AGENDA

> Call to order
  - IT Service Investment Board Chair
> IT Governance evaluation process
> Recommendation for TRF FY 2019 rates
> ISC/Workday stabilization
> Finance Transformation update
> UW-IT FY 2019 Investment Planning update
> Oversight of University IT Projects
  - APS 2.3 Governance and Process
> Wrap up
IT Governance
Evaluation Process

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

> Initiating an evaluation process of IT Governance Boards
  – Value this Board’s advice and guidance and time commitment involved
  – Goal is to ensure Board continues to be effective and is a valuable use of your time

> Gather your input to identify
  – What’s working well, what could be improved
  – Important IT issues that should be considered by this Board

> Process
  – In-person meetings in February
  – Questions sent in advance
  – Results and recommendations shared at next meeting
QUESTIONS
Technology Recharge Fee FY 2019

Recommendation

Bill Ferris
Chief Financial Officer, UW-IT

Linda Nelson
Director of Finance & Administration, College of Arts & Sciences
TRF Advisory Committee Members

> Bill Ferris, UW Information Technology, Co-Chair
> Linda Rose Nelson, College of Arts & Sciences, Co-Chair
> Maureen (Mo) Broom, UW Medicine
> Kelly Campbell, Evans School of Public Policy & Governance
> Gary Farris, Graduate School
> David C. Green, School of Medicine
> Tim Rhoades, UW Bothell
> Barbara Wingerson, Finance & Facilities

> Ex Officio (non-voting):
  Betsy Bradsby, Research Accounting & Analysis
TRF Advisory Committee Charge

Support the IT Service Investment Board (SIB) in its annual review and assessment of the Technology Recharge Fee by providing analysis, identifying issues and making recommendations.

Timeline
TRF Committee >> Svc Investment Board >> EVP/Provost
Fall 2017 January 2018 February 2018
## TRF Rate History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY11*</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14*</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical Center</strong>*</td>
<td>$53.43</td>
<td>$53.43</td>
<td>$53.43</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.91</td>
<td>$51.34</td>
<td>$51.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus</strong></td>
<td>$52.68</td>
<td>$52.68</td>
<td>$52.68</td>
<td>$54.50</td>
<td>$54.50</td>
<td>$55.51</td>
<td>$56.13</td>
<td>$56.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The TRF supplements GOF/DOF resources to provide Basic Services
- Reduction of Dial Tone in FY11 rate resulted in ~$20 per phone/month, or $6M annual savings to campus

* Rate change for FY 14 reflects adjustment in methodology only

** Excluded from GOF/DOF Subsidy: Network & Telecom billed separately to Medical Centers resulting in an effective rate: $83.69
Proposal for FY 2019 – TRF Rate

> Maintain fundamental cost allocation methodology used for prior TRF
> UW-IT FY 2018 budget as base
> Modest Rate Increase ~2% for FY19
  – Cover Inflationary increases
    > Microsoft Campus License
    > Major maintenance agreements
## FY 2019 TRF Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRF Monthly Rate</th>
<th>FY17 &amp; 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>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus -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; Medical Centers Network & Telecom billed separately. Effective Medical Center rate $85.00
** Supplements existing GOF/DOF resources to provide Basic Services
Using Workday as new data source

> Transition from HEPPS to Workday as source
  > Use same basic criteria – Headcounts (not FTE), Monthly Salaried (exclude Hourly), Actively Paid (no auxiliary), and 4 Quarter Average

> Change
  > Home Dept. Budget # to Default Budget Number on Primary Position
  > Results in same total Headcount, minor changes to where allocated
QUESTIONS
AGENDA

> ISC Key Activities
> Stabilization/First Time in Workday Projects
> Campus Engagement
> New ISC Advisory Council
> Workday Governance Committee
ISC Key Activities

> Formally closed out the HRPM program with the BOR and the OCIO final reports

> During the first 29 weeks of operation 80,155 cases have been created for the ISC in UW Connect

> Of those, 97% are now in a resolved/closed status.
Weekly Totals of Cases Opened
Stabilization and First Time in Workday Projects
Stabilization and Transformation

> Large-scale, organizational change transforms the people, processes and technologies within the institution.

> Change of this magnitude can result in a dip in productivity and customer satisfaction.

