AGENDA

> Call to Order
  – Welcome and introductions

> Research Computing Strategy Outcomes

> IT Governance evaluation findings
  – Discussion and input

> Data Governance update

> Major Projects update
  – Clinical Transformation
  – Finance Transformation
  – IT Project Portfolio Executive Review

> Wrap up
Research Computing Strategy Outcomes

Mary Lidstrom
Vice Provost for Research
QUESTIONS
IT Governance Evaluation Findings

Aaron Powell
Vice President, UW-IT and Chief Information Officer

Erik Lundberg
Assistant Vice President, Research Computing & Strategy, UW-IT
AGENDA

> Current Model
> Purpose and Process
  – IT Governance Evaluation Questions
> Findings and Recommendations
> Critical IT Issues - Summary
> Next Steps
> Input/Discussion
> Appendices – Critical IT Issues and Detailed Findings
Current Model
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT) GOVERNANCE

IT Strategy Board
- Strategic Plans; Recommend Policies; Funding Strategies
  - President
    - Provost
  - Guidance on Strategic Direction
    - IT Service Investment Board
      - Provide Analysis; Identify Issues; Recommendations
        - TRF Advisory
          - Vice President for UW-IT and CIO
            - Service and Process Improvement Recommendations
          - Priority Projects; Recommend Funding Levels; TRF Review
            - IT Service Management Board
              - Refer Issues; Provide Input
                - Provide Analysis; Identify Issues; Recommendations
                  - IT Service Investment Board
                    - Refer Issues; Provide Input
                      - IT Strategy Board
                        - Refer Issues; Provide Input
                          - Vice President for UW-IT and CIO
                            - Service and Process Improvement Recommendations
Purpose and Process
Purpose

Evaluate the current IT Governance model
- What is working well
- What could be improved
- Identify critical IT issues
- Identify recommendations for improvement and key IT issues for future board agendas

Goal: Ensure boards continue to provide valuable guidance and are an effective use of members’ time
Process

> Gather input from each member of the IT Strategy Board and IT Service Investment Board

> Synthesize and consolidate responses – reflect broad consensus

> Share findings and recommendations
  – Incorporate findings from an evaluation with IT Service Management Board in spring 2017
Findings and Recommendations
Summary of Recommendations

> IT Governance is critical – needs continued support
> Keep the current model – a majority think it’s working
> Improve level of discussion and engagement on each board
> Improve information flow and interaction between the boards
> Broaden representation
> Important to retain reporting relationship to Provost as well as EVP for Finance & Administration
A number of critical IT issues were identified by both boards, and are included in the appendices.

These issues will be discussed at our fall meeting.

They include the following categories:

- Teaching and learning
- Research support
- Administrative systems modernization (Finance Transformation, Workday – HR/P, and data integrations)
- Managing data
- Security and privacy
- Other (central and decentralized IT, software site licensing, service optimization, leveraging IT, regional partnerships)
Next Steps

> Prioritize critical IT issues with boards in fall for inclusion in future agendas

> Implement recommendations
   – Improve level of discussion and engagement by:
     > Ensuring agenda items include questions for discussion/input
     > Allowing sufficient time for discussion
   – Broaden representation by:
     > Ensuring each board has representation from UW Bothell and/or UW Tacoma
     > Expanding Strategy Board membership to include more academic representation
   – Identify recommendations for improving information flow between boards for board consideration in fall
   – Retain advisory relationship of Strategy Board with Provost as well as EVPFA
INPUT/DISCUSSION
Appendices – Findings and Recommendations
IT Governance Evaluation Questions

Critical IT Issues

> What are the two or three most important technology-related issues the University faces today? Within the next five years?

> What is the greatest threat/opportunity the UW will face in the next three-to-five years? How do you think technology can contribute to solving it?

Governance Model

> What works well in the current IT Governance model?

> What changes would you recommend to make this model more valuable?

> What other ideas do you have for improvements in the Board or IT Governance model?

> What do you see as the role of the Strategy Board/IT Service Investment Board?

> What do you see as the importance of IT Governance to the University?
Findings and Recommendations

> IT Governance is critical — needs continued support

- Provides an important forum for key stakeholders to inform major IT decisions
- Serves an important State compliance role
- Promotes transparency, buy-in and accountability
- Builds confidence and trust in UW-IT
- Raises awareness of major IT projects underway across the UW and future directions, helping units to plan and manage their resources better

> Keep the current model — a majority think it’s working

- Current model is a good structure, and is working
- There is a diversity of representation, and many thought that was really important
- It’s valuable to hear different perspectives around the table
- Each board adds a valuable perspective and serves an important and distinct role
- Meetings are well organized and well run
Findings and Recommendations (continued)

> Improve level of discussion and engagement on each board

- Service Investment Board: include more discussion questions and opportunities for input and engagement with each agenda item
- Strategy Board: ensure focus on important, strategic issues and engaged discussion

> Improve information flow and interaction between the boards

- Disconnect between the boards now — boards don’t know what the others are doing or how their discussions are interrelated
  > Ideas: annual joint meeting, or have SIB and SMB as Strategy Board subcommittees
- Strategy Board should provide strategic guidance to the other two boards and relationships between the boards should be clarified
- Clarify how this model ties in with other IT governance across the UW (UW Finance Transformation Sponsors, Teaching and Learning Oversight, Data Governance, research computing, etc.)
  > Do decision-makers have coordinated input from the various boards?
> Broaden representation

