IOWAccess Project Concept Paper

1. *Email completed copy to the IOWAccess Manager: malcolm.huston@iowa.gov .*
2. *Send signed hard copy to Malcolm Huston, IOWAccess Manager, DAS-ITE, Hoover B Level, Des Moines, IA, 50319-0150.*
3. *Contact ITE or vendor to prepare for project.*

Date
26 August 2009

Project Name
Museum Collection Content Management System

Requesting Agency
Department of Cultural Affairs/State Historical Society of Iowa (DCA/SHSI)

Is this project in support of a program designated as an Iowa Great Place, pursuant to section 303.3c?
NO

Project Point(s)-of-Contact *(include name and phone number)*
Jodi Evans 281-3295

Project Sponsor *(include name and phone number)*
Mary Jane Olney 281-6320

Business Case Justification
Project is listed as a goal in SHSI Mission Statement

Expected Results in this Project
Increased citizen access to museum collection records and images

Recipients of this Service
Citizens of Iowa; anyone with internet connection

Request *(include dollar amount and description of what will be purchased - i.e. services, hardware, software)*

Project Timeline

Phase	Start Month/Year	End Month/Year	Estimated Amount
Scope Analysis	July 2007	July 2009	$0 phase complete
Design	July 2009	August 2009	$0 phase complete
Implementation	Jan 2010	April 2010	**$20,235**

Resources Being Contributed *(people or funds being contributed to the project by the sponsoring agency- include role/% of time or amount in dollars)*

Jodi Evans, Museum Registrar/Project Leader   **60% time Jan to April 2010**
                                                     30% time thereafter

Walter Ladd, ITE   **10% time Jan and Feb 2010**
Rick Dressler, DCA/SHSI webmaster   **10% time Jan and Feb 2010**

IOWAccess Advisory Council Scoring Factors

Each IOWAccess Advisory Council member assigns a 1 to 10 point value on the following factors to your project proposal. These scores, plus your presentation before the Council and various discussion points, form the basis for the Council's decision on your proposal. Address each factor below:

1. Statutory requirement or other mandate

Is the project required by law or regulation, or is it needed to comply with state IT standards? Does the project fulfill a new mandate or is it required by existing law? Is it required by IT standards or necessary to interface with existing application?

From the State Historical Society of Iowa Mission/Vision Statement:

Goal 1. Connect Iowans with their heritage – where they want it, when they want it and how they want it.

Strategy 1.b. Provide on-line access to State Historical Society of Iowa resources, programs and service.

2. Other funding source(s)

What other funding sources have been investigated and what were the results? Have they been applied for? What is available? Have transaction or other customer fees been considered? Is there a return to the IOWAccess Revolving Fund through transaction fees? Highest ranking for seeking/receiving outside funding.

ROI-Pooled Tech: committee unanimously recommended IOWAccess as a better fit for this project.

3. Improved citizen access to government information

How is citizen access to government enhanced? Greater convenience? Better reliability? Proportion of manual/in person effort being replaced/eliminated? Faster response time? Easier to use? More secure? The greater the degree of citizen access to information, the more points.

- **Greater convenience – anyone with a connection to the WWW can access museum object information.**
- **Faster response time to casual information requests.**
- **Since the museum moved to the New Historical Building in 1988, people have been asking "where's all the stuff" – on-line content will allow viewing of those objects not on exhibition.**

4. Impact on citizens or the business they conduct with the governmental entity

What segment of the citizen population is affected? Is this just a select group or the public as a whole? How does the proposed solution meet an identified need vs. a "nice to have"? Is the primary beneficiary the citizen vs. does this enhance the entity's ability to serve the citizen? Highest ranking for most citizens served.

- **Public as a whole – anyone with WWW connection.**
- **The project falls somewhere between 'need' and 'nice to have': current electronic resources are adequate to manage the museum collection but will not support an on-line function.**
- **Our constituents have indicated they want more access to museum object information.**
- **Other museums (many smaller than SHSI) have put content online.**
- **On-line content is no longer the cutting edge in the museum profession – it is now a standard goal.**
- **Cannot disconnect the difference between citizen as beneficiary and enhancing the agency's ability to serve – the citizens want access to museum collections; on-line is the most efficient mechanism.**
- **State government agencies should provide a high operating standard; the State Museum needs to be a leader in museum management, setting an example for how all Iowa museums should operate.**

5. Enhanced access to government information/ greater interactivity

How does the project enhance citizen one-stop electronic access to government information and transactions or allow for greater interactivity? The most points for "beneficial" use of IT to revamp business processes. Highest for total replacement. Average if adds new dimension to existing service.

