through but if anything catastrophic happens, we will have to face
the possibility of pushing the GO LIVE date back.

We did our ‘motivating’ luncheon and watched 9 to 5 this month to lighten the mood and give
everyone a break. Some people really enjoyed and appreciated it while others didn’t want to ‘waste’
their lunch hours sitting through the movie – ‘there were at work enough’. There are some people
that are handling the project well and becoming leaders (______) – helping others out
with the training of the software as well as positive attitudes. The committee is buried and has limited
time to interact with all staff.

Assignments

1. Project Management Activities:  - Update Issue Log and sent to __ and ____ weekly

   NOTE: All other assignments are now in the Issue Log for this project

2. Activities Planned for ____’s visit during the week of April 21 – 25, 2008
   - Discuss Dashboard layout for Project
   - Discuss Security groupings; assist with 7.9.0 security setup
   - Discuss CDD Folder Layout for Project; assist with 7.9.0 setup
   - Assist with 7.9.0 default settings for AP, AR, CR
   - Help test 7.9.0 PE, AP, AR, CR
   - Determine in Bank file can use common codes for this interface or will this need to be a
     custom interface
   - Review status of all interfaces
   - Review status of all data conversions
   - If time permits - Create Workflow Test Plan for models that have been created
   - If time permits - Test Workflow Test Plan
   - If time permits - HR and Payroll checks

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Cap</th>
<th>Invoiced to Date</th>
<th>% Invoiced</th>
<th>Amount Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>$368,100.00</td>
<td>$48,861.00</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$319,239.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>78,600.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>75,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$446,700.00</td>
<td>$51,861.00</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>$394,839.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (63 onsite visits; 59 scheduled at time of report)</td>
<td>$107,100.00</td>
<td>$13,516.73</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$93,583.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$553,800.00</td>
<td>$65,377.73</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>$488,422.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary includes all invoices sent to the ___ through 03/14/08
Project Status Report

Client: Project Manager
Prepared by: Project Manager
Date Prepared: April 25, 2008
Distribution List: Project Manager, Director of Information Systems, Project Manager

Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Financials</th>
<th>HR/PY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live Dates</td>
<td>July 1, 2008</td>
<td>January 6, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Date Probability*</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated Probability of occurring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$553,800.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Actual</td>
<td>$103,974.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget</td>
<td>$449,825.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Total Cost</td>
<td>$553,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel is included in the above Totals

Accomplishments/Issues

Project Management Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE
   A Completion of Project Management Documents
     □ Project Calendar – continues to be modified as needed
     □ continues to update SharePoint so that the team is kept informed

Development Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE
   A ELF AP Check Ticket #392580 – has begun development work on this in February 2008. The work continues – testing with Bank using 7.9 and new printer.

   B Interfaces – the core team reviewed the interfaces for Phase I (11 interfaces in total) to determine which interfaces would be completed by (8 interfaces) and (3 interfaces). The 3 interfaces that would like to create are (there are no funds in the contract for these 3 interfaces):
      (a) Ticket #392928: IPP Interface – Bid was signed by on February 19, 2008. Work on this interface began on March 11, 2008. This interface will require specific posting strategies.
(b) Ticket #392927: **Advance** – a standard interface has been developed between Advance and [redacted] for 7.7.2 and 7.9 versions. [redacted] requires a SAP 36 character field (account number) that [redacted] needs to receive and report back to [redacted] University. [redacted] provided an addendum on March 4, 2008 for the standard Advance interface. As of April 25, 2008, [redacted] does not plan to use this standard Advance interface. Data will be uploaded into [redacted] and data will be exported via a CDD Report to provide information to various organizations within the campus. This ticket can be voided as it is no longer needed.

(c) Ticket #392930: **Pro System Extract** – is not needed for go live and is on hold at this time. A [redacted] discovery call could be scheduled for later this spring.

(d) 8 Interfaces will be developed by [redacted]:
   i. 5 – JE Interfaces (interim payroll GL, Monthly Rewrite to Chase Credit Cards, Mellon Custodial Reconciliation, Chase ACH file for Trust)
   ii. 1 – CR Interface (PEP)
   iii. 1 – AR and CR Interface (Interim)
   iv. 1 – CDD Report (Monthly Rewrite to part of Advance data)

(e) Ticket #406840: **Bank Reconciliation** – [redacted] created a ticket to load the standard BAI2 format in Production and Test on April 23, 2008. [redacted] proved the bank reconciliation information on April 14, 2008.

C) **Data Conversion** – there are several conversion needed
- **Person Entity** – conversion and clean up has been completed. Any new entries for the legacy system will be also updated in [redacted].
- **General Ledger Transactions for 6 mos of Trust History (TBD):** Endowment module will be released in June 2008. There was discussion during this week related to using the endowment module even though it is still in beta for go-live July 1, 2008. [redacted] will discuss this with [redacted].
- **General Ledger Beginning Balances** – This is scheduled to be done in the near future.
- **Job Ledger Beginning Balances** – This is scheduled to be done in the near future.
- **Accounts Payable 1099 Transactions** – [redacted] programmed a file to upload into; [redacted] needs expertise/assistance with SQL Server DBA skills to get this loaded into [redacted]. If [redacted] cannot load this file – it will need to become a development task.
- **Fixed Asset Tables** – Discussion of the conversion will happen after the FA training.
- **Bank Reconciliation Outstanding Checks** – [redacted] wrote a program to upload outstanding checks into [redacted]; [redacted] loaded the data into 7.7.2. After a quick review of the data – there are a couple more changes needed (e.g. some records have dollars in the master record but zero dollars in the child record, will add a reference). [redacted] will compare the 7.7.2 vs 7.9.0 table structure for bk_document_mstr and bk_document_dtl and determine if there were any changes made in 7.9.0. The goal is now to upload the data to 7.9.0.
D Report Scope - has made great progress on the list and priorities. has been developing reports since the week of March 18, 2008. Reports that are ready to test by have not been verified as of this report. will have staff verify each report to make certain the data is correct.

Functional Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE - Phase I
   A completed configuration decisions and reviewed PE, AP, AR, CR with during the week of March 18 – 21, 2008
   B worked on CDD Development and Workflow overview during the weeks of March 18 – 21, 2008 and April 8 – 11, 2008
   C visit for April 22 – 25, 2008 was rescheduled for May 5 – 7, 2008 due to personal emergency
   D reviewed 7.9.0 PE, AP, AR, CR modules with core staff during the week of April 22 – 25, 2008; also finalized a flowchart of the AP Workflow Model

2) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE - Phase II
   A reviewed HR/PY setup with core staff based on agenda during the week of April 1 – 4, 2008
   B setup 7.9.0 Timecard Online during a DL on April 25, 2008

Technical Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE
   A Done - Ticket # 397696 – Load 7.7.2 Build 102 on Production
   B Done - Ticket #392586 – RSP to create a 7.7.2 Test Environment (this should also be Build 102)
   C Done - Ticket #401765 - RSP to load 7.9 in Test Environment (app/database server) first/second week of April 2008
   D Done - Ticket #401766 - RSP to load 7.9 in Test Environment (web server) first/second week of April 2008
   E Ticket #402368 - RSP to upgrade Production Environment (app/database server) to 7.9.0 beginning May 9, 2008
   F Ticket #402367 - RSP to upgrade Production Environment (web server) to 7.9.0 beginning May 9, 2008

Training Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE
   A is in the process of creating End User Documentation for the Accounting staff.
   B Training materials will be needed for the additional users that will be trained before and after go-live

Help Desk Tickets

407404 – Open:
   - APOHPPPA - 7.9.0 web will only allow me to print checks from "GL" ledger and not for other general Ledgers
   - 7.9.0 web will NOT allow me to print checks for any records that have GL/JL combo even if I try to set preferences prior to printing
   - I am only able to print checks via Insight by editing options changing ledgers and then print GL/JL checks.