  – Representation from UW Tacoma and/or UW Bothell needed on all boards

  – More academic representation needed on the Strategy Board, including Deans and a Principal Investigator

> Important to retain reporting relationship to Provost as well as EVP for Finance & Administration

  – Strategy Board needs to report to the Provost and EVP-FA because IT spans both academic and administrative areas

  – Need both administrative and academic leadership to provide broad, institutional perspective
Critical IT Issues - Details
Critical IT Issues

> Teaching and Learning
  – Data analytics dashboards (rapid access to student data)
  – Wi-Fi needs to be pervasive
  – Adaptive technologies in classroom (universal design)
  – Need to answer the question at an institutional level – are we adopting a single strategy for the University or having each campus, school/college, department adopt its own based upon individual needs?

> Examples: different student analytics systems at UW Tacoma and UW Bothell; Continuum College; different admissions processes

> Research Support
  – The University under-invests in research computing support
Critical IT Issues (continued)

> Administrative Systems Modernization
  – Need to clarify and communicate overall long-term institutional strategy

> Finance Transformation
  – Need an institutional funding strategy that doesn’t rely on taxes
  – Need to address capacity issues, including how the University will support FT along with other major projects
  – Need to incorporate lessons learned from HR/Payroll
  – Need to ensure early engagement from key stakeholders across the UW
  – Need to address the impacts — both transformative and disruptive

> Workday – HR/P
  – Need to address current issues and make the system work effectively for the UW

> Data integrations
  – Need interoperability between administrative systems
  – Need to recognize the complexities involved in data integrations, view as a priority, and adequately resource i2325
Critical IT Issues (continued)

> **Managing Data**
  - Need capability to manage data of increasing volume and complexity, while addressing cybersecurity issues
  - Need a strategic and holistic plan at the institutional level for how to manage data — it’s an issue of competitive advantage for the UW

> **Security and Privacy**
  - Need to scale-up cybersecurity, especially in the University’s decentralized environment, and with the emergence of the Internet of Things
  - Need to address how to protect clinical, student, and research data, especially with data intensive advancements such as genomics and precision medicine
  - Phishing is increasingly sophisticated and pervasive
Critical IT Issues (continued)

> Other issues

– **Central and decentralized IT**: need to leverage central, enterprise-wide IT to create efficiencies, use resources wisely

– **Software site licensing**: how to structure it to take advantage of economies of scale?

– **Service optimization**: what services can be decommissioned to create capacity for innovation?

– **Leveraging IT** for transformational change — there is a tendency to focus on risks versus the potential for transformation (academic, clinical, and administrative)

– **Regional partnerships**: how the UW is connected to the larger network of regional and national partners
Detailed Findings
What’s working well

> The model is working well
  – The distinct roles of the boards are valuable
  – The model remains a good structure

> Promotes visibility, awareness, transparency and collaboration
  – Raises awareness of major projects underway, which helps departments plan, as well as use time and resources wisely
  – It’s valuable to hear the different perspectives around the table
  – Highly collaborative and discussion-based

> Represents breadth of UW
  – IT Strategy Board structure is good. It includes the right people across the right areas – research, medicine, administration, teaching and learning
  – IT Service Investment Board has a distinct role, bringing together people with resources to coordinate strategies. The UW needs that guidance
  – Participation of IT directors on the IT Service Management Board is critical. It’s important for them to have that voice
Improvements

> Improve interconnection between boards, other IT governance groups
  - The three boards should be more tightly linked, with better communication between them
  - Strategy Board needs to provide strategic guidance for other two boards
  - How does this model connect with other UW governance structures (i.e., Data governance, tri-campus, UWFT, teaching and learning oversight, etc.)

> Representation should be strengthened in some areas
  - Governance should include representation from all campuses
  - Strategy Board needs more academic representation

> Improvements to IT Service Investment Board
  - Allow more time for engaged discussion
  - Engage members in gathering input from leadership and stakeholders within their units, and report back
Advisory Structure

> Strategy Board needs to be advisory to the Provost and EVP for Finance & Administration (EVPFA)

- Should be advisory to both the Provost and EVPFA, as IT spans both academia and administration

- Should be advisory to institutional decision-makers to enable executive management to make decisions
Importance

> Credibility and Trust

– Critical to have high level stakeholders across the University informing important decisions

– Provides buy-in and transparency; builds confidence

– Creates values and establishes principles for how we make investment and priority decisions

> Support for decisions with broad impact

– Provides support for key IT decisions

– The value of the State Information Service Board was that people had to answer to them and tell the truth

– Role is to provide advice on where to invest IT resources and support for decisions with broad impact

– Provides support in making hard decisions
Data Governance Update

Anja Canfield-Budde
Associate Vice President for Information Management, UW-IT

Ann Nagel
UW Privacy Official, University Privacy Office

Associate Vice Provost for Privacy, Academic and Student Affairs
Problem Statement

Based on the 2017 Provost Charge to the Task Force, input from the Task Force, and the 2016 Memo to the Provost

History
Data Management Committee: Charged by Provost in 2006. Inactive since 2014. Decisions about data are made in isolation, compromising the quality, availability and access to institutional data.