- **The citizen has the control in accessing museum object information; most questions can be answered as the citizen browses.**
- **Current museum collection management is the result of two *kaizan* events and a near-constant evaluation of methods and procedures weighed against available resources and the standards of the museum profession. Museum-specific content management system (CMS) will replace the 'look' of collection management but not the content.**
- **Replacing current electronic systems with museum-specific CMS will streamline some processes; the CMS has been developed specifically for accepted museum practices; content can be manipulated easily within the CMS.**

6. Collaboration

Does your project provide an opportunity for another governmental entity to share the resources or benefits? Can your project be used by another entity? The most points for projects benefiting multiple governmental entities or encouraging collaboration between entities. (May be demonstrated by letters of commitment from other entities.)

The operations of the state museum are fairly unique among government agencies. PastPerfect is widely used among individual museums so collaboration potential does exist. While PastPerfect has fundraising, archives, library, and exhibition development components, linking those functions within the State Historical Society of Iowa is not a current goal.

7. Chance for success

Describe why the project is well placed for success. Realistic timeline? Previous success rate? Sufficient support staff? Upper level management commitment? More points for projects with low technical and business risk and high chance of success.

- **SHSI does not have a programmer. A CMS takes programming out of the process, freeing up time to create content.**
- **Switching from an ad hoc set of forms and templates created in a two different operating systems (MS-WORD and MS-ACCESS) to a fully-contained CMS just makes good sense; the most useful forms and templates already exist and the system provides enough flexibility to create specialized applications.**
- **Staff have researched other museum CMS – PastPerfect is well-known in the field, developed specifically for museums with small staff.**
- **Some images are available for immediate upload.**
- **The Director of DCA is fully committed to on-line access.**
- **With museum-specific CMS the technicalities have been worked out – this is almost a load-and-use system.**
- **The biggest time-factor will be new photography – staff have created a priority list based on citizen requests, risk, and ease of photography. Creation of images of objects not on the priority list will become part of staff workplans.**

8. Estimated financial cost/benefit

Provide a rough calculation of costs vs. benefits. The higher the ratio of estimated benefit to the estimated cost, the more points.

1st year Execution costs: $20,235.
2nd year and continuing Execution cost: $11,350 (registrar salary and hosting costs)
Benefit to citizens: about $58,000 in time spent accessing museum collection information.
Ongoing Cost vs benefit: 5.11

9. Transparency

How does the project enhance open and transparent government for citizens? More points for project with high usability in allowing citizens to quickly reach information or services.
Since the museum moved to the New Historical Building in 1988, citizens have asked 'where's all the stuff?' On-line content managed through CMS will provide an answer to that question in a format that is becoming more and more familiar to most people.
Citizens will have immediate access to object information rather than waiting for staff to respond to emails, phone calls, or letters.

10. Efficiency

Why is this project the "best" solution for the need? Are there alternatives and if so, why are they inadequate? More points for project that replaces outdated/legacy system or localized information access.

- **This project will replace a legacy system using MS-ACCESS and MS-WORD developed by a non-programmer in response to immediate job responsibilities.**
- **While the current database systems are adequate in managing the museum collection, they will not support the inclusion of images which is essential to on-line museum catalogs.**

- **Other museum-specific CMS have been considered but those systems are more expensive and more complicated. PastPerfect has been developed with smaller museums in mind (smaller staff, not necessarily smaller collections.)**
- **PastPerfect has also been developed specifically for history museums while other systems are designed for art or archeology collections.**

Acknowledgement of Conditions for Approval of IOWAccess Project

Project Approval Conditions

IOWAccess Revolving Fund project approvals are based upon the application materials submitted to the IOWAccess Advisory Council and approved by the Director of DAS. Recipients of IOWAccess projects are subject to the following conditions.

- The Iowa Accountable Government Act, Iowa Code Chapter 8E
- Information technology standards and practices that that are applicable to "participating agencies", the Office of the Governor, and elective constitutional or statutory officers pursuant to Iowa Code Section 8A.206.
- Iowa Administrative Code Section 11-25(8A) - Information Technology Operational Standards.
- Policies and procedures of the IOWAccess Advisory Council and DAS as outlined in this acknowledgement or published on their websites.

