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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
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
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?
Findings and Recommendations (continued)

> **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
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
Critical IT Issues - Summary
Critical IT Issues - Summary

> 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
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 – Critical IT Issues and Detailed Findings
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 it
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
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Agenda

Program Updates:
> Current Areas of Focus
> Guiding Principles
> Leadership Retreat
> Governance Update
> Stakeholder Engagement
> Maintaining Momentum
> Timeline and Program Scope
Current Areas of Focus

> Documenting Outcomes of April 20 Leadership Retreat
> Readiness and Resource Planning
> Benchmarking and Current State Data Gathering Plan
> Communications and Stakeholder Engagement Strategies
> Technology Level Setting and Strategy
> Recruitment of AVP and BAs
> Development of Project Toolset (JIRA, SharePoint)
Where are we and where are we going?

Where we are . . .

> Largely Decentralized and Federated
> Sacrificing enterprise efficiency in order to optimize processes for the unit

Where we’re 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
How do we plan to get there?

> Establish leadership commitment to promote standardization and limit exceptions (aka “special snowflakes”)

> Implement strategic change management that highlights the value of enterprise optimization and engages key stakeholders in design activities

> Identify variation through an analysis of current state processes to enable a future state design that minimizes process variability across the enterprise

> Innovate and transform business processes by capitalizing on UW’s entrepreneurial spirit

> Define exception criteria and implement a robust approval process for exceptions
Guiding Principles

A set of general rules that help program team and governance members make the right decisions when faced with a choice. They are rarely amended and are used to inform and support the manner in which an organization sets about fulfilling its mission.

Guardrails

Guardrails are intended to help program team and governance members make high-quality decisions faster and with less risk. They are designed to keep projects from unintentionally straying into dangerous territory as well as to support greater alignment across an organization by providing a context for understanding the business needs.

Tactics

Assessments that consider both short and long term needs when describing how the Finance System fits into the broader UW (UW Academy and UW Medicine) Business and IT ecosystem. They evolve from guardrails and provide detailed tactics for UWFT team members to follow when configuring the system.
Guiding Principles

> Senior Leaders are engaged and unified in supporting UW Finance Transformation as a top 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
Example of Guiding Principle, Guardrail and Tactic

- Guiding Principle – The computing infrastructure and services are consolidated and integrated across the Enterprise to eliminate redundancy, justifying any exceptions

- Guardrail – Use standard approach to Workday integrations across UW and UW Medicine to eliminate redundancy in alignment with business needs

- Tactic – Integration from Workday to Enterprise Integration Platform (EIP); EIP to supply data to downstream systems
Leadership Retreat Objectives

> Establish a common understanding of pertinent program information going forward, such as our shared vision and key definitions

> Review program work to date, and capture the best thinking regarding guiding principles and stakeholder engagement

> Deep dive into the guiding principles with a focus on how to achieve targeted productivity gains, maintain momentum, decrease program costs, and minimize rework, including the identification of known risks
What is Program Governance?

> Program governance is the management framework within which program decisions are made

> The goal is to provide a decision-making framework that is logical, robust and repeatable to govern an organization’s investments
Top Governance Challenges

- Difficulty driving to consensus
- Decisions are not timely enough
- Don’t follow escalation path
- Making decisions that stick
- Passive-aggressive governance: end runs, silent "coup," reversals
- Inconsistent prioritization and resource allocation
- Lack of accountability
- Factional strife (e.g., business unit vs. business unit)
- Aligning decisions with changing conditions
- Balancing delivery with innovation
- Governance body is not representative of key stakeholders impacted
- Decisions made are sub optimal, addressing needs of only small group of stakeholders
- Decisions are not aligned with guiding principles and guardrails
UWFT Governance Structure

- Board of Deans and Chancellors
- Accounting Advisory
- Process Transformation Teams
- UW Medicine Leadership
- Technical Advisory
- Faculty Advisory

*Administrative leadership for program team is VP Finance*
## UWFT Governance Structure