Structure
A single governing board is no longer deemed suitable for the UW’s increasingly complex and diverse data, systems and business process ecosystem. Knowledge about data risk, needs, and points of access to data is dispersed across many units.

Overall
Increasing demand for data for decision making at the UW.

UW is investing millions of dollars in new systems (e.g. HR/P, Finance Transformation, Student) and changing business practices.

An institution-wide approach to data governance is needed to mitigate risk and to increase the effective use of data as a UW strategic asset.

Resources
Resource and budget constraints require clear prioritization around data.

Rapid Change
Rapid innovations in technology and use of data lead to divergent or competing priorities. Focus on specific technical solutions rather than the broad strategic and cross-institutional data needs of the UW.

For more details on the Provost’s charge to the Task Force, see Appendix.
Executive Summary of Recommendations for the Provost

> Create a bi-cameral data governance structure that has a steering and an operational committee
> Include Seattle, Bothell, and Tacoma
> Focus scope on academic, research administration and business data
> Follow clear membership criteria with diversity, breadth and depth
> Include members who are intellectually diverse and promote collaboration across multiple areas of data on behalf of all UW
> Designate 2 FTE for supporting the governance group and its initiatives
Proposed Data Governance Structure

Data Governance
Scope: Academic, Research Administration, and Business Data

Charged by the President and Provost to:
- Prioritize high level outcomes based on priorities across the institution
- Develop strategy related to multiple areas of data
- Reconcile competing priorities across UW units
- Create accountability for outcomes

Charged by the President and Provost to:
- Execute on strategy
- Intake, prioritize, and identify shared solutions to systemic problems
- Collaborate or liaise with the Steering Committee and other groups
- Charge task force(s) to research, analyze, and assess solutions
- Support outreach and education

Charged by the Operational Committee if/when needed to:
- Analyze and propose solutions for operational committee initiatives

Related Governance Groups

Maintain strong relationships with related governance groups and processes.

Data Trustees & Custodians

Continue existing responsibilities and engage in cross-domain work.

Existing Working Groups & Communities

Elevate and promote value added initiatives.

Collaboratively Building and Empowering Existing Resources
Next Steps

- Develop communication plan for new data governance structure, upon Provost review and approval
- Identify potential members for Steering Committee and Operational Committee
- Draft and send charge letters
- Fund resource request and create positions
- Establish positions, reporting and working relationships, and hire positions
- Coordinate

Determine how data governance structure will coordinate with related governance
Appendix
Provost’s Charge to the Data Governance Task Force

**Provost’s Charge**

1. Summarize past experience and present concerns across the UW

2. Recommend that the DMC remain, be modified, or be replaced

3. If a new model is recommended, address: data needs, policy needs, impact, value and risk of data, compliance, and accountability

**Task Force Process**

- Aug 11, 2017: Identified pluses and deltas
- Nov 8, 2017: Discussed scenarios and related activities
- Nov 11, 2017: Grouped activities derived from scenarios
- Jan 23, 2018: Review focus areas and discuss proposed governance structure
Provost’s Charge to the Data Governance Task Force

Provost’s Charge

4. Recommend membership criteria and potential members

5. Show how the model aligns with relevant existing governance

Task Force Process

> Feb 23, 2018: Reviews scenarios in proposed structure, discuss membership criteria and support activities

> Mar 1, 2018: Review governance groups that may relate to the proposed structure. Review resource request.
Example of Data Governance Structure in Action

**Disparate data needed for institutional priority:** Steering committee members identify an institutional priority and data for strategic decision making not available in a single system, or a user environment or report format within the disparate systems that hold the data.

### STEERING COMMITTEE

1. Clarify how new institutional priority aligns with existing priorities. Discuss if there is a pattern or multiple needs for the same aggregate data in a user friendly form. Request OC to research data availability and data quality and assess options.

### OPERATIONAL COMMITTEE

2. Identify data needed, articulate additional business and technical information needed to answer business question, assess value, feasibility, and cost.

### TASK FORCE

3. If/as needed research unknowns

### EXAMPLE OF RELATED GROUPS

- **Data Custodians for data in scope**
- **System Owners for systems in scope**
- **Compliance Steering or Working Group**
- **UW Privacy Office**
- **Office of the CISO**
- **Others TBD**

4. Review analysis and prioritize against existing strategy or outcomes.

5. Communicate priority to stakeholders. If deemed priority, partner with relevant orgs to create project proposal.
Example of Data Governance Structure in Action

Guidance on Access Focused Decisions: Guide Data Custodian decisions on access requests for multiple systems with varying data and similar compliance requirements (e.g., Workday, EDW, SDB, Canvas)

1. Summarize pattern of requests for similar data in disparate systems. Identify guidelines that may or may not exists or access principles and technical means that vary.

2. Prioritize scope for data and systems requiring further research and analysis. Specify parameters for proposed solution.

3. Refine problem statement based on scope and parameters. Research and document applicable guidelines or technical solutions. Make recommendations to OC

4. Based on assessment propose action plan and guidelines to SC

5. Approves new guidelines and partner with other committees and orgs to unify access philosophies across systems and orgs

6. Ensures ongoing awareness of and use of the new guidelines

EXAMPLE OF RELATED GROUPS

Data Custodians for data in scope
System Owners for systems in scope
Compliance Steering or Working Group
UW Privacy Office
Office of the CISO
Others TBD
Example of Data Governance Structure in Action

Use of Financial Aid Data for Research: UW researcher requests sensitive student data for research project, including academic and financial aid data. Data custodians decide this is not permissible under federal laws. Researcher disputes this decision.