IOWAccess Project Policy Guides

The acceptance of an IOWAccess Project is based on the following:

- Sponsoring agency is responsible for the efficient and effective administration of IOWAccess Projects through the application of sound management practices.
- The IOWAccess Project Process is guidance only and describes a customary sequence used in software development. As such, sponsoring agencies are not required to conform to the IOWAccess Project Process.
- Sponsoring agency assumes responsibility for using IOWAccess funds in a manner consistent with program objectives and the terms and conditions of the IOWAccess Project.
- Sponsoring agency will commit appropriate resources in a timely manner to the project to prevent undue delay in project completion.
- Sponsoring agency will be responsible for compliance with audit requirements.
- Approval of one phase of an IOWAccess project does not mean that other phases will be approved. Each phase is subject to separate approval.

Guidelines for Costs

Allowable costs

To be allowable under IOWAccess Projects, costs must meet the following general criteria:

- Be necessary and reasonable for proper and efficient performance of IOWAccess Projects.
- Be authorized or not prohibited under State or local laws or regulations.

✓ Not be included as a cost or used to meet cost sharing or matching requirements of any other State or Federal Project in either the current or a prior period, except as specifically provided by State law or regulation.

Reasonable costs

A cost is reasonable if, in its nature and amount, it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the cost. In determining the reasonableness of a cost, consideration shall be given to:

- Whether the cost is of a type generally recognized as ordinary and necessary for the operation of the sponsoring agency or performance under the IOWAccess Project.
- Market prices for comparable goods or services.

Composition of Cost

Typical costs chargeable to IOWAccess Projects are:

- Cost of materials acquired, consumed, or expended specifically for the purpose of those Projects.
- Equipment and other capital expenditures detailed in the application and previously approved as part of the Project.

Amounts not recoverable as costs under one State or Federal Project may not be shifted to another State or Federal Project, unless specifically authorized by State or Federal legislation or regulation.

Availability of Funds

DAS Finance processes the disbursement of all funds for IOWAccess Projects. Qualifying expenditures for goods and services obtained from other than DAS-ITE or Iowa Interactive, LLC, must be paid by the sponsor and submitted to DAS for reimbursement. In order to facilitate the timely processing of IOWAccess Project reimbursements, entities must use the following process:

- The request must be submitted by the sponsor in writing or through e-mail to the IOWAccess Manager.
- The request must include the following information:
    - ✓ Identification of the IOWAccess Project for which reimbursement is being sought,
    - ✓ The amount of reimbursement requested,
    - ✓ Period of time covered by request,
    - ✓ A comprehensive description of the items covered by the request, and
    - ✓ Copies of any supportive documentation (e.g. vendor invoices, documentation for completed work).
- The IOWAccess Manager will review the supporting financial information and evaluate it against the originally approved project.

- When satisfied that the request meets the stated requirements, the IOWAccess Manager will recommend the request for approval for payment and submit it to DAS Finance for processing.

- In no case will the total reimbursement for each phase exceed the approved amount of the Project phase.

The sponsor seeking reimbursement of expenses is responsible for retaining all necessary documentation pertaining to the relevance and results of the work performed and will provide such documentation upon request. DAS Finance will refer the Auditor of State to the sponsor should there be any questions about the expenditures associated with the Project.

Sponsor Monthly Status Reports

No later than the 21st day of each month the sponsoring agency shall submit a status report to the IOWAccess Manager if work is being performed by a developer *other than DAS-ITE or Iowa Interactive, LLC*. This status report should include:

- A short narrative of the accomplishments for the month.
- Descriptions of any changes in tasks, resources, or issues materially affecting the project plan and, if necessary, a schedule with new target dates provided.

Changes to a Project

All changes to the Project, or the proposal that resulted in the Project, must be reviewed by the IOWAccess Advisory Council. The Sponsor must be prepared to appear before the IOWAccess Advisory Council to answer questions and provide any clarifications necessary prior to any action by the Council regarding a change to the Project. Reasons for requesting a change to the amount of the Project include, but are not limited to:

- Changes in the scope or objectives of the Project.
- Changes in the amount of project funding.
- Carryover of approved funding for a period of more than one year from the date of approval of the original funding.

All changes to an Project recommended by the IOWAccess Advisory Council must be subsequently approved by the Director of DAS.

Project Disputes

Iowa Code 679A.19 DISPUTES BETWEEN GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES.

"Any litigation between administrative departments, commissions or boards of the state government is prohibited. All disputes between said governmental agencies shall be submitted to a board of arbitration of three members to be composed of two members to be appointed by the departments involved in the dispute and a third member to be appointed by the governor. The decision of the board shall be final."

Sponsor Acceptance

Signing below will signify that sponsor acknowledges and agrees to the IOWAccess project approval conditions as defined in this document.

Sponsor Signature	IOWAccess Manager Signature
Date	Date