**Business Requirements Document**

**Project: eVal Implementation**

**BRD Title: eVal Security Roles**

**BRD: #17**

**Development required by:**

***Washington State’s eVal Team***

**BACKGROUND**

This Business Requirement Document (BRD) is part of a set of business requirement documents that are part of the Seattle School District’s 2015 implementation of Washington State’s online evaluation tool, eVal. eVal is an online tool developed by the State to support teacher professional growth in alignment with Washington State’s mandates for TPEP (Teacher Principal Evaluation Process). The project goal is to successfully integrate this tool into the District’s TPEP activities, adhering to the District’s obligations of its CBA and to the spirit of the TPEP process which is aimed at fostering professional growth through collaborative, face-to-face discussions between teacher and evaluator.

BRDs related to eVal functionality have been submitted to the State’s eVal development team. BRDs related to back-office activities which require District development have been submitted to DOTs (the District’s development team). Where noted, several of these documents require review and collaboration from both teams.

*For further information, please see Excel file “eVal Seattle - Enhancements and BRD Index” which contains listing of each enhancement that has been approved for development and the related BRD and assigned development team.*

| Version No. | Date | Name | Description of Change |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 10/31/14 | Donna Schmidt | Baseline; submitted to for review to eVal, DOTs and HR teams |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# High Level Requirement Description

The set of requirements in this document are related to security roles within eVal or additional layers of security requested for the eVal tool to ensure users cannot inadvertently change District-wide settings (see BRD 1) and to ensure that adequate security measures are taken for any functionality that impacts the integrity of the data, such as the year-end functionality to purge data from the system (see BRD 9).

# Business Objective

Ensure that only those with appropriate training and authorirization can change District settings within the tool or can request that data be purged.

# Business processes impacted by the change

The HR team administering eVal will need clearly defined roles, responsibility and training for configuring District settings or requesting that yearly data be purged.

# Requirement Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| REQ ID | Requirement | Purpose or expected outcome |
| 17.1 | The District requires an eVal role which would map to the organizational role of “Executive Director.” These administrators require read only access to the evaluators, to all reports and to any teacher data that has been made visible to the evaluators; however, these staff members should not be able to configure any settings in any way that affect any users (such as District settings or school settings; no ability to create prompts, questions, goals, etc.) | These are administrators at the Stanford Center who evaluate principals (their organizational role, not necessarily using the eVal tool as the District has not started to use the Principal Evaluation functionality in eVal). These staff members will monitor how the evaluators are performing by reviewing how they are evaluating teachers. They provide TPEP assistance to an evaluator to help ensure high quality in the evaluation process. These staff members are not, however, authorized to make changes in the eVal tool which would affect the end user experience.  To summarize:  Building level settings: School principals are the only authorized users for changing settings at a building level. They will do that by using the eVal role “School Administrator.”  District level settings: To ensure appropriate training and oversight, very few staff will have this ability. These designated employees will use the eVal role “District Administrator.” |
| 17.2 | The District requests an extra approval step for granting the District Administrator role. | As the District Administrator role holds the “keys to the castle”, and as that role has authority to make changes which would affect all eVal users district-wide, an additional approval step is needed before this level of authority is granted. In the existing design, any staff could request the District Administrator role through EDS, and if the EDS Security Manager approves it, then it is done. Realizing that there are several EDS Security Managers and that routing the right request to the right manager will depend on business processes, and given the large volume of staff who will be onboarded to EDS, there is significant room for error where an EDS manager would inadvertently approve someone as District Administrator.  A potential design would be the ability to designate two users as DA Approvers, and any new DA requests would have to be approved by them before they are activated. These approvers could receive an email letting them know that there are DA requests waiting for their approval. |
| 17.3 | The District requests a non-automated, verbal confirmation before a staff member can elect to purge data (see BRD 9) | BRD 9 requests the ability to purge data yearly from the eVal system. Given the impact to the user community and to the District if the data is purged prematurely, the District requests a verbal validation process by which the eVal team must receive verbal confirmation from the District before enabling this functionality at a given time for a given year. (Example: a District Administrator configures the data to be purged at a certain date/time. This request will be queued, but it will not be acted upon until further validation. Once validated, the DA can now “pull the switch” within eVal to purge the data). |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Review and Approval

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Team | Person | Organizational and Project Roles | Role | Date review/approval received |
| Project | Clover Codd | Exec Director Strategic Plan & Partnerships; **Project Sponsor** | Approve project deliverable |  |
| HR | Brent Jones | Asst Superintendent for Human Resources; Project Steering Committee representative for HR; Internal customer for many of the technology updates requested in these documents | Approve project deliverable |  |
| HR | Elaine Williams | Subject matter expert representing Labor Employee Relations Team | Review |  |
| HR | Denise Williams-Saunders | Subject matter expert representing Labor Employee Relations Team | Review |  |
| HR | Sue Means | Subject matter expert representing Labor Employee Relations Team | Review |  |
| DOTs | Nancy Petersen | Director, Enterprise Applications | Informational |  |
| DOTs | James Bradley | Manager, Business Applications | Informational |  |
| DOTs | Mabel Mah | Sr Business Analyst (SAP/HR); project systems analyst representing DOTs for design and development | Review and accept as milestone deliverable |  |
| eVal Dev Team | Anne Chinn | Lead eVal Developer | Review and accept as milestone deliverable |  |
| eVal Dev Team | Dana Anderson | eVal Supervisor/ Project Manager | Review and accept as milestone deliverable |  |