1. Data Custodians evaluate if this is a unique use case or pattern of issues over time. They summarize problem statement and possible solutions for discussion with Operational Committee.

2. Identify if similar scenarios exist. Assess value, risk, and feasibility. As needed, seek input from SMEs or chairs of other committees. Approve solution(s) based on assessment and strategy.

3. If/as needed research unknowns for assessment or support implementation of a solution.

4. Reviews solution and assesses if solution should be universally applied across campuses, orgs, systems, and areas of business.

5. Partner with Data Custodian(s) to communicate new approach.

EXAMPLE OF RELATED GROUPS

Articulate additional expertise or perspective needed from:
- Human Subjects Division
- IRB
- Compliance Steering or Working Group
- UW Privacy Office
- Others TBD
Crosswalk Organizational Codes in Admin Systems: Organization codes are used in major and minor administrative systems including FIN, SDB, Workday and Advance. The org code structure in each application is different from all the others. This makes aligning money (FIN and Treasury’s endowment database), faculty and staff (Workday), students or academic disciplines (SDB) and alumni and donors (Advance) extremely challenging.

1. Individuals with shared concerns meet to formulate problem statement and proposed solutions for OC


3. Researches and analyzes scope of changes to data, technology, and business processes. Summarize internal and external requirements

4. Review research and recommend action plan for SC

5. Review OC recommendations and determine a short and long term strategy.

6. Partner with relevant orgs to create project proposal.

EXAMPLE OF RELATED GROUPS
Articulate additional expertise or perspective needed from:
- Workday Sponsor Group and Steering Committee
- Finance Transformation Gov (TBD)
- Others TBD

Issue Advocate

OPERATIONAL COMMITTEE

STEERING COMMITTEE

TASK FORCE
Membership Criteria

Steering and operational committee

> Works jointly on behalf of the whole UW
> Encompasses Seattle, Bothell and Tacoma
> Incorporates executive leadership perspectives
> Represents all areas of data in scope
> Includes academic colleges or schools
> Represents faculty interests
> Considers student government
Membership Criteria

Steering Committee and Operational Committee

- Comprise of intellectually diverse mindsets to promote informed decision-making
- Promotes shared solutions
- Creates buy-in and ability to execute on strategy
- Applies experience and expertise to ensure data strategies come to fruition
- Include some individuals who were part of Task Force and can help uphold the governance and culture change

Task Force(s)

- Varies and includes expertise needed for each task force charge
**Related Governance Group**

**Key collaborators help:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triage Topics</strong></td>
<td>Determine which governance group is best situated to move a given topic forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordinate Efforts</strong></td>
<td>Ensure efforts don’t get buried in process or unnecessarily shuffled between committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficient Decision Making</strong></td>
<td>Support efficient decision making and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistent Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Align strategy for shared or overlapping interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Related Governance Groups

Sample List of Key Collaborators:

- Compliance Steering and Working Group
- IT Strategy Board
- IT Service Investment Board
- Workday Steering Group
- Finance Transformation Sponsors Group
- UW Privacy Office
- Office of the CISO
- Research Advisory Board
- Environment Health & Safety Committee
- IRB
- Others TBD - this will constantly evolve as other governance groups evolve
Related Other Groups

Sample List of Constituents:

- Computing Directors
- Administrators Council
- IT Service Management Board
- Student Data Council
- Tri-Campus Report Prioritization Group
- Workday Report Writers Group
- Husky ID Card Advisory Council
- Others TBD
**Resource Request**

**Campus Data Steward**  
(i.e., director or assistant director)  
- Lead data stewardship and governance initiatives  
- Liaison between SC and OC and with other governance  
- Neutral facilitator, organizer, and liaison without a stake in a specific data domain, system, or technical solution  
- Ex officio chair or facilitator for the OC  
- Develop data governance processes and operating model  
- Engage stakeholders, constituents and committees  
- Research and summarize information (e.g., policies, practices, options)  
- Develop intake process that expedites review, identifies patterns and encourages solutions

**Data Governance Business Analyst**  
(i.e., analyst, specialist, manager)  
- Support the CDS in researching and summarizing information (e.g., policies, practices, options)  
- Manage documents related to initiatives or outcomes  
- Track initiatives and document key decisions  
- Provide project management and coordination  
- Develop and coordinate communications, publications and trainings  
- Support cross-domain work for data governance priorities (e.g. data access or sharing processes)
Request for Contribution from Existing Resources*

Time and engagement from existing resources

> Identify issues and convene task forces to fulfill strategy
> Contribute and help draft deliverables
> Present information for decision making
> Communicate and share information with target audiences
> Review and advise on action plans
> Support the administration of data governance structures, committee and initiatives

* May include but is not limited to contributions from data custodians, data trustees, institutional and departmental analysts, system owners, communications specialists, project managers, etc.
Task Force Members

> **Aaron Powell**, Chief Information Officer, UW-IT (co-Chair)