406793 – Open:
   - BKUPRP- I created check no 00000011.....see page 1 for entry into BKUPCD
   - Reprinted check 00000011 (see page 6 for all criteria)
Project Management Summary

Go-Live Plans

July 1, 2008 – Financials

NOTE: is attempting to implement Endowments by July 1, 2008; and will be discussing this during the week of April 28, 2008

January 6, 2009 – HR/PY

Actual Project Delays

None at this Time

Anticipated Project Delays

None at this Time

Risk Analysis

Risk #1:

7.9 release contains the desired Endowment module. The software release for this module is planned for June 2008 in 7.9.1. plans at this point to go-live on 7.9.0 in July 2008. May 9, 2008 is the decision day moving forward with 7.9 or planning to go-live on 7.7.2

Risk #2:

Consultant knowledge of the new Endowment Module as well as business process(es); the Consultant's ability to provide guidance to structure's Chart of Accounts to accommodate the new module.

Morale

There are many things that are outstanding as we head into the final two months prior to GO LIVE. The pressure is on and building – some are handling it (most of committee, & ) and some are not ( ). The mandatory Saturdays really upset and refused to come to two Saturdays. This is causing major
unrest within the accounting department, defiance and even some disciplinary issues. It is trying to understand and take into consideration’s attitude, but also has mountains of work on his plate and this is one more thing to deal with. is especially frustrating to the committee because he should be, not instigating trouble. Now that all groups/staff have their own AP/AR/GL information, they are beginning on training and input. They also realize we are ‘behind’ or at least it seems that way and struggle with feeling we’re going to succeed. Technically we’re on track but it does feel as though we’re behind and won’t make the deadline.

Committee wise: we are good but overwhelmed; but getting used to the pace. We’ve received great feedback and accolades from regarding our progress and smooth planning/training/progress so far AND we’re way ahead of budget. We were able to do a lot in house with our internal IT expertise, so we’re able to save quite a bit on our budget. If all goes accordingly, we’ll be about $100K - $200K UNDER budget at the end of PHASE II.

Assignments

1. Project Management Activities: Update Issue Log and sent to and weekly

   NOTE: All other assignments are now in the Issue Log for this project

2. Activities Planned for’s visit during the week of May 27 – 30, 2008
   - Discuss Cutover Plan
   - Discuss End User Training (scope, readiness)
   - Review Dashboard layout
   - Discuss Security groupings; assist with 7.9.0 security setup
   - Review CDD Folder Layout
   - Bank Reconciliation
   - Review status of all interfaces
   - Review status of all data conversions
   - Discuss Payroll Checks/Direct Deposit formats and submit requests to Development
   - Review Training Plans, Documentation for Phase I

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Cap</th>
<th>Invoiced to Date</th>
<th>% Invoiced</th>
<th>Amount Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>$358,100.00</td>
<td>$76,311.00</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>$291,789.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>78,500.00</td>
<td>7,275.00</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>71,325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$446,600.00</td>
<td>$83,586.00</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>$363,114.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (63 onsite visits; 59 scheduled at time of report)</td>
<td>$107,100.00</td>
<td>$20,388.41</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>$86,711.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$553,800.00</td>
<td>$103,974.41</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>$449,825.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary includes all invoices sent to the through 04/25/08.
Project Status Report

Client: [redacted]
Prepared by: [redacted] Project Manager
Date Prepared: May 30, 2008
Distribution List: [redacted] Project Manager
[redacted] Director of Information Systems
[redacted] Project Manager

Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financials</th>
<th>HR/PY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live Dates</td>
<td>July 1, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Date Probability</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 6, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>$553,800.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Actual</td>
<td>$132,314.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget</td>
<td>$421,485.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Total Cost</td>
<td>$553,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel is included in the above Totals

Accomplishments/Issues

Project Management Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE – Phase 1 and 2
   A Completion of Project Management Documents
      □ Project Calendar – continues to be modified as needed
      □ [redacted] continues to update SharePoint so that the team is kept informed

Development Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE, CONFIRM – Phase 1
   A ELF AP Check Ticket #392580 – [redacted] is fine-tuning the micr testing with the Bank.
      The Bank has passed the reading of the Micr line for all checks, but at times there
      are exceptions for the 8 AP check formats. [redacted] continues to adjust printer
      parameters to produce better bank results.
   
       B Interfaces – the status of interfaces:
            (a) Ticket #392928: IPP Interface – The interface has been tested
                several times. [redacted] has additional tests that need to be complete.
            (b) Ticket #392927: [redacted] Advance – This ticket was voided as it is
                no longer needed at this time.
(c) **Ticket #392930: Pro System Extract** – This ticket was voided as it is no longer needed at this time.

(d) **8 Interfaces** (developed by ) have been created, documented and are being tested for go-live:
   1. 5 – JE Interfaces (interim payroll IFAS GL,  
      - Monthly Rewrite to Chase Credit Cards, Mellon Custodial Reconciliation, Chase ACH file for Trust 
   2. 1 – CR Interface (PEP)  
   3. 1 – AR and CR Interface  
   4. 1 – CDD Report  
     - Monthly Rewrite to  
     - part of Advance data  

(e) **Ticket #406840: Bank Reconciliation** – loaded the BAI2 format to test and determine if JP Morgan's file can be read by this interface. As of this report – a ticket has been created because BKCSR1 is not able to find the program bk768.

**C Data Conversion** – the status of data conversions:

- **Person Entity** conversion and clean up has been completed. Any new entries for the legacy system will be also updated in IFAS.
  
  **Note:** Upgrade to 7.9.0 lost the TIN and 1099 Flags in the PE data. is in the process of updating these two fields from the legacy system.

- **General Ledger Transactions:** for 6 mos of Trust History (TBD): Endowment module will be released in June 2008. has decided to wait for January 2009 to Go-Live on Endowments. 7.9.2 will be available late October/early November 2008. There will be a discussion in the near future regarding these transaction, however, this is not critical for July 1, 2008 Financial Go-Live.

- **General Ledger Beginning Balances**:
  - This work is scheduled to be done the 1st 2 weeks of July 2008. These balances will be manually entered by

- **Job Ledger Beginning Balances**:
  - This work is scheduled to be done the 1st 2 weeks of July 2008. These balances will be manually entered by

- **Accounts Payable 1099 Transactions**:
  - will load this data into Production the week of July 7, 2008

- **Fixed Asset Tables**:
  - Discussion of the conversion will happen after the FA training; FA training has been postponed until October 2008 as of the week of May 27, 2008.

- **Bank Reconciliation Outstanding Checks**:
  - will load this data into Production approximately July 7, 2008 after the bank statement has been reconciled.

**D Report Scope** – still has many reports to be developed. is going to review with staff the Reports available to July 1, 2008 go-live with staff in the next few days to identify any missing reports.

**Functional Track**

1) **PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE, CONFIRM – Phase I**
   A worked on Workflow and CDD Development during the week of April 29-May 2, 2008 and May 5 – 7, 2008 (remote)
   B completed review and answered questions related to AP, AR, CR, JE with during the week of May 5-7, 2008
C reviewed GL and Endowment requirements with during the week of May 20-23, 2008; this included modifying posting strategies

2) PLAN, PREPARE – Phase II
A conducted several DL session involving setup – May 5th, May 12th, May 14, and May 16, 2008

Technical Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE, CONFIRM – Phase I and II
A Done - Ticket #402368 - RSP to upgrade Production Environment (app/database server) to 7.9.0 beginning May 9, 2008
B Done - Ticket #402367 - RSP to upgrade Production Environment (web server) to 7.9.0 beginning May 9, 2008
C Done – Load 7.9.0 Build 146 on Production and Test
D Create a 3rd IFAS Account called BETA/Development – and to discuss details of contract for this. This 3rd environment is needed by the end of June 2008.