### President and Provost
- Ana Mari Cauce, UW President
- Jerry Baldasty, UW Provost

### Program Sponsorship
- Jeff Scott, EVP, Finance and Administration; Exec Sponsor
- Aaron Powell, VP UWIT and CIO
- Brian McCartan, VP Finance
- Jacqueline Cabe, CFO, UWM and VPMA UW
- Joy Grosser, CIO, UWM
- Ruth Mahan, Chief Business Officer - UWM and VPMA UW
- Sandra Archibald, Dean of Evans School
- Sarah N. Hall, Assoc. VP, Planning and Budgeting
- Sean Sullivan, Chair of Board of Deans

### Operational (SME) Support:
- Ann Anderson, Assoc. VP, UW-Finance
- Erik Walerius, Chief Supply Chain Officer, UWM
- Maureen Broom, Assoc. VP and UWM Enterprise Finance Officer
- Sue Camber, Assoc. VP and Controller, UW Finance Ex-Officio
- Anna Brannen, Bluecrane (external QA)
- Laura Parma, OCIO
- Richard Cordova, Exec. Director, Internal Audit

### Program Leadership Team (PLT)
- TBD, Asst. VP, Finance Transformation
- Anja Canfield-Budde, Interim Assoc. VP, UW-IT
- Ann Anderson, Assoc. VP, UW-Finance
- Beth Britt, UWITS
- Brett Simmons, UWM IT
- Dan Schaaf, Assoc. Controller, UW Finance
- Dave Green, SOM
- Jason Campbell, Sr. Dir., Financial Analysis & Budget Strategy
- Jeff Techico, UWM

### Program (SME) Support:
- Jim Kresl, Asst. Vice Provost, Office of Vice Provost Research
- Linda Nelson, A&S
- Maureen Hooley, UWP
- Tammy Ayyoub, Controller, UW Med

- Jeanne Marie Isola, Project Director UWFT
- Jenn Dickey, Senior Project Analyst, UWFT Ex-Officio
- Richard Cordova, Exec. Director, Internal Audit
Issue Escalation Process

> Promote identification and timely resolution of issues that represent material impact to program cost, schedule, or quality

> **Mitigate the impact of any potential delay** in issue resolution by having a clear, widely understood escalation path with a standard review cadence for all issue types

> **Empower the program** to efficiently make decisions and resolve issues rapidly at the appropriate level

> **Utilize escalation criteria to tailor issue analysis** to governance structure, accountability levels, and distribution of stakeholder expertise

> Mechanism to resolve issues with cross institutional or strategic implications needs to be resolved at the program leadership level
What are the Escalation Criteria?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Escalation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Budget</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar value variance &gt; x% or x $ in projected vs actual amount or spend rate in Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Budget</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar value variance &gt; x% or x $ in operating costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schedule</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slip in schedule due to missed milestones over a specified number of days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope Change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in number of functions or entities included in scope (extemporaneously)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Risks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latent discovery of technology roadblocks, missed integration requirements, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impacted Stakeholders</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders associated with other major projects or are otherwise sensitive to any changes in schedule or budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution that has impacts to upstream or downstream stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal or Compliance Issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program issues that are related to the ability to meet legal or other compliance requirements in the solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deviation from guiding principles, guardrails or tactics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program issues where solution is not aligned with agreed upon guiding principles, guardrails or tactics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder Engagement

Proven success with University Services Renewal (USER) project model

Engaging University community
- UW Employees
- Sponsors*
- Steering Committee
- End-User Planning Teams
- Technical Teams
- USER Task Teams
- Units/Departments
- Business Stewards**

USER PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT TEAMS
Iterative Approach
- Test ideas
- Get feedback
- Engage in dialogue
- Collaborate

Outcomes
- Web tools for Users
- Streamlined business practices
- Culture of change

ADAPTING USER PROJECT MODEL FOR FINANCE TRANSFORMATION
Process Transformation Teams

- Process Transformation Team: Manage Cash and Financial Assets
- Process Transformation Team: Hire to Retire
- Process Transformation Team: Project Inception to Close
- Process Transformation Team: Asset Acquire to Retire
- Process Transformation Team: Plan and Manage the Business
- Process Transformation Team: Supplier Requisition to Payment
- Process Transformation Team: Grant Award to Close
- Process Transformation Team: Record to Report
- User Task Group around specific need

Core Team FDM, Integrated Prototype
Other Engagement Strategies?

