PROJECT CLOSEOUT REPORT

Submitted to Large Project Oversight on 1/31/2017

GENERAL INFORMATION

Program/Project Name: ND Statewide Longitudinal Data System (ND SLDS)
Agency Name: ITD
Project Sponsor: Lisa Feldner
Project Manager: Jennifer Kunz

PROJECT BASELINES

Original And Final	Project Start Date	Baseline Execution Start Date	Baseline End Date	Baseline Budget	Actual Finish Date	Schedule Variance	Actual Cost	Cost Variance
Original Baseline	2/1/2011	2/1/2011	12/31/2012	$1,929,000				
Final Baseline	2/1/2011	2/1/2011	9/30/2016	$8,296,286	9/30/2016	0%	$8,102,927	2.3% under

Notes:

MAJOR SCOPE CHANGES

There were seven scope changes in this project. When scope additions were made, they were accepted because they were contingent upon on additional funding (either general funds or grant). The schedule was re-baselined to accommodate the scope additions.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Business Objective	Measurement Description	Met/ Not Met
1. Capability for data sharing	1.1 Has the project produced longitudinal data to provide historical data and reports to authorized users?	Met
	1.2 Has the project produced ETL processes for consuming agency data and the logging and auditing required?	Met
	1.3 Does the data available allow for research on the individual level as authorized?	Met
2. Establish data governance	2.1 Has the project established data governance that defines available data and data sharing agreements?	Met
	2.2 Has the project identified data that is unavailable due to legal or privacy issues?	Met
	2.3 Has the SLDS Committee promoted strategies to raise awareness of available data for research and reporting requirements to the SLDS participants?	Met

PROJECT CLOSEOUT REPORT

Submitted to Large Project Oversight on 1/31/2017

Business Objective	Measurement Description	Met/ Not Met
3. Address the remaining system capabilities and elements prescribed by the America COMPETES Act that are not met by other projects	3.1 Has the project addressed the following five required system capabilities at project completion? [Request for Applications NCES 09-04, Grants for Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems Under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, Section IV] 3.1.1 The system must enable States to examine student progress and outcomes over time, including students' preparation to meet the demands of the postsecondary education, the 21st century workforce, and the Armed Forces. 3.1.2 The system must facilitate and enable the exchange of data among agencies and institutions within the State so that data may be used to inform policy and practice. 3.1.3 The system must enable the matching of teachers with information about their certification and teacher preparation programs, including institutions at which teachers received their training. 3.1.4 The system must enable data to be easily generated for continuous improvement and decision-making. 3.1.5 The system must ensure the quality and integrity of data contained in the system.	Met
	3.2 Has the project addressed the following six required data elements at project completion? 3.2.1 Element 2: Student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information [America COMPETES Act Section 6401(e)(2)(D)(i)(II)] 3.2.2 Element 3: Student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, or complete P-16 education programs [America COMPETES Act Section 6401(e)(2)(D)(i)(III)] 3.2.3 Element 4: The capacity to communicate with higher education data systems [America COMPETES Act Section 6401(e)(2)(D)(i)(IV)] 3.2.4 Element 5: A state data audit system assessing data quality, validity, and reliability [America COMPETES Act Section 6401(e)(2)(D)(i)(V)] 3.2.5 Element 11: Data that provides information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education, including whether students enroll in remedial coursework [America COMPETES Act Section 6401(e)(2)(D)(iii)(I)] 3.2.6 Element 12: Data that provides other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education [America COMPETES Act Section 6401(e)(2)(D)(iii)(II)]	Met

PROJECT CLOSEOUT REPORT

Submitted to Large Project Oversight on 1/31/2017

POST-IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

Post-Implementation Reports are performed after a project is completed. A "PIR" is a process that utilizes surveys and meetings to determine what happened in the project and identifies actions for improvement going forward. Typical PIR findings include, "What did we do well?" "What did we learn?" "What should we do differently next time?" Notable findings are presented in this closeout report.

What Went Wrong? or What Went Right?	Lesson Learned (What behavior/action would have prevented or improved things? or What behaviors/actions should be repeated to promote success?)
1. The project had great support from Lisa Feldner and Tracy Korsmo and they marketed the project and the results positively.	Continue the support and marketing of the SLDS by key leaders.
2. The design of injecting time into NDUS data provides a needed data foundation which will provide valuable insight and allow for historical reporting and analysis. The complexity of moving the volumes of data required daily and determining if historical data had changed was difficult.	The project utilized cost effective and sustainable measures but ultimately the solution did require an investment into enterprise data integration tools which would have been beneficial and saved time if implemented earlier.
3. I think the project was EXTREMELY well-managed and is probably the best SLDS in the country. Unfortunately, it is the best kept secret in ND.	Seek to improve advertising and access to key stakeholders, as well as encouraging them to use it. Ensure this data becomes easy to understand and easy to access by taxpayers.
4. Having the right people at the table. Transparency of information, to the public, schools and between departments.	Continue supporting and ensuring this success is sustained.
5. Lots of new and innovated ideas were brought forward to SLDS.	Continue supporting and ensuring this success is sustained.
6. Our teachers could have used even more training on how to use the product.	The Data UP project is intended to meet this need for better data utilization and instructional support.
7. Communication could have been better.	Seek to improve communications whenever possible.
8. There was a question as to whether or not data requests should be handled as maintenance or under the project – it was determined that the requests should be handled outside the project, but needed an "owner" and so the project team had to write up that procedure after some requests had already been received and processed	When writing up the organizational change/transition plan, consider whether or not any transitions need to occur during the project and write that portion of the plan earlier than the end of the project.
9. Prior to presenting data sharing agreement to the agencies for review and signature, work with the Attorney General's Office to obtain buy-in for the project and to bring all the various agency assistant attorney generals together at the same time to discuss come to agreement on the document.	For future data sharing agreements, continue collaboration with all parties.
10. The project manager's method of agile/iterative scheduling really seemed to control the work in the postsecondary part of the project.	Advocate using agile/iterative scheduling for future data warehouse work.
11. It would be great to have data available on a more public scale.	The SLDS portal and dashboards will begin to support this need. Data UP project is intended to meet this need for better data utilization.

PROJECT CLOSEOUT REPORT

Submitted to Large Project Oversight on 1/31/2017

What Went Wrong? or What Went Right?	Lesson Learned (What behavior/action would have prevented or improved things? or What behaviors/actions should be repeated to promote success?)
12. Some projects tend to be pushed back when higher priorities arise. I understand that this can happen, but submission date should be taken into account.	Seek to meet resource constraints for ongoing support.
13. Sometimes there is missing data, the reports are slow to run, and some reports don't load.	Continue analyzing and improving data integrity and system performance.
14. When SLDS Committee members changed (e.g., new designees, etc.), it would have been very helpful to have an orientation or on-boarding process, so that structure, roles, expectations were well understood.	Improve on-boarding process for new SLDS Committee members

SUCCESS STORIES

How the Project Resolved Business Problems/Needs:

1. The SLDS has provided information which allows for predictive analysis. Determining students' likely success in (non-developmental courses) from high school to postsecondary has enabled high schools to target interventions.
2. SLDS has brought many sources of data into one space.
3. SLDS is now providing our fall enrollment reports for the NDUS that can be run in 20 minutes. Previously these reports took well over a week to compile.
4. Ability to provide baseline remediation, postsecondary completion, and ACT data to the Regional Education Associations to assist them in applying for the Succeed 2020 (Hess Corporation) grant and then benchmark their progress.
5. The SLDS project is able to consistently provide data on students through the workforce. This provides data to prove or disprove projects productivity.
6. Early childhood data collection.
7. SLDS when working correctly is so nice for our teachers to use. They can check on each student for attendance, grades, etc.