> **Philip Reid**, Vice Provost Academic and Student Affairs (co-Chair)

> **Anja Canfield-Budde**, Associate Vice President, UW-IT

> **Russell Cannon**, Director of Institutional Research, UW Bothell - later represented by **Adrian Sinkler**, Senior Institutional Research Analyst, UW Bothell

> **Colleen Carmean**, Director of Institutional Research, UW Tacoma - later represented by **Alice Few**, Institutional Analyst, UW Tacoma

> **Elizabeth Cherry**, Associate Vice Provost, Compliance and Risk Services - later represented by **David Anderson**, Executive Director, Office of the Provost

> **Liz Coveney**, Associate Vice President, Human Resources Administration - later represented by **Rachel Gatlin**, HRIS Director

> **John Drew**, Director of IT, Graduate School

> **Walt Dryfoos**, Associate Vice President, UW Advancement

> **Helen Garrett**, Office of the University Registrar and Chief Data Officer, Enrollment Management

> **Erin Guthrie**, Director of Institutional Analysis, Office of Planning and Budgeting

> **Jim Kresl**, Associate Vice Provost, Office of Research

> **Kay Lewis**, Office of Student Financial Aid, Enrollment Management

> **Steve Majeski**, Associate Dean for Research and Infrastructure, Arts and Sciences

> **Karen Matheson**, Director of Institutional Research and Information Management, College of Education

> **Nancy McDonald**, Director Administration and Finance, School of Medicine

> **Adam Moore**, Professor, Information School

> **Ann Nagel**, Institutional Privacy Official, Academic and Student Affairs

> **Jim Phelps**, Director of Enterprise Architecture and Strategy, UW-IT

> **Adam Sherman**, Assistant Dean, The Evans School

> **Peg Stuart**, Assistant Vice Provost, Academic Personnel

> **Nancy Jagger**, Executive Director Integrated Service Center, UW-IT
Authors of the Memo to the Provost

Bill Abella, Senior Business Intelligence Report Developer, Office of the University Registrar

Larry Calter, Director of Student Programs, UW-IT

James Drake, Business Analyst, College of Engineering

John Drew, Director of IT, Graduate School

Harry Edmon, Director of IT, College of the Environment

Crystal Eney, Director of Student Services, Department of Computer Science and Engineering

David Fray, Director of Departmental Computing, College of Engineering

Thomas Frizelle, Director of Information & Learning Technologies, College of Education

Kole Kantner, Technology Director, The Evans School

Roland Lai, IT Director, Department of Anesthesiology & Pain Medicine, Department of Surgery

Jennifer Lehner, Institutional Analyst, Graduate School

Karen Matheson, Director of Institutional Research and Information Management, College of Education

Dorothy McKee, Manager CRM Systems, Foster School of Business

Michael Middlebrooks, Director IT Infrastructure and Operations, Dean of Medicine

Marc Miles, IT Assistant Director, Foster School of Business

Sue Mokhtarnejad, Director IT Strategies, UW Bothell

Patrick Pow, Vice Chancellor, UW Tacoma

Barb Prentiss, Director of IT, School of Medicine

Matt Saavedra, Associate Director, Office of the University Registrar

Adam Sherman, Assistant Dean, The Evans School

Jennifer Ward, Director, University Libraries

Charles Wesley, Application Development Manager, UW Bothell

Zane Wilson, Financial & Student Data Coordinator, Foster School of Business

Ann Wunderlin, Manager, Communication and Education UW-IT

Thayer York, Director of Technology Services, School of Law
QUESTIONS
Major Projects Update
Clinical Transformation

Joy Grosser
Chief Information Officer, UW Medicine
CLINICAL TRANSFORMATION PROGRAM

PLANNING UPDATE
AGENDA

• Introductions & Opening Comments
• Planning Background
• Scope
• Cost Model
• Program Staffing
• Program Timeline
• Benefits
• Program Structure
• Introductions
• Opening Comments
PLANNING BACKGROUND

• Impact Advisors Engaged
  – Cost model substantiating preliminary estimate
  – Value assessment/benefits identification

• Conservative Cost Modeling & Conservative Benefits Approach
  – Starts with industry best practice and published outcomes
  – Assesses UW Medicine for value targets and applicability
  – Estimates quantified and validated with operational UW Medicine clinical and business leaders

• Experience Demonstrated
  – Completed 100 similar engagements over past 8 years
  – Proprietary cost modeling tools are continually refined based on their experience leading the execution of many of the implementations
  – Recent customer modeling at academic clients (Wake Forest, Northwestern, UC Davis) and similar programs (Spectrum Health) have proven accurate and reliable.
SCOPE: EXTENSION OF EXISTING SYSTEM

Software: Extending Epic as Core Vendor

- UW Medicine currently utilizes a subset of available modules within Epic’s enterprise suite of fully integrated applications. Clinical Transformation expands use of UW Medicine’s existing instance of Epic enterprise suite.

- Program replaces substantial set of applications, more than current inpatient EHRs (Cerner’s Millennium and Soarian products).

- Program eliminates significant number of interfaces between applications. Remaining interfaces will be replaced.

