**Narrative**

**Problem Statement:**

The University of Louisville’s Research and Design website is difficult to navigate. This department is major source of revenue for UofL. When the university secures a research project, they are entitled to skimming a part of the budget off the top, upwards of 40%. The client wishes the website would highlight certain features and information more promptly than it currently does. The stakeholders aren’t finding resources which demonstrates fundamental challenges. Researchers, students, industry officials, community members, and administrators are unsatisfied with the website as it does not focus on the goal of the department. Researchers and student aren’t be connected to projects, industry officials aren’t discovering funding options, community members aren’t getting the news they should, and administrators are being forced to bridge the gaps.

**Vision of the Expected Solution:**

To effectively solve the problems we are presented with, we need to analyze the current system. We must decide what information is invaluable, the client commented that most of the copy is correct. Using As-Is and To-Be models will help determine the processes currently available, and how they might change. The client wishes researchers and industry officials would be directed more effectively. Funding is one of the main processes, it being easily accessible through links and pages makes it easy for a researcher, industry partner, or institution to get involved and find what they need.

**Business Case:**

The menus are difficult to navigate. The information needs to be more directly available. By increasing functionality, we can also increase involvement which will affect revenue.

1. Students: Need to access research topics and areas, newsletters from the department, and applications. Redesign will lead to more students being placed on projects.
2. Researchers: Need to access funding opportunities, completed research questions, and upcoming projects.
3. Industry: Having a limited number of university and industry collaborations affects…

* Amount of Funding: The Industry partnerships give students and faculty additional funding.
* Resources: By striking up corporate partnerships, universities have more resources to undertake projects, and they’re able to diversify their research areas.
* Market Involvement: Universities know that some problems can’t be solved in isolation in labs, industry feedback is key to taking an invention or product from conception to market.
* Exposing Students to Industry Culture: Companies are hungry for ideas, and the actual technologies and intellectual properties to commercialize them. Companies are hungry for talent. This is a very good opportunity to expose students to different industries. When students graduate, they are better prepared to start working at these companies.
* The benefits for companies continue to stack up, including access to a network of faculty, key opinion leaders, lead scientists, and the ability to team up with other companies interested in the same research.

**Feasibility Considerations:**

A feasibility study is an analysis that takes a project's relevant factors into account. This includes economic, technical, and organizational factors which ascertain the likelihood of completing the project successfully. Project managers use feasibility studies to understand the pros and cons of undertaking a project before they invest time and money into it.

1. **Technical Feasibility:**

* It addresses the technical feasibility of the project: the extent to which the system can be successfully designed, developed, and installed by the IT group. Technical feasibility analysis is in essence a technical risk analysis that strives to answer this question: Can we build it?
* Many risks can endanger the successful completion of a project.
* **Familiarity with Functional area: Less familiarity generates more risk**
* First is the users’ and analysts’ lack of familiarity with the functional area. When analysts are unfamiliar with the business functional area, they have a greater chance of misunderstanding the users or of missing opportunities for improvement.
* **Familiarity with Technology: Less familiarity generates more risk**
* Familiarity with the technology is another important source of technical risk. When a system uses technology that has not been used before within the organization, there is a greater chance that problems will occur, and delays will be incurred because of the need to learn how to use the technology.
* **Project Size: Large projects have more risk**
* Project size is an important consideration, whether measured as the number of people on the development team, the length of time it will take to complete the project, or the number of distinct features in the system. Larger projects present more risk, both because they are more complicated to manage and because there is a greater chance that important system requirements will be overlooked or misunderstood.
* **Compatibility: The harder it is to integrate the system with the company’s existing technology, the higher the risk**
* Finally, project teams need to consider the compatibility of the new system with the technology that already exists in the organization.

1. **Economic Feasibility:**

* Economic feasibility analysis (also called a cost–benefit analysis), which identifies the financial risk associated with the project. It attempts to answer the question, should we build the system? Economic feasibility is determined by identifying costs and benefits associated with the system, assigning values to
* **Identifying costs and benefits**
* List the tangible costs and benefits for the project. Include both one-time and recurring costs.
* **Assigning Values to Costs and Benefits**
* Work with business users and IT professionals to create numbers for each of the costs and benefits.
* **Determining Cash Flow**
* Project what the costs and benefits will be over a period of time, usually three to five years. apply a growth rate to the numbers, if necessary.
* **Determining Net Present Value (NPV)**
* Calculate what the value of future costs and benefits are if measured by today’s standards.
* **Determining Return on Investment (ROI)**
* Calculate how much money the organization will receive in return for the investment it will make.
* **Determining the Break-Even Point**
* Find the first year in which the system has greater benefits than costs. This will help you understand how long it will take before the system creates real value for the organization.
* **Graphing the Break-Even Point**
* Plot the yearly costs and benefits on a line graph.

1. **Organizational Feasibility:**

* The final type of feasibility analysis is to assess the organizational feasibility of the system, how well the system ultimately will be accepted by its users and incorporated into the ongoing operations of the organization. There are many organizational factors that can have an effect on the project, and developers know that organizational feasibility can be the most difficult feasibility dimension to assess. In essence, an organizational feasibility analysis attempts to answer the question, If we build it, will they come?
* **Project champion(s)**
* A champion: Initiates the project, Promotes the project, allocates his or her time to project, provides resources.
* **Organizational managers**
* Know about the project, budget enough money for the project, encourage users to accept and use the system.
* **Users**
* Make decisions that influence the project, perform hands-on activities for the project, ultimately determine whether the project is successful by using or not using the system