> Focus Group participant
> Participant in Workday demos
> Participant in surveys
> Beta tester
What Can Impact Momentum?

> Key leadership and direction changes
  - Program (e.g., vacant AVP)
  - Key stakeholder groups (e.g., incoming Provost)
  - Key governance roles

> Competing Priorities
  - Other major projects
  - Ongoing operating priorities

> Resistance to change
  - Unclear value
  - Unspoken concerns

> Slow decision making
  - Collaborative nature of culture and “management by committee”

Large, complex programs fail to deliver anticipated outcomes nearly 70% of the time.
## Best Practices to Maintain Momentum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Define program vision and priorities at the highest executive level</th>
<th>2. Invest in strong program governance and leadership</th>
<th>3. It’s about the people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Establish a compelling reason for change  &gt; Create a stake in the outcome  &gt; Infuse the organization with purposeful action  &gt; Set priorities across the enterprise (major projects)  &gt; Clear objectives</td>
<td>&gt; Basic project management approaches do not scale  &gt; Sets the tone for the initiative  &gt; Drive, determination and passion are needed to deliver large scale change  &gt; Instill confidence with a positive focus, while having hard conversations  &gt; Leaders need to continually plan and adapt to keep pace with changing complexity</td>
<td>&gt; Identify key roles and skills – get the right people at the right time  &gt; Empower and support teams to do what they do best  &gt; Resources will change – have a robust knowledge transfer process and leverage interim roles where needed  &gt; Perception is powerful – leverage change management techniques throughout the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Best Practices to Maintain Momentum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Communication should be concise, honest and timely</td>
<td>&gt; Push decision making down to the lowest level</td>
<td>&gt; Be realistic about the progress you expect to see; aim to crawl, walk, or run as appropriate</td>
<td>&gt; Despite the best plans and intentions, change will come and it will be disruptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Be present or send an informed designate</td>
<td>&gt; Gather the right information and represent differing viewpoints</td>
<td>&gt; Set checkpoints to objectively measure progress and prepare to adjust</td>
<td>&gt; Where possible, build in contingency in both schedule and cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Foster an environment of truth telling where participants can be heard and concerns addressed</td>
<td>&gt; Confidently make decisions and stand by them – limit rework and backtracking</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Don’t stand still – encourage other work to move forward while key decisions are evaluated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Program Dependencies

> Retreat deliverables (for inputs to RFP)
  – Guiding Principles
  – Governance and decision making
  – Stakeholder engagement
  – UW and UWM requirements
> UWFT as a top administrative priority (resource capacity)
> Readiness Phase work plan and staffing plan
  – Vendor Strategy
  – Finalize key roles and responsibilities required for readiness
  – Assumptions around contributed staff
> Leadership transitions
  – Hiring of AVP
  – VP of Finance
> Ability to engage broadly with units
# 90 Day Plan – April 9 – July 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Financials</td>
<td>FY18/FY19 Budget Updates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retreat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Retreat</td>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finalize Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsor Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>Existing Staff &amp; Contributed Labor Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority Role Recruiting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onboarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness Vendor</td>
<td>RFI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vendor Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update Draft RFP and Approve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Release RFP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Top 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses Due</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHANGE MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Management Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change Management Plan &amp; Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>UWFT Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Gathering Announcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUSINESS PROCESS TRANSFORMATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Process Team</td>
<td>Appointment Letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kickoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Logistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vendor Planning, Workshops and Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current State Data Gathering</td>
<td>Taxonomy Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X-Walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gartner Activities (TBD)</td>
<td>Data Gathering Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Staffing Refinement</td>
<td>Establish TLT, TCO, Issue &amp; Risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Readiness Phase Objectives, Integration Approach, Develop Guardrails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# UWFT Program Timeline by Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>FY2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wave 0</td>
<td>Readiness 18 mos.</td>
<td>Wave 1 – Core Financials &amp; Supply Chain Implementation 24 mos.</td>
<td>Wave 1 Stabilization 12 mos.</td>
<td>Wave 2 Planning 6 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 2 Stabilization 9 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Wave 0
Readiness 18 mos.

