# Level 1 Project Documentation

## ITL1-0007 CampusClarity Implementation

### TAC 216 Companion Guide Version: 2016

### Project Start: April 17, 2017

### Projected End: June 1, 2017

#### Project Purpose

The Department of Employee Development & Compliance Services has requested the implementation of Campus Clarity at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi to address Title IX mandates for information and education for Students.

#### Project Value

Implementation of CampusClarity will position the University to meet or surpass statutory requirements through the replacement of current limited training and manual reporting with a more comprehensive, automated training, tracking and reporting for the entire student body. In addition, the existence of LawRoom to evaluate and apply of Federal and State regulatory requirements to CampusClarity training, as part of the contract, provides the means to ensure ongoing compliance.

Anticipated savings includes the anticipated savings of 2 – 3 FTEs that are currently providing information during follow on training for key Student Leaders and select Campus student groups. This does NOT include the costs incurred in the development, management, reporting or retention of related training activities. In addition, responding to investigations is difficult given the manual tracking of training activity and lack of automated reports

#### Complexity and Risk Assessment Level

Complexity Assessment Project Level: 1

The project scored at and will be managed at Level 1.

#### Deliverables

| Deliverable | Description |
| --- | --- |
| Training Material Development and Maintenance  | EverFi will provide the training material, tailored to comply with Title IX mandates for our Institution. The following Courses have been selected: |
| Retention of Historical Information | EverFi will provide for the retention of information related to the completion of training by students.  |
| Mass Emails to the Student population | EverFi and TAMUCC will automate the interfaces between TAMUCC systems and Campus Clarity that will dispatch an email with a link to the TitleIX courses that a Student must complete. Note: Sanction Courses will be manually sent to students. |
| Reporting | 1) Ongoing Reporting: Implement reporting capability so that compliance to Federal and State Title IX mandates can be tracked and evaluated.2) Investigative Reporting: Provide for the retention and reporting of training fulfillment for investigation reporting.3) Compliance Success Reporting: Implement reporting capability so that compliance to Federal and State Title IX mandates can be tracked and evaluated. |
| TBD: Holds for non-Compliance | Implement a process, business and technical, for the interface between CampusClarity and Banner to effect holds for students that have not completed required training. |

#### Estimated Work Effort

Work effort will be estimated for the following Deliverables:

* Mass Emails to the Student population
* TBD: Holds for non-Compliance

#### Project Milestones

| Milestone | Begin Date | End Date |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Project Kick-off | April 17, 2017 | April 17, 2017 |
| SSO Integration (2-3 weeks to set up, 1 week for testing URL) | April 12, 2017 | May 12, 2017 |
| SFTP Setup (4 – 5 weeks) | May 4, 2017 | May 15, 2017 |
| Course Setup (2 weeks after they are defined) | April 17, 2017 | May 4, 2017 |
| Testing | May 12, 2017  | May 22, 2017 |
| Training | May 4, 2017 | May 22, 2017 |
| Production Readiness Review/Communication Rollout | May 23, 2017 | May 24, 2017 |
| Go-Live | June 1, 2017 | June 1, 2017 |

#### Risks

* If we are unable to automate setting holds for students that have not completed training within the required timeframe, a manual process will be need to be approved by the Banner Data Owner and put in place
* If IT staff is unable to work on this implementation, the implementation date may be delayed.
* If we are unable to implement prior to Fall 2017 semester, we will need to continue the current program until the implementation can be completed

#### Assumptions

* If students have sufficient knowledge and information about Title IX topics, specifically consent and incapacitation, we will see a reduction in:
	+ The number of complaints
	+ Exposure of the University’s liability.
* The use of CampusClarity for providing Title IX information and education for students will be key in meeting or surpassing Audit recommendations for our campus.
* IT support staff will be available to work with the Functional users and the Vendor to complete implementation by the requested timeframe
* The initial Title IX training will be sent to all active Students for completion

#### Constraints

* Requested implementation late summer 2017 or sooner, preferably before students arrive on campus for the Fall 2017 semester
* A process needs to be put in place to identify the student populations for each course identified
* A process needs to be identified and approved by Banner Governance to place a registration hold for students that have not completed mandatory training
* The logic behind how to define the groups of students and corresponding courses to be taken will need to be defined
* The timing for when training must be completed will need to be defined