Training Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE – Phase I
A is in the process of creating End User Documentation for the Accounting staff as well as those who will approve workflow.
B Training materials will be needed for the additional users that will be trained before and after go-live

Help Desk Tickets

The following are open help desk tickets at the time of this report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Ticket</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Date Open</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Pri</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Tech</th>
<th>Sub System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>403916</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>3/25/2008</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We have multiple General Ledgers and Job Ledgers, ARBTRCUB, see attach</td>
<td>TRENT</td>
<td>AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>404505</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>3/31/2008</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Printing problems GLUTRIJ &amp; GLREFLPT. SQL server 7.7.2 build 93</td>
<td>JIBRAN</td>
<td>GL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>406793</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>4/22/2008</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>BKUPRC- I created check no 00000011... see page 1 for entry into BKUPC</td>
<td>EDWARD</td>
<td>BK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>407404</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>4/28/2008</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SQL server 7.9.0 build 140 Test see attached. When I try and r</td>
<td>DANA</td>
<td>ARCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>407408</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>4/28/2008</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SQL server 7.9.0 build 140 Test see attached tai sheet. When I</td>
<td>DANA</td>
<td>ARCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>408620</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>5/8/2008</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PEUPPE conversion. Our data was converted from 7.7.2 to 7.9. I notic</td>
<td>DANA</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>409072</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>5/13/2008</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CHBPROOF SQL server 7.9.0 build 140 Test. See attached print sc</td>
<td>DANA</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>409177</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>5/13/2008</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLJEAPRN SQL server 7.9.0 build 140 Test. See attached report an</td>
<td>DOMINICK</td>
<td>GL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>409307</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>5/14/2008</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sendpay not working in 7.9 at SHAWNEE. To duplicate problem login and</td>
<td>ROBINA</td>
<td>PY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>409366</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>5/14/2008</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>See attached print screen. Every entrance into one of these mask, A</td>
<td>DOMINICK</td>
<td>GL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>409936</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>5/20/2008</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sendpay not working in 7.9. See attached screenhot. It complains abou</td>
<td>KIRK</td>
<td>PY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Management Summary

Go-Live Plans

July 1, 2008 – Financials

   NOTE: will begin implementation of the Endowment Module with 7.9.1 in June/July and plans to go-live on the Endowment Module by January 1, 2009

January 6, 2009 – HR/PY

Actual Project Delays

None at this Time

Anticipated Project Delays

None at this Time

Risk Analysis

Risk #1:
IFAS 7.9.1 release contains the desired Endowment module which is planned for June 2008 in IFAS 7.9.1. plans to go-live on 7.9.0 in July 2008 with Phase I - Financials.

Risk #2:
Consultant knowledge of the new Endowment Module as well as business process(es); the Consultant's ability to provide guidance to structure Chart of Accounts to accommodate the new module.

Morale

A lot of parallel work has been completed, but the staff is still nervous about the GO LIVE next month. Some things they are uncertain of - processes, reports and total functionality. The committee is trying to explain to them that some of these things we need to hold until the very end or we'll simply work out after GO LIVE. We have stopped the mandatory Saturdays and everyone has pretty much agreed to get what needs to get done on their own time, whether that's
working late or working through lunch – or both. It’s becoming apparent that some people simply don’t have the skill set for the new system (maybe). They’re background and previous skill base just aren’t enough to push them through this. They are keeping good attitudes and is trying very, very hard and putting in a lot of OT hours to stay on top of current duties and learning IFAS.

We’re (committee) are nervous – just bc we’re unsure of what lies ahead. We look at the plan, we’re on track – but it just feels a little unsettled. We have another ‘motivator’ luncheon with Karate Kid as the movie and we tie parts of the movie to the groups. It’s fun – but one comment of ‘are WE ALL gonna get a car if we do good too?’ didn’t really help ( ). is still fighting the change a little and basically wants to know what is going to get out of the deal. wants more money, a promotion, or something for all of ‘effort’. attitude is not helpful and ( ) are starting to affect others attitudes. There is slight talk of merit awards for the group after the GO LIVE date as a thank you for all of their hard work.

Assignments

- Test APOHBTUB Workflow Model
- Resolve rejection issue with AP model
- Resolve issues with loading the bank file with BKCSR1 (current issue is that bk program did not exist on either test or production servers)
- Discuss with – how to handle prior year invoices
- Setup Development Discovery Call for PY Checks/Direct Deposits
- Schedule ( )’s 2 visits
- Setup task to load 7.9.1 into 3rd environment

Items Accomplished during ( )’s Visit week of May 27 – 30, 2008

- Created Cutover Plan – Phase I
- Tested/Fixed the AP Workflow Model for records processed via APOHININ
- Modified the AP Workflow Flowchart
- Modified Project Calendar (added additional visits) – ( ) has auditors on-site and did not want any training scheduled in September 2008
- Assisted ( ) and ( ) with defaults for AP and CR
- Bank Reconciliation: program required for BKCSR1 was not loaded to Test or Production so could not make further progress on this
- PY Checks and Direct Deposits: discussed formats and made notes of specific needs

Other Items to Note:
- ( ) decided to postpone Fixed Asset Training/Data Load until October 2008 (visit for this has been scheduled)
Activities Planned for [person]'s visit during the week of June 24 – 27, 2008

- Assist with data cleanup in Production in preparation for Go-Live on July 1, 2008
- Discuss Cutover Plan
- Discuss End User Training
- Bank Reconciliation
- Assist with miscellaneous issues

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Cap</th>
<th>Invoiced to Date</th>
<th>% Invoiced</th>
<th>Amount Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>$368,100.00</td>
<td>$98,562.00</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>$269,538.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>78,600.00</td>
<td>8,775.00</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>69,825.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$446,700.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$107,337.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>24%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$339,363.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (63 onsite visits; 59 scheduled at time of report)</td>
<td>$107,100.00</td>
<td>$24,877.57</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>$82,122.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$553,800.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$132,214.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>24%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$421,485.43</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary includes all invoices sent to the [person] through 05/30/08.
Project Status Report

Client: [Redacted]  
Prepared by: [Redacted] Project Manager  
Date Prepared: June 30, 2008  
Distribution List: [Redacted]  
Director of Information Systems  
[Redacted] Project Manager

Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financials</th>
<th>HR/PY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live Dates</td>
<td>July 1, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Date Probability*</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated Probability of occurring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>$553,800.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Actual</td>
<td>$164,163.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget</td>
<td>$389,636.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Total Cost</td>
<td>$553,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel is included in the above Totals

Accomplishments/Issues

Project Management Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE – Phase 1 and 2
   A Completion of Project Management Documents
      □ Project Calendar – continues to be modified as needed
      □ [Redacted] continues to update SharePoint so that the team is kept informed
      □ [Redacted] arranged to replace with [Redacted] for the remainder of the project.

Development Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE, CONFIRM – Phase 1
   A ELF AP Check Ticket #39280 – The check formats are tested and ready.
   B Interfaces – the status of interfaces:
      (a) Ticket #392828: IPP Interface – The interface is ready
      (b) 8 Interfaces (developed by [Redacted]) have been created, documented and are ready for go-live
      (c) Ticket #406840: Bank Reconciliation – [Redacted] downloaded a *.cvs version of the bank file as the BAI2 format was not loading
properly with the "standard BAI2" interface. [Redacted] and [Redacted] setup common codes for the utility BKUTLB and successfully loaded the file. There are problems with running BKUPRC – [Redacted] will submit a helpdesk ticket. Distance Learning sessions are scheduled with [Redacted] for July 28 and 29, 2009 to review the Bank Reconciliation capabilities.

C Data Conversion – the converted data is ready or will be loaded:
- **Person Entity**: conversion and clean up has been completed. Any new entries for the legacy system will be also updated in IFAS.
  
  **Note**: Upgrade to 7.9.0 lost the TIN and 1099 Flags in the PE data. [Redacted] is in the process of updating these two fields from the legacy system.

