

**ORegon Budget Information Tracking System (ORBITS)**  
Phase 2A Close-Out Evaluation – August 2002  
Results (Approx. 100 Coordinators/10 returned)

--

#	Statement	Average
<b>1. Communication regarding the ORBITS project</b>		<b>4.26</b>
a.	Was at a level of detail necessary for me to be informed.	4.33
b.	Was timely, appropriate, and informative.	4.33
c.	Provided value in communicating project activities and issues.	4.11
<b>2. User participation on project activities</b>		<b>4.33</b>
a.	Active participation was encouraged.	4.56
b.	My input was valued and made a difference.	4.11
<b>3. Project Meetings</b>		<b>4.25</b>
a.	Provided value in communicating project activities and issues.	4.25
<b>4. ORBITS Project Team</b>		<b>4.31</b>
a.	Members were accessible and I was able to call them with questions.	4.44
b.	The roles and responsibilities of team members were communicated clearly throughout the project.	4.00
c.	Information received from members was valuable.	4.33
d.	Members were responsive to discussions and interactions on project issues.	4.44
<b>5. ORBITS Project Website</b>		<b>4.22</b>
a.	I believe the website will meet my needs for ongoing project communication.	4.22
<b>6. Documentation</b>		<b>4.39</b>
a.	The ORBITS Data Entry Guide (located in the Training Manual) is useful in understanding the applications' windows, etc.	4.44
b.	Both the Training Manual and the Data Entry Guide have been valuable resources in learning the application.	4.22
<b>7. Using the Application</b>		<b>4.33</b>
a.	The ORBITS Application is user friendly and easy to navigate.	4.33
b.	When encountering problems, the ORBITS Help Desk, through May 2002, was able to assist me in solving my problem.	4.44
c.	The ORBITS reports that are currently available for my use, give me pertinent information and serve my reporting needs.	4.22
<b>Overall Rating</b>		<b>4.30</b>

## Comments from the Evaluation:

### 2 b. User participation

- My input made a difference to whom?

**Response:** The input provided by members of the User Support Team (agency coordinators) made a difference in the overall quality and functioning of ORBITS.

### 4 a. ORBITS Project Team

- Great Customer Service!

### 6. Documentation – Changes to documentation you would like to see from the Project Team in Phase 2B.

- If ORBITS is designed to interface with SFMS agency structure “appropriated funds”, why is BAM management allowed to override these controls?

**Response:** ORBITS appropriated funds match the SFMS appropriated funds. The SABR Section works with agencies and analysts to try to meet the needs of all users of ORBITS.

- Better documentation of how to fix possible problems such as the inability to print or fixing the view display of screens to avoid cut-off of page layouts. Need instructions of what to do if these problems arise and who to contact.

**Response:** Deploying ORBITS through Citrix was a learning experience for everyone. For the unfortunate few who experienced problems, it was frustrating. We apologize. Even with agencies’ involvement in testing, a few problems were discovered and have been fixed. The training materials included a section on reporting problems. Now that the system has been implemented, problems should be reported to Gilbert Gaviola in the SABR Section.

### 7. Using the Application – General comments.

- Fix some of the online errors that cause a loop that you can’t get out of without exiting/canceling the whole application.

**Response:** As mentioned above, all known problems have been fixed.

- Printer problems were still in the process of being resolved (resolution was to purchase a new printer).

**Response:** This was the only known printer that had to be replaced. The ORBITS project assisted the agency with the replacement.

### General Comments:

- Overall, I thought everything went really well with ORBITS – the staff did a really good job.