

Appendix A

| NPC Financial Aid Processing Solution Scoring Instrument | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---------------|--------|----------------|
| Evaluation Criterion | Good (Score = 2) | Acceptable (Score = 1) | Unacceptable (Score = 0) | Score (2,1,0) | Weight | Weighted Score |
| 1. Appropriate solution for the appropriate problem | Solution is designed for comprehensive financial aid processing. Meets strategic priority outcomes to automate awarding and reduce processing times. | Solution meets many of the strategic priority outcomes, but not all of them. Features or functionality of the software fall short of expectations. | Solution is not the appropriate solution to obtain the goals of the strategic priority. | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| 2. Ease of use (end user) | Interfaces are simple and intuitive. System responds to user input and queries in a timely fashion. System understands and accommodates the needs of its users. | Solution is slow. | Unnecessarily complex processes. Cumbersome or unintuitive user interface (e.g., multiple clicks to achieve a task). Not user friendly. | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| 3. Security, privacy, local, state, and federal laws | Role-based access control at a detailed level. Secure web site and secure communication (https), and encryption of relevant data. | Some role-based access control. Unclear security features and/or encryption of relevant data. | Lack of role-based access to data. Insecure web site (http). Lack of proper encryption. | 0 | 50 | 0 |
| 4. Proven and verifiable record of success | Provided positive references and information on 3 or more significant Jenzabar CX implementations. | Has some demonstrated experience with Jenzabar. | Claims of success with little or no evidence. No Jenzabar experience. | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 5. Flexible roles | Provides the ability to have multiple users access student record as well as one user to multiple students (many-to-many relationship). | Unclear ability to have multiple users access student record as well as one user to multiple students (many-to-many relationship). | Does not provide the ability to have multiple users access student record as well as one user to multiple students (does not support many-to-many relationship). | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 6. Add Custom Fields | Ability to add custom fields that can be used in packaging process. Fields can be included in system logic to help determine student eligibility and compliance with Title IV regulations. | Limited ability to add custom fields. | Can't add custom fields. | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 7. Auto Packaging | Ability to automatically package students that are not selected for verification and do not have actionable C codes. | Limited auto packaging. | No auto packaging. | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 8. Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) | Ability to track factors of SAP, calculate student academic progress, and identify students that fail to meet SAP requirements. Tracks SAP appeals, denials and approvals. | Limited SAP functionality. | No SAP functionality. | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 9. Ability to audit data – actions, communications, and omissions of users | Yes. | Limited. | No. | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 10. Technology implementation | Database is Informix or Microsoft SQL Server. | Database is MySQL. | Database is proprietary to the solution. | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 11. Cost of maintenance | Fixed and reasonable. | Variable and difficult to predict for budgeting purposes. | Unreasonable. | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 12. Cost and ease of integration with existing systems | Fixed and reasonable cost of integration or migration of data to the new financial aid processing system; i.e., Jenzabar CX, OnBase, and CampusLogic. Recent experience integrating with Jenzabar CX. | Unclear cost of integration or migration of data to the new financial aid processing system. No recent experience integrating with Jenzabar CX. | Open-ended cost structure. Unclear path for migration of data. | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 13. Ability to enter notes/summaries to student portfolios/files | Yes. | Limited. | No. | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 14. Student segmenting and sorting by award type, date, and status | Yes. | Limited. | No. | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 15. R2T4 and Overpayment | Ability to easily identify students that have decreased their enrollment status (Half-time, Withdrawn etc.). | Can run a report for changes to student enrollment (12 credits, 9 credits, etc.). | System doesn't connect to registration data. | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 16. Reconciliation | Ability to easily access student award summaries for COD reconciliation. | Can run reports on student awards. | Difficult or cumbersome reconciliation process. | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 17. Flexible reporting | Ability to schedule reports to run on a regular basis. Reports can be created in MS Word, Excel, or PDF file formats. | Ability to run reports, but with little or no automation. Report file formats are limited. | Rigid or inadequate reporting; labor-intensive processes. | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 18. Timely software upgrades / responsiveness | Quick to respond to changes in federal regulations. Committed to federal compliance. | Slow to respond to changes in federal regulations. Burden of federal compliance placed solely on users. | Not responsive to changes in federal regulations. | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 19. Dashboard and real-time graphic reports | One click access to most frequently asked questions Provides a variety of graphs for most frequently asked questions. | Limited graphical access to data. Unclear graphs, difficult to access, or interpret data. | No dashboard or graphic reports available. | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 20. Context sensitive help | Built in FAQs, context sensitive help, tool tips, video tutorials. | Printed manuals. Requires financial aid staff, IT staff, and administrators to attend training sessions for an extended period of time. | No documentation and help is provided or incomplete help is provided. | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 21. Communication tools to create email, text, and snail mail documents | Yes. | Limited. | No. | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 22. Scalability | The system should be scalable. Accommodate the natural growth of the college. Scalability does not require an increase in the cost of hardware or software. | Scalability may require reasonable increase in the cost of hardware or software. | System design is not scalable or requires significant increase in the cost of software or hardware. | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 23. Cost of supporting software tools and infrastructure | No hidden costs for additional software licensing. Preferably using mature public domain tools and technologies. | Unclear cost structure. Reasonable licensing costs. | Some software applications include a hidden licensing cost (such as having to purchase runtime libraries, database systems, development tools, etc.). | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 24. Initial software price | Fixed and reasonable | Variable and difficult to predict for budgeting purposes | Unreasonable | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 25. Cost of hardware and network (servers, network traffic, etc.) | Fixed and reasonable. | Variable and/or unclear costs. | Variable and unreasonable costs. | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 26. Student schedules – ability to identify financial aid eligible courses. | Yes. | Limited. | No. | 0 | 5 | 0 |

| | |
|---------------------|-------------|
| Total Score: | 0 |
| Max Score: | 1380 |