Hardware: Infrastructure & Devices in Place

- Infrastructure capacity via regular refresh cycle

- End-user devices and internal networks already used to access EHRs

Systems Managing These Functions Replaced

- Critical Care
- Clinical Content
- Care Management/Social Work
- Disease Management/Diabetes
- Drug Database
- HIE
- Infection Control
- Medication Administration
- Patient Portal
- Cardiology
- Emergency Department
- Nurse Triage/Call Center
- OB/GYN
- Oncology
- Ophthalmology
- Orthopedics
- Surgery/OR
- Transplant
- Lab*
- Pharmacy (inpatient & retail)
- Radiology
- ED Billing
- Registration
- Admission/Discharge/Transfer System
- Admitting Forms and Label Printing
- Claims Clearinghouse
- Claims Scrubber
- Electronic Remittance
- Eligibility Checking – Medicare
- HIM
- Insurance Verification
- Medical Necessity/LCD/NCD CCI
- Patient Credit Card Payments
- Payment Batching, Depositing, and Posting
- Payment Posting/Patient Credit Care Portal
- Refund Check Printing
- Statement Printing
- Interface Engine
- Biomedical Device Integration
- Business Intelligence/Reporting/MU
- MU Reporting
- Downtime Reports
- Management Reporting Dashboard

*Potential later go-live
COST MODEL BREAKDOWN

- EHR Professional Services ($19.3M)
- EHR Software ($13.3M)
- Non-EHR Software ($6M)
- Internal Labor ($56.1M)
- External Labor ($50.1M)
- Hardware ($1.5M)
- Other Non-Labor ($13.2M)

UW Medicine
Project team size & makeup drives 2/3rds of program budget:

- Based on vendor implementation methodology
- Adjusted for UW Medicine complexity
- Staffing model developed in partnership with Impact Advisors and vendor Implementation Services
- Contractors used in strategic positions and where long term position no longer needed
Program Director (1+)
Transformation Executives (5)
Subject Matter Experts\(^1,2\) (17)
Program Manager (5)
Project Manager (10)
Architects (3)
Team Leads (28)
Analysts\(^2\) (92)
Training\(^2\) (14)
Classroom Trainers\(^3\) (20)
Coordinators (11)
Technical (6)
DBA (2)
Other Support (3)
Go-Live Support\(^3\) (100)
Legacy EHR Backfill (14)
External QA (1)

Comprehensive Staffing Plan
Position, Source, Month by Month

\(^1\) Dedicated project SMEs – 0.5 FTE or greater
\(^2\) Includes partial FTEs
\(^3\) Position staffed only at go-live peak
• Program ramp-up begins July 2018.
• Staffing peaks in FY20 Q4 and FY21 Q2 correspond to go-lives (classroom trainers, end-user support specialists).
• Staffing model includes post-live stabilization following second go-live (if needed)
Program Timeline

- Initiation to Go-Live: 22 months
- Go-Live #2 (if needed) 6 months later
- Stabilization phase following Go-Live #2

Impact Advisors & Vendor Guided Timeline Estimate

- Vendor recommends 19-24 month range
- Multiple factors (complexity, # facilities, # legacy EHRs, IT project execution maturity etc…) warrant 22 months to first live

Vendor Implementation Timeline Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health System</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inova (VA, DC)</td>
<td>5 Facilities</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>19 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectrum (MI)</td>
<td>12 Hospitals</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>20 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Medicine</td>
<td>4 Facilities³</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>22 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Methodist (TX)</td>
<td>8 Facilities</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>23 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Health (OH)</td>
<td>11 Facilities</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>24 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Medicine (IL)</td>
<td>7 Hospitals</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>28 Months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Licensed inpatient beds
² From initiation to 1st Go-Live
³ Includes SCCA campus
BENEFITS APPROACH

- Approach was based on proven, realized benefits at other leading provider organizations
  - HIMSS Davies Award winners
  - HIMSS Level 7 organizations
  - HFMA best practice
  - Impact Advisors’ customer experience
- Estimates are conservative
  - Assessed for practical UW Medicine value and applicability
  - Quantified and validated with UW Medicine clinical and business operational leaders
- UW Medicine prospective benefits validated through workshops and interviews:
  - 40 clinical operations leaders
  - 40 physicians
  - 20 business and administrative leaders
# QUANTITATIVE BENEFITS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Benefits (FY21-27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT Services Benefits</td>
<td>Software and Hardware Cost Reductions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing Reductions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NWH Software &amp; Services Contract Elimination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$131.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Cycle Management Benefits</td>
<td>Improved Documentation and Charge Capture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in Preventable Denials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved Point-of-Service and Online Cash Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician and Clinical Staff Efficiencies*</td>
<td>Meds, Allergy, and Problem List Review and Reconciliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of Clinical Data in Multiple EHRs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcription of Clinical Data from EHR to EHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Information Management Efficiencies</td>
<td>Scanning, Request of Information, Coding Staff Reductions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cost Management Benefits</td>
<td>Reduction in Adverse Drug Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in Surescripts Transaction Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Clinical Benefits</td>
<td>Specific benefits related to clinical quality and patient safety to be defined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$191.2M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Benefits identified may only be realized if throughput is improved*
PROGRAM OVERSIGHT STRUCTURE

Program Executive Steering Committee
UW Medicine Vice Presidents and Senior Leaders including: CMO, CFO, CHSO, CIO, UW-IT VP, UWP President, Executive Director(s)