- **General Ledger Transactions for 6 mos of Trust History (TBD)**: Endowment module will be released in June 2008. [Redacted] has decided to wait for January 2009 to Go-Live on Endowments. 7.9.2 will be available late October/early November 2008. There will be a discussion in the near future regarding these transaction, however, this is not critical for July 1, 2008 Financial Go-Live.

- **General Ledger Beginning Balances**: This work is scheduled to be done the 1st 2 weeks of July 2008. These balances will be manually entered by [Redacted].

- **Job Ledger Beginning Balances**: This work is scheduled to be done the 1st 2 weeks of July 2008. These balances will be manually entered by [Redacted].

- **Accounts Payable 1099 Transactions**: [Redacted] will load this data into Production the week of July 7, 2008.

- **Fixed Asset Tables**: Discussion of the conversion will happen after the FA training; FA training has been postponed until October 2008 as of the week of May 27, 2008.

- **Bank Reconciliation Outstanding Checks**: [Redacted] will load this data into Production approximately July 7, 2008 after the bank statement has been reconciled.


**Functional Track**

1) **PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE, CONFIRM – Phase I**
   - **A**: [Redacted] assisted [Redacted] prepare for go-live on July 1, 2008 during the week of June 3-6, 2008.
   - **B**: [Redacted] worked on Workflow and CDD Development during the week of June 10-13, 2008.
   - **D**: [Redacted] is onsite June 30 – July 3, 2008 for the week of Go-Live.

2) **PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE – Phase II**
   - **A**: [Redacted] was onsite to continue the HR/PY training during June 17-2, 2008.
Technical Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE, CONFIRM – Phase I and II
   - [REDACTED] – Work with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to be certain expectations can be met for having the 3rd environment ready by July 14th
   - [REDACTED] will prepare 3rd environment by cloning Production no later than July 10th; [REDACTED] will notify [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] when complete
   - [REDACTED] – will create CSR ticket for loading 7.9.1 on the 3rd Environment and also modify Ticket #412908 as needed to reflect preparation of 3rd Environment
   - RSP will load 7.9.1 in 3rd environment on July 14th (or on Release Date)
      Note: [REDACTED] explained that HR/PY training is scheduled for the end of July and Endowment training is in August; 7.9.1 is needed to begin the endowment implementation
   - [REDACTED] – create CSR Ticket to load 7.9.1 in Production (tentative November 2008)
   - [REDACTED] – will follow-up to determine best way to move HR/PY and Endowment data from 3rd environment back to Production late December 2008 and let [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] know how this will be accomplished

Training Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE, CONFIRM – Phase I
   A [REDACTED] has conducted End User Training and is staff is ready for go-live
   B Process improvement discussions will continue after go-live as people continue to understand IFAS and how the current processes work.

Help Desk Tickets

The following are open help desk tickets at the time of this report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client ID</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Ticket</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Date Open</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Pri</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Bi-Techer</th>
<th>Sub System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>403916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>3/25/2008</td>
<td>O 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Printing problems GLUTRIIJ &amp; GLREFLPT, [REDACTED] SQL server 7.7.2 build 93</td>
<td>TRENT</td>
<td>AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>3/31/2008</td>
<td>O 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>BKUPRP- I created check no 00000011....see page 1 for entry into BKUPC</td>
<td>JIBRAN</td>
<td>GL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>4/22/2008</td>
<td>O 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>OHBPROOF-PRF SQL server 7.9.0 build 140 Test. See attached print sc</td>
<td>EDWARD</td>
<td>BK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>5/13/2008</td>
<td>O 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>GLJEAPRN PRF SQL server 7.9.0 build 140 Test. See attached report an</td>
<td>DANA</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>5/13/2008</td>
<td>O 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am receiving a reoccurring message on the console stating that $6e00a0un</td>
<td>DOMINICK</td>
<td>GL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>5/22/2008</td>
<td>OC 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>See attached report. Since RSP loaded build 146, we are not able to</td>
<td>TREVOR</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>5/28/2008</td>
<td>OC 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>See attached report. Since RSP loaded build 146, we are not able to</td>
<td>TREVOR</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Management Summary

Go-Live Plans

July 1, 2008 – Financials
October 2008 – Fix Assets implementation will begin; go-live yet to be determined
January 6, 2009 – HR/PY
January 2009 - Endowment Module: will begin implementation of the Endowment Module with 7.9.1 in August 2008

Actual Project Delays

None at this Time

Anticipated Project Delays

None at this Time

Risk Analysis

Risk #1:

Consultant knowledge of the new Endowment Module as well as business process(es); the Consultant's ability to provide guidance to structure's Chart of Accounts to accommodate the new module.

Morale

We're LIVE! It was actually rather anti-climatic. We've spent the entire couple of days prior to and July 1 waiting for something big to happen. AP entries were made and posted; AR receipts were entered and posted. There were some reporting questions: how to find this item or that transaction, but other than that — all was very quiet. Indicates this is a product of our planning, diligence and hard work towards staying on track and utilizing our
resources to the fullest extent. The staff, although still anxious about input, are relieved they are only inputting data into one system. It is taking them a lot more time. We (committee) are telling them that is part of the learning curve and with time, they will move just as fast or faster in IFAS than they did in legacy. A few people get frustrated when they are unable to find things or don’t understand what to do next — but realize they are tired and it’s all new yet. Most poor attitudes have now turned to dislike for IFAS — the system — itself. A few people agree in some respects but they say ‘it’s not going anywhere — we’d better get used to it’. It’s comforting to hear people are finally accepting the system. They are very proud of their accomplishments and we have a GO LIVE party to celebrate. Each staff member is presented with a small goodie bag to commemorate the occasion. At the staff meeting announces our accomplishment and recognizes all involved. Also allotted monies to give merit ‘bonuses’ out to the accounting and IT staff. The merits were determined by involvement and overall performance. This also helps attitudes.

Assignments

- Create helpdesk ticket for BKUPRC issue
- Discuss with — how to handle prior year invoices/AR
- Discuss with — process considerations for AP, PY and EF (Payroll Direct Deposit) all from same bank account
- Followup regarding 3rd environment for 7.9.1:
  - Work with and to be certain expectations can be met for having the 3rd environment ready by July 14th
  - will prepare 3rd environment by cloning Production no later than July 10th; will notify and when complete
  - will create CSR ticket for loading 7.9.1 on the 3rd Environment and also modify Ticket #412908 as needed to reflect preparation of 3rd Environment
  - RSP will load 7.9.1 in 3rd environment on July 14th (or on Release Date)
  - — create CSR Ticket to load 7.9.1 in Production (tentative November 2008)
  - — will follow-up to determine best way to move HR/PY and Endowment data from 3rd environment back to Production late December 2008 and let know how this will be accomplished

- Schedule visits – see Project Calendar
- Create CSR for Loading 7.9.1 in Production (tentative timeframe 11/30/2008)

Items Accomplished during Visit week of June 23 – 27, 2008

- Data cleanup in Production in preparation for Go-Live on July 1, 2008
- Revised Project Calendar
- Discussions regarding 3rd Environment for 7.9.1
- Bank Reconciliation: program required for BKCSR1 did not load data; used common codes for BKUTLB – this successfully loaded the sample data
- Other miscellaneous topics

Activities Planned for visit during the week of July 8 – 11, 2008
- Provide Live Assistance
- Determine status of HR/PY implementation and adjust Project Calendar
- Discuss PY/HR Interfaces needs
- Discuss HR/PY Data conversion needs

## Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Cap</th>
<th>Invoiced to Date</th>
<th>% Invoiced</th>
<th>Amount Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>$368,100.00</td>
<td>$125,364.00</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>$242,736.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>78,600.00</td>
<td>6,820.00</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>68,780.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$446,700.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$135,184.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>30%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$311,516.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (53 onsite visits; 59 scheduled at time of report)</td>
<td>$107,100.00</td>
<td>$28,979.58</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>$78,120.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$553,800.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$164,163.58</strong></td>
<td><strong>30%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$389,636.42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary includes all invoices sent to the through 6/30/08
Project Status Report

