



Plug-In Request Evaluation Policy

Introduction

There are software platforms in use at Haverford that have established channels through which other vendors (i.e. 3rd party) may offer products designed to integrate and extend delivered functionality. Examples of these are the Workday and Zoom Marketplaces and the Moodle Plugins Directory. This policy addresses the process by which members of the Haverford community may submit a request for one of these additional products, and the criteria by which that request will be evaluated.

Scope

This policy applies to any requests for “3rd party plug-ins” to supported enterprise applications.

Policy

Requests for software plug-ins must be accompanied by an explanation of how the product is intended to be used via the Plug-In Request Form. Products will be evaluated by IITS using the ‘Plug-In Evaluation Rubric’ (appendix A). Products should achieve an average score of **2.0** or lower on the rubric to be considered for implementation.

Requests will be reviewed by the IITS division’s internal committee utilizing these criteria:

- **Vendor Management:** Is the vendor reputable? Do they offer “terms of service” or privacy policy consistent with Haverford’s policies? How is technical support provided?
- **Product Functionality:** Does the product offer new functionality not otherwise available? Is it easy to use? Does it meet accessibility requirements?
- **Deployment Effort:** Is the level of effort for deployment reasonable? Are there any client or infrastructure requirements that would be a barrier or liability to ongoing use?
- **Ongoing Administration:** Is single sign-on available? Is account administration required?
- **Cybersecurity:** Are confidential or regulatory protected data exposed? If so, are appropriate protective measures implemented?
- **Cost**



Procedures

- 1) The community member interested in using a new Plug-In must complete the [Plug-In Request Form](#). The request form will include:
 - Intended Purpose -- A description of the value added to the College or the individual community member with this Plug-In and the anticipated scope of use.
 - Priority -- Level of Priority for acquiring and implementing the Plug-In
 - Standard Priority -- Desirable but not based on specific timing need
 - High Priority -- Specific planned usage within next two (2) weeks
 - Cost and Responsible Party for Cost
- 2) The Plug-In evaluation committee will meet on an ad-hoc basis (not to exceed 2 weeks from date of the request) to review Plug-In request forms received and communicate the results of the evaluation process in a timely manner back to the requestor.
- 3) If a proposed Plug-In passes the evaluation process but has significant cost, a followup Cost/Benefit review may be needed to finalize approval.

Definitions

3rd Party Plug-In – A piece of software designed to supplement an existing product to provide additional features, but developed by an organization other than the manufacturer of the existing product. Plug-In must be available through the original manufacturer’s product “marketplace”.

Supported Enterprise Application – A solution managed by IITS and the ability to be utilized by part of or the entire Haverford community.



HVERFORD COLLEGE

References, Related Resources, or Appendices

Plug-In Evaluation Template

Products should achieve an average score of **2.0** or less on below rubric to be considered for implementation. A score of 4 in Data Protection or Accessibility results in immediate rejection.

If a particular criteria is not applicable, it should be scored “NA” and excluded from the Average calculation.

	Criteria		Score
1	New functionality	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Provides significant new functionality not available via existing applications.2) Provides some new functionality or new integration for existing functionality.3) Does not provide new functionality.	
2	Implementation Effort	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Requires minimal effort for implementation.2) Requires some effort for implementation.3) Requires extensive effort for implementation.	
3	Client Requirements	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Minimal. Browser or simple self-install, no special hardware requirements.2) Moderate. IITS must perform client install.3) Specialized software / hardware required or dependency on aging software components (Flash, etc).	
4	Infrastructure Requirements	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) None, stand alone software as a service.2) Requires minimally complex internal resources.3) Requires significantly complex internal resources.	
5	Single-Sign On Capability	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Integrates with existing SSO technologies.2) Requires additional SSO technologies or significant changes to existing.3) No SSO capability available, users will have an additional set of login credentials.	
6	Account Maintenance	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Integrates with existing Identity Management process, no manual account maintenance required.2) No Identity Management integration, but manual account maintenance not difficult to use and/or infrequently required.	



HAVERFORD COLLEGE

		3) Manual account maintenance is difficult to use and/or frequently required.	
7	Data Protection and Security	1) No interaction with enterprise protected data (passwords, student records, etc.). Scope of data access appropriate to functionality. 2) Minimal interaction with enterprise protected data, only via encrypted channels. Scope of data access appropriate to functionality. 3) Interaction with enterprise protected but not regulatory protected data without encrypted channels. Scope of data access appropriate to functionality. 4) Violates regulatory requirements for data protection and/or scope of data access violates College privacy norms. This immediately eliminates the product from evaluation.	
8	Terms of Service	1) Provider has strong terms of service specifying data ownership is retained by content creator and prohibiting reselling or sharing of data with 3rd parties. (Excludes metadata intended to improve product performance). 2) Provider has terms of service with some protections specified. 3) Provider has no terms of service.	
9	Ease of Use	1) Has a user-friendly interface, easy to become skillful. 2) Interface may be confusing. 3) Interface is cumbersome, unintuitive, and inflexible.	
10	Tech Support Availability	1) Provider offers robust support available directly to user. 2) Tech support / documentation is available, but limited or not user-friendly. 3) Tech support / documentation is not available.	
11	Accessibility	1) Fully meets applicable accessibility guidelines. 2) Meets some accessibility guidelines. 3) Limited capacity to meet accessibility guidelines. 4) Fails to meet accessibility guidelines. This immediately eliminates the product from evaluation.	
		Average:	



HVERFORD
COLLEGE

First approved/Last revised June 1, 2021

Effective date June 1, 2021

Next review required by June 1, 2026

Sponsor: Kathryn Giorgianni, Director of Infrastructure Services

Contact the Office of IITS with any questions.