## Wave 1
- Core Financials & Supply Chain Implementation 24 mos.
- Stabilization 12 mos.

## Wave 2
Planning 6 mos.

### Big Bang with 18 Month Readiness

**Better Aligned for Success:**
- Allows more time to stabilize after HRP
- Provides necessary time for readiness activities
- Allows more time for staff ramp up in readiness

**Lower Technical Risk:**
- Avoids temporary integrations
- Provides more time for supply chain functionality

**Somewhat Higher Program Risk***
- Larger scope
- Paradigm shift to enterprise-wide decision making
- Competing priorities
- Go-live on biennium close
- Shorter implementation timeline and steep ramp up for implementation

*A “Big Bang” deployment provides a stronger foundation for achieving business benefits because design decisions will be integrated across the enterprise.

*Risks will be managed through mitigation strategies.
Scope: Organizational and Functional Scope

**Organizational**
- UW Academy
- UW Medicine
  - UW Medical Center
  - UW Neighborhood Clinics
  - Harborview Medical Center
  - UW Physicians
  - Airlift Northwest
  - Northwest Hospital
- Other UW Entities
  - Real Estate Entities
  - Portage Bay
  - Metro Tract

**Functional**
- Banking and Settlement
- Budgets
- Business Assets
- Customer Accounts
- Customer Contracts
- Endowments
- Expenses
- Financial Accounting
- Grants Management
- Inventory
- Procurement
- Projects
- Supplier Accounts
- Supplier Contracts
- Transaction Tax
- Foundation Data Model
- Planning (includes OpEx, Capital and Workforce Planning)

**Other**
- HCM Workday Remediation
- Conversions
- Integrations
- Workday Reports
- UW Academy EIIA (Enterprise Integration Platform, Finance Data Warehouse & BI Portal)
- UWM EIIA
- Change Management
- Technical and Functional Readiness

---

1 Valley Medical Center will be integration only
2 Assumes Integrations only
3 Includes Effort Certification, Cost Share and Labor Distribution
4 Wave 2
QUESTIONS
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
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.

**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.

**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.
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.
Executive Summary of Recommendations for the Provost

> Create a new data governance structure that has a steering and operational committee
> Include Seattle, Bothell, and Tacoma
> Initial scope: academic, research administration and business data
> 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

Steering Committee

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

Operational Committee

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

Task Forces

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

Collaboratively Building and Empowering Existing Resources

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.
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.

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.

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

3. If/as needed research unknowns.

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 RELATED GROUPS
Others TBD
Data Custodians for the data areas in scope
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 exist 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.


**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

**STEERING COMMITTEE**

**OPERATIONAL COMMITTEE**

**TASK FORCE**

Data Custodians
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
Example of Data Governance Structure in Action

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEERING COMMITTEE</th>
<th>5. Review OC recommendations and determine a short and long term strategy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONAL COMMITTEE</td>
<td>4. Review research and recommend action plan for SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK FORCE</td>
<td>3. Researches and analyzes scope of changes to data, technology, and business processes. Summarize internal and external requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Advocate</td>
<td>1. Individuals with shared concerns meet to formulate problem statement and proposed solutions for OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXAMPLE OF RELATED GROUPS</td>
<td>Articulate additional expertise or perspective needed from:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workday Sponsor Group and Steering Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Transformation Gov (TBD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