Client: 
Prepared by: Project Manager
Date Prepared: August 31, 2008

Distribution List: Project Manager
Project Manager
Director of Information Systems

Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Live Dates</th>
<th>Financials</th>
<th>HR/PY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live Date Probability*</td>
<td>July 1, 2008</td>
<td>January 6, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete</td>
<td>Live</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated Probability of occurring

Project Budget $ 553,800.00
Project Actual $ 248,044.44
Remaining Budget $ 305,755.56
Projected Total Cost $ 553,800.00

Accomplishments/Issues

Project Management Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE – Phase II
   A Completion of Project Management Documents
      □ Project Calendar – continues to be modified as needed
      □ continues to update SharePoint so that the team is kept informed

Development Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE – Phase II
   A Ticket #415565 – PY CheckWriter for EO
   B Interfaces – the status of interfaces:
      (a) EFT file for Credit Union – this will be created during the payroll process
      (b) TIAA-CREF – this interface will be created via a CDD Report
   C Data Conversion – there will be no data converted in this Phase
   D Report Scope – is still working on report development.
**Functional Track**

1) Phase I - FINANCIALS
   A. July 2008 was Phase I – Financials Go-Live month assisted
   B. August 2008 follow-up – Financials Post Go-Live assisted with this months activities

2) Phase II – HR/PY
   A. July 2008, completed several DLs working on payroll calc codes; assisted with explaining Pay Bases
   B. August 2008 – worked with to create/correct calc codes and process Parallel #1 employees; provided the payroll check and direct deposit formats for and – these are being tested; assisted with payroll postings and these are now working as expected
   C. September 2008 – goal is to complete Parallel #1 activities and begin (maybe finish) Parallel #2

3) Phase II - ENDOWMENT MODULE
   A. 7.9.1 Software required to prepare the endowment calculations will be available at the end of September/beginning of October 2008. This software build will contain all of the fixes found to-date by Quality Assurance team. will help determine the exact build that needs to be loaded and its availability during the week of September 23rd.
   B. RSP will load the specific Build identified by as soon as it is available in preparation of’s trip on October 28, 2008
   C. will gather all reporting requirements and be ready to share these with the week of September 23rd
   D. will be onsite the week of Oct 23rd to begin setting up the recurring calculations with
   E. will monitor activities to help determine if additional resources are needed

**Technical Track**

1) Phase I and II
   A. following-up scripts to move HR/PY and Endowment data from environment back to Production
   B. will need to schedule loading the 7.9.1 Build containing Endowment fixes end of September/beginning of October 2008

**Training Track**

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE, CONFIRM – Phase II
   A. to determine needs

**Help Desk Tickets**

The following are open help desk tickets at the time of this report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client ID</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Ticket</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Date Open</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Pri</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Sub System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>392581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLNTTEST</td>
<td>11/29/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PY check wrote client will be using EO</td>
<td>TERRYD</td>
<td>PY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Management Summary

Go-Live Plans

October 2008 – Fix Assets implementation will begin; go-live yet to be determined
January 6, 2009 – HR/PY
January 2009 - Endowment Module: will begin implementation of the Endowment Module with 7.9.1 in August 2008

Actual Project Delays

None at this Time

Anticipated Project Delays

None at this Time

Risk Analysis

Risk #1:

Consultant knowledge of the new Endowment Module as well as business process(es); the Consultant's ability to provide guidance to structure's Chart of Accounts to accommodate the new module.

Morale

It's been one month since we went live and things are still moving smoothly. No major hiccups or issues to speak of. Some growing pains re: new processes, workflow for the departments and looking for information and not be able to find it as quickly as some want it. All in all, people are managing the change well. They are glad the 'heavy lifting' is done and they can start working toward a new normal. Some are struggling with questions they are asked from the University and making sure they give the right information. There are still a few (with poor attitudes and now are taking it out on the system itself. They are not making the change as readily as others and rely on the legacy system too much than they should. Some are still adjusting to the new orgkey and object code thought process and thinking through issues as if they were processes through legacy. Several middle managers have commented on how glad they were to have gone through this process, just so they have something else 'under their belt' and to reference in future experiences.

Assignments

- Obtain Credit Union file record format for EFT file (needed by August visit)
- Obtain TIAA-CREF's file record format for Retirement file
- Submit to changes needed to the payroll check and direct deposit formats for and
- Be certain that Direct Deposits match the EO stub for and
- Determine all Endowment Reports needed for Go-Live
- Follow up regarding 3rd environment for 7.9.1:
  - [Name] will follow-up to determine best way to move HR/PY and Endowment data from 3rd environment back to Production late December 2008 and let [Name] and [Name] know how this will be accomplished.

- Software Upgrade for Endowments in 3rd Environment 7.9.1 at end of Sept/beginning Oct (will check on status of this during Sept trip)
- [Name] to check on standard Endowment reports available
Items Accomplished during [Visitor's Name]'s Visit week of August 26 – 20, 2008

- Revised Project Calendar
- Bank Reconciliation: how to manually clear checks
- Assisted with miscellaneous payroll calculations
- Other miscellaneous topics

Activities Planned for [Visitor's Name]'s visit during the week of September 23 – 26, 2008

- Determine status of HR/PY implementation and adjust Project Calendar
- Provide HR/PY Assistance with Parallels, Misc Items
- Discuss status of IFAS Environments – check on Build with Endowment fixes
- Check on any additional Endowment CDD Reports (only one more planned beyond what [Visitor's Name] currently has)
- Discuss all Endowment Reports needed; check on the standard Endowment reports available

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Cap</th>
<th>Invoiced to Date</th>
<th>% Invoiced</th>
<th>Amount Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>$368,100.00</td>
<td>$185,216.00</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$182,884.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>78,600.00</td>
<td>16,082.50</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>62,517.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$446,700.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$201,298.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>45%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$245,401.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (83 onsite visits; 59 scheduled at time of report)</td>
<td>$107,100.00</td>
<td>$46,745.94</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>$60,354.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$553,800.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$248,044.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>45%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$305,755.56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary includes all invoices sent to the [Recipient's Name] through 08/31/08
Project Status Report

Client: [Redacted]  
Prepared by: [Redacted] - Project Manager  
Date Prepared: September 26, 2008  
Distribution List: [Redacted] - Project Manager, [Redacted] - Director of Information Systems

Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financials</th>
<th>HR/PY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live Dates</td>
<td>July 1, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Date Probability*</td>
<td>Live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Complete</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated Probability of occurring

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Budget</td>
<td>$ 553,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Actual</td>
<td>$ 252,795.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget</td>
<td>$ 301,004.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Total Cost</td>
<td>$ 553,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel is included in the above Totals

Accomplishments/Issues

Project Management Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE – Phase II  
A Completion of Project Management Documents  
   □ Project Calendar – continues to be modified as needed  
   □ [Redacted] continues to update SharePoint so that the team is kept informed

Development Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE – Phase II  
A Ticket #415565 – PY CheckWriter for EO  
   (a) In-Process: [Redacted] has run Payroll and will be looking at EO stub for each employee; any necessary changes will be noted and provided to development for corrections. This stub will be tested again in Parallel#3  
B Interfaces – the status of interfaces:  
   (a) EFT file for Credit Union – this will be created during the payroll process  
   (b) TIAA-CREF – this interface will be created via a CDD Report\  
C Data Conversion – there will be no data converted in this Phase for HR/PY  
Functional Track

1) Phase I – FINANCIALS - Complete

2) Phase II – HR PY
   A September 2008 Activities:
     □ Payroll Parallel #1 activities were completed – Congratulations to ALL!!!!
     □ As of September 26, 2008 – Payroll Parallel #2 activities were almost complete (still needed to review checks, direct deposits, Employee Online Stubs, Payroll Posting Strategies)
     □ assisted with several DLs and with an on-site visit for HR/PY during this month
     □ assisted with a week of remote CDD/Webform/Workflow development