Transformation Leadership
Transformation Executives representing Physician, Clinical, Business/Revenue Cycle, and Information Technology

Operations Leadership
Program committee chairs and functional leaders

Program Committees
Multi-disciplinary teams made up of subject matter experts, operational leaders, and IT staff. Committees defined by functional areas (e.g., Clinical Inpatient, ED, OR/Anesth, Pharmacy, Access/Reg/Sched, Patient Engagement, etc...)
QUESTIONS
Finance Transformation
Update

Brian McCartan
Vice President for Finance, UW Finance & Administration
**UW FINANCIAL SYSTEMS – CURRENT VS. FUTURE**

**Where we are...**

> Outdated financial systems
> Largely decentralized and federated
> Sacrificing enterprise efficiency because the system doesn’t adequately meet the needs of units

**Where we are going...**

> Standardized and simplified
> Leverage system functionality that enables modern accounting practices and supports consistent, streamlined processes and policies across the enterprise to achieve productivity gains
> Optimize processes for the enterprise while continuing to support UW’s entrepreneurial spirit

**UWFT Vision**

Deliver accurate and complete financial information to empower value-driven decisions and ensure integrity and responsible stewardship necessary to achieve cost efficiencies
UW Financial Systems – Future State

Flexible financial reporting & analytic tools
Reduce side systems and creative use of project accounting
Standard financial policies, processes, procedures

Significant organizational changes
  > Staffing and skillsets
  > Transparency of financial data
  > Changes in data and consistency in business practices

INTEGRATED SYSTEM
Lessons Learned from HR/P Modernization

> Focus on *business* transformation, not simply technology
> Scope, schedule and budget: If you change one, you impact all
> Engage the right people at the right time
> Focus on end-to-end processes
> Value voice, collaboration and the courage to course correct
> Leadership and Program Team speak with one voice
> Maintain UW commitment and momentum when turnover occurs
> Focus on reporting early
Why Workday for UW Finance?

Based on a thorough evaluation process conducted in partnership with Deloitte, the UW has determined Workday Financials (FIN) will provide the best available platform to support its business objectives for finance transformation.

Workday will enable the UW (enterprise and unit-level) to:

- Deliver accurate data quickly (including via mobile)
- Provide the same data to everyone, facilitating transparency in decision-making at all levels
- Identify overruns, deficits, and other risks big and small
- Support long-term planning through better forecasting (enterprise and unit-level)
- Integrate all platforms, including HRP, Procurement and Finance (enter data only once)
- Help us leverage the hard work and dedication of our staff to improve effectiveness
- Reduce the workload associated with business functions and interactions that are necessary but secondary to our core mission
Organizational, Functional and Systems Scope

Organizational
- UW Campus Units
- UW Clinical Enterprise*
- Other UW Entities

Functional
- Core Financials
- Procurement/Supply Chain
- Post-Awards Grant Management
- Annual Planning and Forecasting

System Replacement
- UW Academy Enterprise Financial Systems
- UW Medicine Enterprise Financial Systems
- Selected unit side systems

Other
- HCM Workday Remediation
- Finance Data Warehouse & BI Portal
- Remediation of other systems such as SAGE - pre-award grants; Student Database, etc.

Not in Scope (integration only): Pre-award Grants Mgmt; Student Data Base; Advancement; Enterprise and unit “side systems”

*Valley Med Center integration only
Risks of Postponing Transformation

- **Significant functionality not available** (e.g., common general ledger, accounts receivable, supply chain, budgeting, planning and forecasting, etc.) exacerbated with the increasing complexity of the UW’s organizational footprint
- **Extreme risk in demographic evolution** of staff (in all roles) that have the anatomy of the fragmented systems and processes “in their heads”
- **Longer recovery periods after system outages**, including catch-up data entry and reconciliation
- **Additional IT consultants** (to help create new side systems or enhancements to overcome current and future functional gaps)
- **Continued challenges implementing regulatory and other compliance requirements**
- **Continued need for operational staff to operate manual/side solutions**
- **Continued challenges keeping up with growing and distributed cybersecurity risks**
How to Get There: UWFT Guiding Principles

> Senior Leaders are engaged and unified in supporting UW Finance Transformation as a top administrative priority for the University of Washington. Leaders will provide focus needed to ensure a successful program.

> Future state processes, policies and procedures are standardized and simplified, to ensure substantial productivity gains across the Enterprise, justifying any exceptions.

> The computing infrastructure and services are consolidated and integrated across the Enterprise to eliminate redundancy, justifying any exceptions.

> Financial and management reports result from a trusted system of record with consistently applied data definitions, eliminating redundant and disparate data repositories.

> One of the key ways risk is mitigated is through clearly defined stage gates with entry and exit decision criteria.