#### Project Team

| Role | Name | Email |
| --- | --- | --- |
| IT, CIO | Names not included in this example. |  |
| Equal Opportunity/Employee Relations Office, Director |  |  |
| Associate Dean, Student Engagement & Success |  |  |
| Equal Opportunity/Employee Relations Office, Associate Director |  |  |
| Student Development Specialist I, Student Engagement & Success |  |  |
| IT, Software Application Developer |  |  |
| IT, Business Analyst |  |  |
| IT Manager, Software Development |  |  |
| IT, Business Analyst |  |  |
| IT Manager, Application Administration – Primary Custodian |  |  |
| IT Application Administration, Systems Administrator |  |  |
| IT, Project Manager |  |  |

#### Lessons Learned

Lessons Learned Participants

* Names not included for this example

| Area | Things That Went Well | Things To Do Differently |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Application Documentation | Need role definitions and availability for people to access the system by job function | Change |
| Application Functionality | Course access was significantly less than originally portrayed | Change |
| Application Functionality | Technical documentation was non-existent | Change |
| Application Functionality | IT doesn’t have visibility into the application or data received by Vendor to be able to vet issues that are escalated. This is needed to clarify solutions. | Change  |
| Application Functionality | Non-admin access, at least view access, should be available for TAMUCC IT support troubleshooting | Change |
| Application Functionality | There is no ‘receipt response’ to indicate what was actually received by CampusClarity | Change – add to Vendor Checklist |
| Application Functionality | The application is very small and highly controlled by the vendor. This does not allow for any group to gain expertise with the tool. | Change – consider the impact of this when evaluating applications |
| Application Functionality | Didn’t realize that modifications to courses would not be allowed | Change – need to at least know and understand impact  |
| Application Functionality | Didn’t realize that courses could be completed multiple times | Change – lack of documentation |
| Application Functionality / Vendor Checklist | SSO was ONLY for Students accessing the courses. We expected SSO to be across the board, including Admin access. | BIG CHANGE |
| Communication Management | Communication was thorough but ran late and did not provide for enough detail to understand - who was responsible for what- how long it would take to put the planned activities into place | Change |
| Communication Management | MarComm did a great job on the posters, cards, etc | Continue |
| Communication Management | Help Desk delays due to uncertainty about how to support initial calls | Change |
| Data | Need to consider using something other than email address as the identifier for the participant | Change |
| Documentation | Don’t have sufficient Vendor technical & user documentation to fully comprehend application functionality | Change – consider this when deciding to accept Vendor application |
| Informational | FYI A# is no longer considered a ‘confidential’ field |  |
| Managing Stakeholder Expectations / Project Process Flow | IT did not have enough time to correctly implement: Had to prioritize implementation into phases to get the critical pieces ready for implementation instead of being able to deliver all pieces with go-live | Change - Determine best approach to prevent getting cornered into delivering too soon |
| Project Team  | All of the groups came together to complete the project in the short time allotted. | Continue but improve lead time |
| Requirements Management | Getting committed requirements was difficult and not in writing | Stakeholder |
| Requirements Management | DR plan for the overall process was not thought out and planned | Change |
| Requirements Management | Modifications for past victims were not available with the system | Change – need to think about these things BEFORE we purchase the project |
| Requirements Management / Close Down | Data archival of old system was a difficult process | Change? Should we test archival as part of implementation so that we understand what will be needed if/when we decommission? |
| Stakeholder Management | Other stakeholders were not engaged in the product selection and had to work with the chosen solution | Change |
| Vendor Checklist | Vendor did not accurately portray what we received | Change |
| Vendor Checklist | CampusClarity had been recently acquired by EverFi and documented functionality did not match actual functionality | BIG CHANGE – don’t do this again! |
| Vendor Checklist | CampusClarity will NOT have any more changes – it will go to end of life without further functionality  | See above |
| Vendor Support | CampusClarity – not available 2 weeks post Go-Live | Change – post Go-Live support |
| Vendor Support | Vendor solution turnaround slow | Change – discuss expectations up front |
| Vendor Support | Vendor made changes from functional users without confirming with the project team. | Change |
| Vendor Support | Needed direct access to Vendor technical staff to vet what was being passed back and forth | Change |