3) Phase II - ENDOWMENT MODULE
   A RSP will load 7.9 Build 162 on DEV as soon as it is available in preparation of’s trip on October 28, 2008
   B will convert data from 3 existing systems for Endowment, Gifts and Trusts
   C will be onsite the week of Oct 27th to begin setting up the recurring calculations with
   D will monitor activities to help determine if additional resources are needed

Technical Track

1) Phase I and II
   A following-up scripts to move HR/PY and Endowment data from 3rd environment back to Production
   B will need to schedule loading the 7.9.1 Build 162 prior to’s visit end of October 2008

Training Track

1) PLAN, PREPARE, EXECUTE, CONFIRM – Phase II
   A to determine needs – plans are in place to train users in Employee Online and Timecard Online the 1st and 2nd weeks of December

Help Desk Tickets

The following are open help desk tickets at the time of this report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client ID</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Ticket</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Date Open</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Pri</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Bi-</th>
<th>Tech</th>
<th>Sub Sys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>392581</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/2007</td>
<td>CLNTTEST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PY check writer/rent will be using EO</td>
<td>TERRYD</td>
<td>PY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>403916</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>3/25/2008</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We have multiple General Ledgers and Job Ledgers, ARBTCRUB, see attach</td>
<td>TRENT</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>406866</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>4/22/2008</td>
<td>OT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Rebuild Security is NOT rebuilding. 7.9.0 Build 140 - IFASTEST - SQL</td>
<td>SCOTTS</td>
<td>NU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>407635</td>
<td>CONTRACT</td>
<td>4/29/2008</td>
<td>CONTRACT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Data Conversion for Endowment moduleScop of this project is cure</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>414402</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Load 7.9.1 in Prod They will be ready for this in November 2008</td>
<td>ASP/RSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Management Summary

**Go-Live Plans**

- **October 2008** – Fix Assets implementation will begin; go-live yet to be determined
- **January 6, 2009** – HR/PY
- **January 2009** - Endowment Module: Consultant will begin implementation of the Endowment Module with 7.9.1 in August 2008

**Actual Project Delays**

None at this Time

**Anticipated Project Delays**

None at this Time

**Risk Analysis**

**Risk #1:**

Consultant knowledge of the new Endowment Module as well as business process(es); the Consultant’s ability to provide guidance to structure’s Chart of Accounts to accommodate the new module.

**Morale**

Most everyone is ok with the July implementation. Several accountants are working on HR PY now and they are becoming tired from the sheer time they are putting into all of the changes. They are hard workers though and really know PY. HR seems removed from the implementation of PHASE II and we're trying to bring them in.
Assignments

- Obtain Credit Union file record format for EFT file (needed by 8/31's August visit)
- Obtain TIAA-CREF's file record format for Retirement file
- Submit to [redacted] changes needed to the payroll check and direct deposit formats for [redacted] and [redacted]

Assignments Continued

- Submit to [redacted] changes needed to the Employee Online Stub format for [redacted] and [redacted]
- Be certain that Direct Deposits match the EO stub for [redacted] and [redacted]
- Determine all Endowment Reports needed for Go-Live
- Convert Data from legacy systems (3 systems – Trust, Gifts and Endowments) to IFAS; data needs to be ready by Oct 26th
- Follow-up regarding 3rd environment for 7.9.1:
  - [redacted] – will follow-up to determine best way to move HR/PY and Endowment data from 3rd environment back to Production late December 2008 and let [redacted] and [redacted] know how this will be accomplished

SUNGARD:

- RSP will load 7.9 Build 162 on DEV as soon as it is available in preparation of [redacted]'s trip on October 28, 2008

Items Accomplished during [redacted]'s Visit week of September 23 – 26, 2008

- Revised Project Calendar
- Assisted with miscellaneous payroll calculations
- Assisted with data conversion specs for Endowment in order to get data into IFAS for [redacted] Oct 26th visit

Activities Planned for [redacted]'s visit during the week of October 27 – 31, 2008

- Determine status of HR/PY implementation and adjust Project Calendar
- Provide HR/PY Assistance with Parallels, Misc Items
- Assist with the Endowment implementation

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Cap</th>
<th>Invoiced to Date</th>
<th>% Invoiced</th>
<th>Amount Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>$368,100.00</td>
<td>$185,216.00</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$182,884.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>78,600.00</td>
<td>16,082.50</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>62,517.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$446,700.00</td>
<td>$201,298.50</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$245,461.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (63 onsite visits; 59 scheduled at time of)</td>
<td>$107,100.00</td>
<td>$51,497.33</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>$55,602.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 4 of 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$252,795.83</th>
<th>46%</th>
<th>$301,004.17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$553,800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary includes all invoices sent to the through 09/26/08.
Project Status Report

Client:  
Prepared by:  
Date Prepared:  February 13, 2009

Distribution List:  
Project Manager
Director of Information Systems
Project Manager

Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>$ 553,800.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Actual</td>
<td>$ 366,562.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget</td>
<td>$ 187,237.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Total Cost</td>
<td>$ 475,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel is included in the above Totals

Project Summary

...has done an excellent job of implementing 7.9 IFAS software which is the newest version software available. ... is live on Financials (July 2008) and Human Resources/Payroll/Timecard Online/Employee Online Modules (January 2009).

...continues to implement the Endowment Module. There are a number of outstanding milestones that need to be completely by the end of February 2009...

...will participate in a preliminary "year-end close" with their external auditors. Year end is June 30, 2009 and the "true" year end close will happen again after this date.

...plans to implement Employee Online W-2s. This capability is very new and will work with development and consulting staff to accomplish this.

...plans to "fine-tune" workflow models and CDD Reports during the next 6 – 9 months as well as implement the Budgeting capability.

Morale

We celebrate ...'s last visit! We’ve come in on the project in both PHASE I and PHASE II under budget by approximately $100K. This is a HUGE success and HUGE accomplishment. This makes very happy. The group is getting more and more comfortable with IFAS – we've been live for 8 months! Seems hard to imagine at this point it's been that long already. We’re already talking about year end close and the audit in the new system! ... This puts additional stress on the rest of the already drained staff bc they are taking on the left over work from ...& ... Most seemed surprised that they would resign after doing all the hard work needed for the
implementation. The majority of the group feels it's the best thing for and for the accounting staff - to 'lose the attitudes'.

Assignments

1. Endowment Module Activities:
   A. [Redacted] will update each week with direction from and then send the document to for discussion
   B. [Redacted] will participate in the weekly calls with and

2. Employee Online W-2s
   A. [Redacted] to schedule discovery call with developer and consultant
   B. [Redacted] to schedule next step(s)

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Cap</th>
<th>Invoiced To Date</th>
<th>% Invoiced</th>
<th>Amount Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>$368,100.00</td>
<td>$270,575.50</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>$97,524.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>76,600.00</td>
<td>18,707.50</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>58,892.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$446,700.00</td>
<td>$289,283.00</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$157,417.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$107,100.00</td>
<td>$77,279.98</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>$29,505.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63 onsite visits; 59 scheduled at time of report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$553,800.00</td>
<td>$366,562.98</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$187,237.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary includes all invoices sent to the through 01/31/08.
APPENDIX B

Distributed Survey
To: Survey Participants

From: Graduate Student of OLS 590 Purdue University

You are being invited to participate in a research study through your employment at xxxxxxxxx. Your contact information has been obtained from information obtained by myself, a co-worker in your company. The purpose of this research is to investigate the relationship of planning during the software implementation you have been involved in since 2008 and your satisfaction as an end user. This survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Participation in this study is completely voluntary, will have no affect on your employment status at xxxxxxxxx and has been approved by the Assistant Vice President of Finance and Senior Vice President of xxxxxxxxx. A survey is distributed via a link sent in this email. The assessment will be completed online using the purdue Qualtrics survey system, and you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. The Purdue University online service system, purdue.qualtrics.com, does not collect personal identifiable information from participants; thus, all responses are completely anonymous and confidential. All participants must be 18 years of age or older.

This research experience is in partial fulfillment of a requirement for a graduate level course titled OLS 590 Independent Study / Research Process lead by Professor Lisa Ncube. The research analysis will provide insights into project management, communication strategies and successful implementations. The knowledge gathered will provide a basis for continued growth, further research and publication submissions.

Your participation is appreciated. Should you have further questions, please feel free to contact Professor Lisa Ncube at (765) 494-5616 or email: lncube@purdue.edu, Krista Hixson at (765) 588-1044 or email: kehixson@purdue.edu or the Purdue Institutional Review Board (IRB), 610 Purdue Mall, Hovde Hall, Room 300: Phone: 765-494-5942, FAX: 765-494-8323, irb@purdue.edu, http://www.irb.purdue.edu

Sincerely,

Krista Hixson
OLS Graduate Student
**Survey basis:**

*How does a proper planning method affect goal achievement? How does a proper planning method affect overall satisfaction of project?*

**Goals:**

1. Do you set work related goals?
   - Very Frequently
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   
   1  2  3  4  5

2. Do you feel setting goals is an important part of your work?
   - Very Important
   - Somewhat Important
   - Not Important
   
   1  2  3  4  5

3. Do you find satisfaction in accomplishing work goals you have set?
   - Very Frequently
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   
   1  2  3  4  5

4. Do work goals that are not accomplished bring a feeling of stress, frustration or unhappiness?
   - Very Frequently
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   
   1  2  3  4  5

5. Do you set personal goals (career, lifestyle, exercise, etc)?
   - Very Frequently
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   
   1  2  3  4  5

6. Do you feel personal goals are important?
   - Very Important
   - Somewhat Important
   - Not Important
   
   1  2  3  4  5

7. Do you feel satisfaction from accomplishing personal goals?
   - Very Frequently
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   
   1  2  3  4  5

8. Do you feel stress when personal goals are not achieved?
   - Very Frequently
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   
   1  2  3  4  5

9. Do you feel that a scheduled plan helps to accomplish a project’s goals?
   - Strongly Agree
   - Somewhat Agree
   - Strongly Disagree
   
   1  2  3  4  5

10. Do you feel that a scheduled plan helps your overall satisfaction when working with a specific project?
    - Strongly Agree
    - Somewhat Agree
    - Strongly Disagree
    
    1  2  3  4  5
Communication:

11. What type of communication tools does your department use to communicate with you about your work?
   a) Mail / Memo
   b) Telephone
   c) Face – to - Face
   d) Group Meeting
   e) E-mail
   f) Internet Chat (AIM, MSN, etc.)
   g) Video Conferencing/Teleconferencing/Video
   h) Other (please describe)

12. Which of these methods would you prefer to use for communication at work?
   a) Mail / Memo
   b) Telephone
   c) Face – to - Face
   d) Group Meeting
   e) E-mail
   f) Internet Chat (AIM, MSN, etc.)
   g) Video Conferencing/Teleconferencing/Video
   h) Other (please describe)

13. When receiving information about specific projects, which communication tool would be most effective?
   a) Mail / Memo
   b) Telephone
   c) Face – to - Face
   d) Group Meeting
   e) E-mail
   f) Internet Chat (AIM, MSN, etc.)
   g) Video Conferencing/Teleconferencing/Video
   h) Other (please describe)

14. How often would you want communication to occur during the project?
   a) Daily
   b) Weekly
   c) Monthly
   d) Every other week
   e) Random – As needed

The next section of questions will involve your specific experiences regarding the IFAS software implementation that occurred in 2008. This is not a questionnaire on the ability, service or functionality of IFAS, but the project of implementing IFAS at [Redacted]. If you have joined employment after the GO LIVE date of July 1, 2008, please use your experiences with the software upgrade that occurred in December 2009.
**IFAS Implementation:**

15. Were you part of the implementation from January to July of 2008?
   a) Yes
   b) No

16. Were you part of the upgrade implementation from September to December of 2009? (If no to question 15 and 16, please skip to question 28)
   a) Yes
   b) No

17. What was the main form of communication used regarding the planning of the implementation to inform you of training, procedures and overall project development?
   a) Group websites
   b) Telephone
   c) Face – to - Face
   d) Group Meetings
   e) E-mail
   f) Internet Chat (AIM, MSN, etc.)
   g) Video Conferencing/Teleconferencing/Video
   h) Other (please describe)

18. How often was your communication, on average, during the implementation?
   a) Daily
   b) Weekly
   c) Monthly
   d) Every other week
   e) Random – As needed

19. Did you understand the mission behind the implementation? Did you understand the goal of the implementation?
   a) Yes
   b) No
   c) Somewhat

Please answer the next set of questions based on your experiences and feelings.

20. I was well informed of the progress being made during the implementation.
    Strongly Agree  Somewhat Agree  Strongly Disagree
    1              2                3              4              5

21. I feel the implementation of 2008 was a success.
    Strongly Agree  Somewhat Agree  Strongly Disagree
    1              2                3              4              5

22. I feel the implementation achieved the goals that were set forth.
    Strongly Agree  Somewhat Agree  Strongly Disagree
    1              2                3              4              5
23. I was able to track my progress with the planning tools available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. I feel satisfied with the implementation of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. I feel work satisfaction by participating and achieving the goal of this implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. In your opinion, briefly describe the three main points or areas that were successful with regard to planning the project (and why if applicable):

27. In your opinion, briefly describe the three main points or areas that were poorly planned, poorly communicated or that failed with regard to planning the project (and why if applicable):

28. How many years have you been employed with [ ]

29. In this position, are you considered:
   a) entry level
   b) middle management (some decision-making abilities)
   c) upper management (involved in all/most decisions regarding the organization)

30. Which age group best describes you?
   a) 18-24
   b) 25-34
   c) 35-44
   d) 45-54
   e) 55+
APPENDIX C

Focus Group Interview Discussion Guide
Interview discussion topics - July 13, 2010

How do you feel about the goal(s) behind the implementation? What made you feel that way?

Do you feel the implementation of 2008 was a success and why or why not? What would you change?

During the implementation of 2008, how did the structured project plan help you track progress?

Do you / did you feel work satisfaction by participating and achieving the goal with the implementation of 2008 and why or why not?

As decision makers/leaders of the project, explain the satisfaction rate of the end users/participants that you witnessed.

From your experience, how does satisfaction (or lack thereof) correlate to effective and efficient goal success? Does satisfaction prove valuable to efficiency in project planning? How?

In your opinion, talk about and briefly describe points or areas that were successful with regard to planning the project.

In your opinion, talk and briefly describe points or areas that were poorly planned, poorly communicated or that failed with regards to planning the project.
APPENDIX D

IRB Approvals
Exemptions under Title 45 CFR §46.101

(b)(2) exempts research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:
   (i) Information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and
   (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

(b)(3) exempts research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under paragraph (b)(2) of this section, if:
   (i) The human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or
   (ii) federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

PLEASE BE AWARE that you cannot begin the project until you have received notification that the exemption has been granted.