> Broad University engagement and communication to define, design, and implement the future state vision will ensure all units are operational at launch.
> 18-month Readiness Phase is $20.2M which will be funded by central UW and UW Medicine funds

> The program communicated a “planning quality” estimate of $195M to the Board of Regents in Nov 2017

> Costs for implementation and stabilization will need to be refined during Readiness Phase

> Over a 10-year period this program will cost roughly the same as UW’s expenses for:

  – Utilities (power, natural gas, water, waste)
  – ½ the cost of routine maintenance (custodial and other operations maintenance)
**UWFT Governance Structure**

- **Sponsor Team**
  - Board of Deans & Chancellors; SCPB
  - Accounting Advisory
  - Process Transformation Teams

- **Program Leadership Team**
  - Core Transformation Team
  - Technical Leadership Team

- **Program Team**

*Administrative leadership for program team is VP Finance*
Technical Leadership Team - Responsibilities

> Champions vision and guiding principles
> Recommends technical architecture for program
> Recommends program technical scope, schedule and cost
> Updates technical guardrails to support program guiding principles
> Recommends changes to program technical scope, schedule and cost
> Recommends proceeding to each succeeding program phase
> Resolves or escalates technical issues escalated from the program
> Acts individually and collectively as a vocal and visible program champion throughout their representative organizations
> Acts as liaison to the organizations they represent and with the Technical Advisory
Technical Leadership Team

> **Aaron Powell**, VP and CIO, UW Information Technology
> **Anja Canfield-Budde**, AVP UW-IT, Information Management
> **Beth Britt**, Director of Analytics, UW Medicine
> **Brett Simmons**, Director of Finance Business Systems, UW Medicine
> **Jeff Techico**, Director, UW Medicine, Supply Chain
> **Jim Kresl**, Assistant Vice Provost, Office of Research, ORIS
> **Jim Phelps**, Director Enterprise Architecture & Strategy, UW-IT
> **Joy Grosser**, CIO, UW Medicine
> **Rob McDade**, Information Architect, UW-IT, Enterprise Data & Analytics
> **Computing Director/CIO** – SOM (TBD)
> **Computing Director/CIO** - A&S (TBD)
> **Computing Director/CIO** – Engineering (TBD)
> **Charlene Hansen**, Associate Director, Internal Audit (ex officio)
> **Program (SME) Support:**
> **Jeanne Marie Isola**, Project Director UWFT
> **Gwen Trentham**, Senior Business Architect UWFT
> **Bryan Hoult**, Senior Business Analyst UWFT
> **Sarah Cantwell**, Project Leader UWFT
Campus User Engagement

Core Team:
- 12-15 members
- Advisory for benchmarking effort
- Advisory for FDM (chart of accounts) design
- Ensure cohesive design across processes

Process Transformation Teams:
- 5-7 members each
- Review WD out of box functionality
- Develop high level future state process, aligning with guardrails
- Ensure cohesive design within processes
- Review prototyped WD configurations
Faculty Involvement

> **Current faculty involvement:**

  - Deans are represented on the Sponsor Team and UW Medicine Leadership Team
  - Communications plan which is currently being implemented will include:
    > Sharing talking points about UWFT to Deans, Chancellors, Chairs and other key leaders
    > Regular updates with the Board of Deans and Chancellors and this group

> **Faculty Advisory group(s) will be established to provide insights into the impacts of UWFT on faculty, examples include:**

  - Researchers/PIs that currently do their own post-award grants management
  - Faculty effort certification for research
  - Reporting needs for Chancellors/Deans/Chairs/Division Heads and other key faculty leaders

> **Seeking advice regarding additional venues/ideas for faculty engagement - discussion**
UWFT Today: Current Areas of Focus

- Documenting/incorporating learnings from April 20 Leadership Retreat
- Benchmarking and current state data gathering plan (side systems, etc.)
- Communications and stakeholder engagement planning and outreach (including regular updates to SCPB)
- Recruitment of AVP and other key positions
- Contract with and onboard Readiness Partner
  - Design future state Foundational Data Model (e.g., Chart of Accounts)
  - Design future state operating model
  - Build prototypes of key processes in Workday (supports campus engagement strategy)
QUESTIONS
IT Project Portfolio Executive Review

Aaron Powell
Vice President, UW-IT and Chief Information Officer
# UW Enterprise IT Projects

**Project Portfolio Executive Summary - 3/1/2018 (update: 5/21/18)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Oversight Level*</th>
<th>Overall Risk &amp; Project Health **</th>
<th>Budget Rating</th>
<th>Schedule Rating</th>
<th>Scope Rating</th>
<th>Issues Rating</th>
<th>Actual Cost (To Date)</th>
<th>Budget (Project Life)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[pending] Clinical Transformation</td>
<td>3 - OCIO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$159,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Transformation Readiness</td>
<td>3 - OCIO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$20,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy Inventory Management System</td>
<td>2 - UW</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$9,658,109</td>
<td>$14,010,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Personnel Applicant Tracking System</td>
<td>2 - UW</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200,353</td>
<td>$1,033,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pending] Northwest Hospital HR &amp; Labor Integration</td>
<td>2 - UW (?)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke Museum CRM</td>
<td>2 - UW</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$66,140</td>
<td>$115,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pending] F&amp;A Space</td>
<td>2 - (TBD)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System Improvement Project</td>
<td>1 - UW</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,888,108</td>
<td>$3,316,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum College CRM</td>
<td>1 - UW</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$700,678</td>
<td>$1,165,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketo</td>
<td>1 - UW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$608,066</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Completed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Oversight Level*</th>
<th>Go Live Date</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR/Payroll Modernization</td>
<td>3 - OCIO</td>
<td>June 16, 2017</td>
<td>June 30, 2017</td>
<td>$71,874,422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION