# Project Charter

## Beta LMS Implementation

## East Texas A&M University

### TAC 216 Companion Guide Version: 2016

### Project Start: September 1, 2015

### Projected End: March 30, 2016

Approval of a project charter indicates an understanding of the purpose and content described in this deliverable. By signing this Project Charter, you agree that work will begin on this project and that resources are committed as described.

| **Approver Name** | **Approver Title** | **Signature** | **Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| John Doe | Project Sponsor | John Doe |  |
| Jackie Turner | PPMO Director | Jackie Turner |  |
| Loretta Young | Business Owner | Loretta Young |  |
| Bob Watts | Project Manager | Bob Watts |  |
| Joe Smith | CFO | Joe Smith |  |

#### Section 1: Project Summary, Deliverables and Scope Excludes

#### Project Summary

Implement the Beta Learning Management System in partnership with the Best Higher Ed Consulting Company prior to the beginning of the 2017 fall semester.

#### Deliverables

| # | Description | Owner | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Pilot installation on existing servers to be used by 10-20 faculty during the spring of 2017 | IT |  |
| 2 | SIS integration of courses, enrollments, students and grades during the spring of 2017 | IT |  |
| 3 | Implementation of online training modules | Training |  |
| 4 | Development of knowledge base and service-desk resources | IT |  |
| 5 | Development of face-to-face training for faculty | Training |  |

#### Scope Excludes

| Exclusion | Exclusion Reason |
| --- | --- |
| Automatic creation of a Beta LMS shell for every course listed in the SIS | Deferred to a later project. |

#### Section 2: Assumptions, Constraints and Dependencies

#### Assumptions

| # | Description | Reason for Assumption | Impact if Incorrect | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | A change control process will be defined and followed. | This is standard for all IT projects. | Impact to schedule and scope |  |
| 2 | Failure to identify changes to project management and technical deliverables within the time specified will result in project delays. | Project does not include any slack. | Impact to schedule |  |
| 3 | Management will support the budget required to implement the new LMS system. | Budget needs have been provided to management. | Showstopper |  |
| 4 | - Management will ensure that team members are available as needed to complete project work. - Mid-level and upper management will foster support and buy-in of project goals and objectives.- Project team members will adhere to the communication plan outlined in the Project Plan.- All project participants will abide by the guidelines and processes established within the Project Plan. | Stated commitment from sponsors; project will include change management processes to address support and buy-in. | Impact to schedule on the low end, showstopper on the high end |  |

#### Constraints

| # | Description | Reason for Constraint | Impact if Incorrect | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Full scope is critical to supporting the 2020 Vision. | Scope | 1 |  |
| 2 | The full implementation can slip to the spring 2018 semester, if necessary. | Schedule | 3 |  |
| 3 | An additional $100K is available for software, annual maintenance fees and consulting fees to maintain the defined scope. | Budget | 2 |  |
| 4 | The software and consulting quotes will expire on October 15, 2015. | Other | Not applicable |  |

#### Dependencies

| # | Description  | Reason for Dependency | Impact if Incorrect | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | IT must be completely done with development before testing can start. | Must have completed product before testing can start | Impact to schedule |  |

#### Section 3: Schedule, Budget and Project Team

#### Rough Schedule

| # | Milestone | Planned End Date |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Pilot installation and testing | November 2016 |
| 2 | Pilot installation goes live | December 2016 |
| 3 | Specify and order new hardware | January 2017 |
| 4 | New hardware goes live | March 2017 |
| 5 | SIS integration complete | April 2017 |

#### Rough Budget

| # | Amount | Source |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | $426,000 | The Provost’s account 24005678 for software and annual maintenance fees over the next three years |
| 2 | $197,000 | The Provost’s account 24005694 for consulting fees |
| 3 | $127,000 | Instructional Services staff time for implementation |

#### Initial Project Team

<Identify initial team members who will be involved in the project.>

| Role | Name/Title | email | Phone |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Sponsor | John Doe | Jdoe@email.com | 979-555-1234 |
| Project Manager | Bob Watts | bwatts@email.com | 979-555-6789 |
| Project Team Members | Sue Smith, Trent Dobbs, Bill Pruitt | smith@email.comtdobbs@email.comrpruitt@email.com | 979-469-2380979-469-7862979-555-3095 |
| Functional Area Project Participants | To be identified |  |  |
| Subject Matter Experts | To be identified |  |  |

#### Section 4: Risk and Quality Considerations

#### Complexity and Risk Assessment Level

Complexity Assessment Project Level: 3

The project was classified as and will be managed as a Level 3 project.

#### High Level Risks

This project is subject to risk in the following areas:

* Inadequate or incomplete security practices, resulting in unintended release of FERPA-protected data
* Failure to define system governance, with documented and agreed-upon processes for long-term sustainability
* Inadequate adoption and usage by faculty
* Failure to comply with internal audit requirements

#### Initial Quality Considerations

The following quality requirements exist for this project:

* Compliance with TAC 202 – Information Security Standards
* Compliance with TAC 216 – Project Management Practices, the Texas A&M University System TAC 216 Companion Guide and both Member- and System-level project governance
* Internal Audit oversight related to compliance with Texas A&M University System Rules and  East Texas A&M University Standard Administrative Procedures
* Software and database security best practices
* System Development Lifecycle best practices