6. Partner with relevant orgs to create project proposal.
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>Topic</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
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.
Next Steps

- Communicate:
  - Develop communication plan for new data governance structure, upon Provost review and approval

- Identify Members:
  - Identify potential members for Steering Committee and Operational Committee

- Charge Committees:
  - Draft and send charge letters

- Fund Resources:
  - Fund resource request and create positions

- Establish Resources:
  - Establish positions, reporting and working relationships, and hire positions

- Coordinate:
  - Determine how data governance structure will coordinate with related governance
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
UW-IT and UW Major IT Project Portfolios

Erik Lundberg
Assistant Vice President, Research Computing & Strategy, UW-IT
# UW-IT Active Projects

## May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Prior...</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW Enterprise-wide Captioning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM Modernization: Course Rollout and Program Proposals (CMM2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst Tools Deprecation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand JV Transactions in MyFD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Info Sys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAM2 - Budgeting &amp; Packaging Aid &amp; Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Info Sys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MyUW: Instructor, Staff, and UWCC Integration + Retire Legacy System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Info Sys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDM Oracle Webcenter Replacement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Info Sys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications Upgrade Phase 3 - Node 1 Migration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Infra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring - System and Service Incident Automation (SSIA)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Infra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WestIn Power and Infrastructure Modernization Project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Infra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container-Based Computing (Discovery)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Infra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Modernization - Deskmail Retirement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery (BC/DR) Tool</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk Mgt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPM6 - Project Portfolio Management Migration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>IT Mgt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Catalog Restructure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>IT Mgt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITFL: IT Billing, Inventory &amp; Asset Modernization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>IT Mgt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Outage and Service Status User Experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>IT Mgt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# UW Major IT Projects

## UW Enterprise IT Projects

### Project Portfolio Executive Summary - Mar 2018

<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>Clinical Transformation</td>
<td>3 - OCIO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Transformation</td>
<td>3 - OCIO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$20,200,000</td>
<td></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>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>F&amp;A Space</td>
<td>2 - (TBD)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</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>
# APS 2.3 Institutional Oversight Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec.</th>
<th>Considerations &amp; Documents to prepare ***</th>
<th>Academic Exemption</th>
<th>Medical Exemption</th>
<th>All Others (Non-Exempt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Stewardship</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4, 5 Oversight Level</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4, 5 Total Project Cost (Investment Cost &amp; System Life Cycle Cost)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.A Project Plan</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Q 2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Approvals required | 8.A UW CIO Approval or Concurrence | Q 5.A | Q 5.B | concur | concur | concur | X (A) | X | -- | X | X | X | X |
|                   | 4 State CIO Approval                      | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | X |
|                   | 4 State Office of Financial Management (for Financial & Admin systems) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | X |

| Project Status Reporting | 10.C Ctrlly Status Reports to UW CIO | -- | -- | -- | -- | Q 1 |
|                          | 10.C Ctrlly Status Reports to UW IT Gov Board | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|                          | 10.B Quality Assurance | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|                          | 10.C Status Reports to State CIO | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | X |

### Notes:
- X: Required
- Q: Quarterly
- UWM: UW Management
- UW: UW
- X (ext.): Extended

---

This chart is ready for review...
QUESTIONS
Technology Recharge Fee FY 2019 Update

Bill Ferris
Chief Financial Officer, UW-IT
The Provost and EVPFA has approved FY 2019 Technology Recharge Fee as recommended by the IT Service Investment Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRF Monthly Rate</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>$ Increase</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Med Center Employee*</td>
<td>$51.34</td>
<td>$52.20</td>
<td>$0.86</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin/Academic Employee</td>
<td>$56.13</td>
<td>$57.28</td>
<td>$1.15</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excluded from GOF/DOF subsidy; Network & Telecom billed separately. Effective rate $85.00.
QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION