

## SCEIS Project Evaluation Form

**Requesting Agency:** *Department of Employment and Workforce Security*

**Project Name:** *Replace Financial Accounting and Reporting System (FARS)*

Project rankings are determined by evaluating both value and resource determinants.

**Value** is defined by the level of importance to the State of South Carolina, user community, and the SCEIS system itself.

**Resources** are defined as the projected labor, costs and time required to complete the requested project (e.g., personnel, hardware, and software).

### I. Value Determinants

The **value** scale is a range from 1 to 6 with 1 having a low level of importance and 6 having a high level of importance.

1 and 2 = low value

3 and 4 = medium value

5 and 6 = high value

**State Benefit (circle one):**

1 2 3 **4** 5 6

This score reflects the overall benefit to the state. Change requests that improve agency processes, enhance controls, streamline work flows or create cost efficiencies may be factors that contribute to this scoring. (Please note: A change request that is required by law, regulation or executive mandate would be a candidate for a higher score within this category.)

*This project utilizes cost allocation functionality yet to be implemented to any significant degree in SCEIS. Cost allocation is a primary function of SAP in private enterprise, but was not included in the base configuration of SCEIS. The implementation of cost allocation will offer agencies new processes that can contribute to greater efficiencies.*

---

**User Community Benefit (circle one):**

1 2 3 **4** 5 6

Examples include a high level of interest across agencies, cost or time savings for enabling this new efficiency. This category should also consider factors such as increased convenience for individual users.

*As previously stated, implementation of cost allocation will provide agencies new functionality that can lead to greater efficiency. Several agencies, primarily large agencies with more complex funding, have inquired into the availability of this functionality.*

---

**SCEIS Benefit (circle one):**

1 2 **3** 4 5 6

This score reflects the proposed project's ability to eliminate redundancies, reduce paper handling, and promote adoption of SCEIS functionality.

*This functionality should provide SCEIS with additional processes for meeting agency requests.*

---

**Value Score (average of category totals):** **3.67**

## **II. Resource Determinants**

The **resource** scale is a range from 1 to 6 with 6 being "high resources" to complete the project and 1 being "low resources" presently available to complete the project.

1 and 2 = low resources  
3 and 4 = medium resources  
5 and 6 = high resources

**Level of resource requirements (circle one):**

1 2 3 **4** 5 6

The scope of the project impacts the resources to be expended upon its delivery. Resources may include development time, additional hardware and or software, or extraordinary agency system requirements such as interfaces outside of the agencies control. This can also be influenced by time constraints to deliver a project.

*Blueprinting, configuration, development, testing and training will require significant time of one to two SCEIS FI staff and of outside consultants for a period of two to three months.*

**Scope of project (circle one):**

1 **2** 3 4 5 6

Scope elements that may hinder a project may include interagency collaboration, agency data not being accessible or ready, or pending statutory requirements

*As with any project, the conflicting time demands on both SCEIS and SCDEW staff is a concern. Approval of the new implementation must be obtained from the US Department of Labor.*

---

**Variation from existing configuration or technology (circle one):**

1 2 **3** 4 5 6

Technology variations include utilizing hardware, software or technology that deviates from the SCEIS Standard Configuration, not following standards of architecture or implementation, or adding a higher level of risk.

*Replacement of the FARS system will require utilization of SCEIS' cost allocation functionality. The complexity of this allocation, while within the ability of SCEIS, exceeds any previous SCEIS allocation implementation. There will be additional configuration, and there may be new development.*

---

**Risk associated with implementing the change (circle one):**

1 **2** 3 4 5 6

Rate according to the level of risk, including strategic risk, financial risk, project management risk, technology risk or operational risk, associated with implementation of the requested change.

*Limited time, competing resource requirements and user proficiency are risks inherent in every SCEIS implementation.*


*Risks of this implementation are mitigated by the fact that there must be a period of parallel testing to provide assurance that the results do not significantly vary from legacy results.*

---

**Resources Score (average of category totals):**

**2.75**

### III. Project Priority



Priority recommended based on overall Resource and Value rankings (check one):

- ☐ low value/low resource  
☐ low value/high resource  
☐ low value/medium resource  
  
☐ high value/low resource  
☒ high value/medium resource  
☐ high value/high resource

Action recommended based on ranking scores and descriptions (check one):

- ☒ Proceed
 ☐ Discontinue project