1. Project Title:
   The Interpretation of a Logic Model

2. Anticipated Funding Source:
   NA

3. Principal Investigator [See Policy on Eligibility to serve as a Principal Investigator for Research Involving Human Subjects]:
   Dr. Lisa B. Neube; Professor; OLS; YONG 436; ph: 494-5616, fax: 496-2519; lncube@purdue.edu
   Name, Title, Department, Building, Phone, Fax, E-mail address

4. Co-Investigators and key personnel [See Education Policy for Conducting Human Subjects Research]:
   Krista Hixson; Graduate Student; OLS; KPTC; ph: 588-1044 fax: 463-3217; kehixson@purdue.edu
   Name, Title, Department, Building, Phone, Fax, E-mail address

5. Consultants [See Education Policy for Conducting Human Subjects Research]:
   NA
   Name, Title, Department, Building, Phone, Fax, E-mail address

6. Anticipated Duration of Study: Please indicate when this project will end. Estimate how long it will take to transcribe audio and/or video tapes if used, and when they will be destroyed.
   Project END Date: May 1, 2010
## Participant Population

7. **Expected Age Range**

Check all that apply:
- ☒ 18-64
- □ 65 and older

8. **Describe location of subjects during research data collection**

Check all that apply:
- ☒ Purdue University, specify campus: Purdue Research Foundation
- □ Elementary/Secondary Schools, specify:
- □ Community Center, specify:
- □ Other University Campus, specify:
- □ Subject’s Home, specify:
- □ International Location, specify:
- □ Other location, specify:

## Summary of Activities

*(use lay language, do not cut and paste from or refer to grant or abstract)*

9. **Briefly state your research question.**

A logic model was created for use during a specific software implementation. This study investigates whether the use of the logic model allowed the project to be more effective in the achievement of project goals and provided overall satisfaction of the participants.

10. **Describe the tasks subjects will be asked to perform (e.g., frequency and duration of procedures, psychological tests, educational tests, and experiments; including screening, intervention, follow-up etc. Reminder: No sensitive information can be sought under exempt guidelines.) Attach all surveys, instruments, interview questions, focus group questions, etc.**

The subjects will be asked to complete in a single online survey created and distributed through the Qualtrix survey system through Purdue University. The decision makers of the project will have a follow up interview that is more in-depth than the online survey questions.

11. **How will the data be recorded?**

- ☒ Written Notes
- □ Audio
- □ Video
- □ Photographs

## Compensation

12. **Will you give subjects gifts, payments, compensation, reimbursement, services, or extra credit?**

□ YES
Recruitment

13. Check all that apply:

☐ The subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office.
   If the above applies, for what office is your subject population a candidate, or if the subject population currently holds a public office for which they were elected or appointed, provide the title(s) of the office:

☐ Federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter (45 CFR §46.101(b)(3)(ii)).
   If the above applies, what federal statute(s) require(s) confidentiality?

☒ None of the above applies

14. Describe the recruitment process to be used:
   An email will be sent to current and previous staff requesting their participation in the online survey. Attach a copy of any and all recruitment materials to be used (i.e. advertisements, bulletin board notices, e-mails, letters, phone scripts, or URLs.)

15. Explain who will approach potential subjects to take part in the research study and what will be done, if anything, to protect individuals’ privacy in this process:
   I will be sending the email to the staff involved in the project, with approval from the CEO. The data will be collected aggregately and it will not be related to or relatable to any one staff member.

16. Is contact information for your subject population publicly available?
   ☐ YES
   ☒ NO
   If no, describe your permissible access to this population (or include written documentation for the cooperation/permission from the holder or custodian of the records):
   I have obtained verbal approval from the CEO to distribute the survey to the staff. If necessary, I can ask for a written authorization.

17. Is contact information for your subject population chosen from records?
   ☒ YES
   ☐ NO
   If yes, what type of records?
   ☐ Medical
   ☐ Educational
   ☒ Employment
Who controls the permissible access for the use of the records?
- I have unlimited access due to my position as project manager and employment with...

Confidentiality

18. Will the data be collected anonymously (without identifiers)?
- YES. Skip to end of document.
- NO. Describe the identifiers to be collected:
  The interviews will not be anonymous but reported in aggregate.

19. Describe provisions that will be taken, if any, to maintain confidentiality of data (i.e. surveys, audio, video, etc.):
  The data will be maintained in the Qualtrix system with access available to only myself and my advisor. It will remain with my advisor on campus for three years.

20. Estimate how long it will take to transcribe audio and/or video tapes and when they will be destroyed.
  There will be no audio or video recordings.

21. Will the PI be able to identify subjects (i.e. identifiers, code keys, etc.)?
- NO
- YES

22. Will identifiable data be made available to anyone other than the PI?
- NO
- YES
  If yes, explain who and why they will have access to the identifiable data:

As Principal Investigator of this study, I assure the IRB that the following statements are true: I have read the Human Subjects "Research Exemption Request Guidelines." The information provided on this form is correct. I will seek and obtain prior written approval from the IRB for any substantive modification in the protocol, including changes in procedures, research team members, funding agencies, etc. I will not begin my research until I have received written notification of final IRB exemption. I will comply with all IRB requests to report on the status of the study. I will maintain records of this research according to IRB guidelines.

Lisa Ncube
Principal Investigator Signature

02/03/10
Date

Submit the original request to: Institutional Review Board (IRB), Ernest C. Young Hall 10th Floor, Room 1032
Principal Investigator: Krista Hixson

Protocol Title: The Interpretation of a Logic Model

Protocol Reference No.: 1001008873 Phone/Fax 765-588-1044

Department/Building: KPTC Email: KEHIXSON@purdue.edu

1. Please list any research personnel being added to the protocol and their role in the research project. Research roles include Principal Investigator, Co-Investigators, key personnel, researchers conducting only exempt research, consultants, etc. For clarification of these roles, please see the Education Policy for Conducting Human Subjects Research located on the IRB website. If a new Principal Investigator is taking over as the lead PI on the protocol, they will need to sign this form in place of the former PI.

2. Please list any research personnel being removed from the protocol.

3. Describe the rationale for the revision:
   Five of the original 26 invited participants are asked to engage in a follow up 30-60 minute in-depth interview. These same participants received an invitation to participate in an online survey.

4. Describe changes to the procedures:
The invited participants will be asked open ended questions similar to the online survey questions, asked to give opinions and ideas regarding the logic model and give situations and scenarios to the questions that happened during the implementation.

5. Describe changes to recruitment and targeted subject population:
No change. The five invited participants will be invited via email with the attached recruitment document. If they reply with interest, we will schedule a meeting time.

6. Submit copies of all instruments and consent forms affected by this revision.

Attached.

INSTRUCTIONS: Submit the original Revision of Protocol Form PLUS one copy of any additional materials. If the revision is for a protocol approved via full Committee review, submit the original and additional materials PLUS nineteen (19) copies to our office.

Principal Investigators Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________
APPENDIX E

Case Study Approval
Approved

Senior Vice President, Treasurer & COO

From:
Sent: Friday, February 05, 2010 10:08 AM
To:
Cc:
Subject: Research Authority - Grad School

To be able to pursue my research for my graduate studies, I need to have your approval to survey the staff regarding the implementation. The survey will be distributed through an online source, take approximately 15 minutes and ask questions regarding the implementation (timing, efficiencies, miscalculations and overall satisfaction). I will be able to use this information in future projects I am involved in.

Earlier you had given me verbal approval allowing me to survey the group. Could you please respond to this email with APPROVED?

I need to have this for the protocol of IRB and the research requirements of human subjects.

Many thanks,
APPENDIX F

Required Authorizations and Endorsements
Department

Departmental approval for pursuit of this project was procured through the College of Technology at Purdue University, specifically through the Department of Organizational Leadership and Supervision and Professor Lisa Neube. This project received full committee approval to wholly pursue this research and present final data, conclusions, and summations at a specified time.

Institutional Review Board (IRB)

With the direction of the committee chair, approval to survey and interview the subjects was gained through the IRB (see Appendix D). All aspects and requirements of the IRB process were completed and fulfilled to allow the engagement of human research. Extra precautions are taken for several different aspects of the project. First, the identity and data are maintained for absolute anonymity. This was a concern for both the researcher and the participants due to the inclusion of their employment in the process. Second, research and employment bounds are kept clinically separate to avoid contaminating either environment. All final data and documentation was filed with the advising professor and maintained for security purposes.

Company

Lastly, approval from the company was granted through the office of the SVP/CEO/COO (see Appendix E). Reasonable availability to the staff was permitted and the SVP/CEO/COO encouraged the staff to cooperate and participate. Unlimited access to all needed information is given and it is agreed the name of the NP is not used in the proposal, final report or any publications nor will any identifiable information within any documentation be attached to this document.