> Operational stabilization is necessary to provide the framework for future process improvement and optimization.
Workday – First Time Project Examples

> Open Enrollment
  – Make full use of Workday for all Open Enrollment activities, including enrollments, verifications and direct communications

> Calendar Year-End
  – Leverage current Workday system functionality to the extent possible for 2017 payroll calendar year-end activities

> Fall Quarter Activities
  – Ensure that all fall hiring and onboarding activities go as smoothly as possible
Case Study: Open Enrollment 2018

- Closed with No Changes, 15,011 (45%)
- Closed with Changes, 18,134 (54%)
- Other, 486 (1%)
Open Enrollment Participation

PEBB Eligible Employees

> Start of Open Enrollment: 33,049
> Confirmation Statements: 33,133

Employees that made changes: 18,134

---

Open Enrollment Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>7439</td>
<td>6242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2821</td>
<td>3214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProStaff</td>
<td>7506</td>
<td>5035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp Hourly</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open Enrollment in Workday - Activity

ISC Tier 1 – November 1 – November 31

> UW Connect Cases: 4,411 closed and resolved cases
> Phone Volume: +73% in September, +91% since October

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Total Calls</th>
<th>Daily Avg.</th>
<th>Last four days of Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept (20 days)</td>
<td>5,503</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct (22 days)</td>
<td>6,066</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov (19 days)</td>
<td>10,523</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>3,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,043 on Nov 30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open Enrollment – Tailored Outreach

- Customized outreach to various employee audiences
- Variety of materials developed to meet the variety of user needs and preferences
- Multiple distribution channels used to maximize reach

ALL BENEFITS ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEES
SEGMENTED AUDIENCE (e.g., OE not submitted)
SEGMENTED AUDIENCE (e.g., OE not started)
SEGMENTED AUDIENCE (e.g., dependent verification)
SEGMENTED AUDIENCE (e.g., FSA/DCAP)
Campus Engagement
Campus Engagement

ISC Advisory Council
- Campus change leaders
- Strategic prioritization
- Troubleshoot pain points

HR/ISC Admin Forum
- Managers
- Policy interpretation
- Processes and protocols

Named Support Contacts
- Specialized training
- Hands-on system know-how
- Networking and peer-support

Administrators’ Corner
- User guides, time-sensitive information
- Access to audience-specific resources
- Known issues and resolutions

Mobile Support Units
ISC Advisory Council

This newly-formed group of ISC campus customers will:

> Meet regularly to discuss what is working well, both system and business process, and what needs to be improved
> Help define and create a more stable, sustainable and optimized experience
> Review the ISC Roadmap of known projects and current operational support requirements
> Provide suggestions for improvement, which will then be prioritized and rationalized against known commitments
Workday Governance

This newly-formed group of campus leadership members will:

> Ensure the UW achieves priorities and successful delivery of the Workday HR system

> Initial focus: stabilization and prioritization with limited resources

> Specific Guardrails:
  – Provide input on prioritization of major projects
  – Promote a culture of collaboration and ensure organizational alignment
  – Support risk mitigation and change leadership
  – Weigh in on sensitive issues that arise
  – Offer SME on any major and relevant policy changes
QUESTIONS
Finance Transformation Update

Ann Anderson
Associate Vice President, Enterprise Services
## Finance Transformation Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program at a Glance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upcoming Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Overview
Why Finance Transformation?
Project Background

Define a Finance Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Strategy for replacing the UW’s and UW Medicine’s legacy financial systems and transforming financial processes:

> Gather **HRP Insights** documenting lessons learned
> Include an **assessment of Workday Financials versus Oracle Financials Cloud** in order to confirm Workday is the right decision for the enterprise
> Include **detailed fit-gap of business requirements** against capabilities of the Preferred Solution (i.e., Workday Financials) in order to identify level of fit and workarounds for gaps
> Document the **business case**
> Define the **recommended approach for the implementation** including functional and organizational phasing
> Develop a **Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) for system replacement** that reflects an aggressive yet realistic timeline and a budget quality estimate
Business Case – The Opportunity

> **Financial Management**
> Close books on a timely basis
> Improve visibility into financial performance and accountability for results
> Improve ability to manage operating margins more closely and prevent operating deficits
> Deploy funds more effectively for maximum impact
> Improve quality and accuracy of reporting and make it easier to manage operations with more accurate and up-to-date information
> Pull data rapidly to make better decisions and avoid mistakes as conditions change or opportunities present themselves
> Strengthen support for core finance functions across the university
> Reduce investment in side systems used to compensate for deficiencies in legacy system
> Drive more consistent and standardized processes across the university and lay foundation for greater efficiency

> **Reporting & Information Management**
> Strengthen internal controls and reduce risks including risk of fraud and security breaches
> Reduce reliance on legacy system knowledge and risk of operability or system failure

> **Operational Efficiency & Effectiveness**
> Reduce investment in side systems used to compensate for deficiencies in legacy system
> Drive more consistent and standardized processes across the university and lay foundation for greater efficiency

> **Risk Management**
> Strengthen internal controls and reduce risks including risk of fraud and security breaches
> Reduce reliance on legacy system knowledge and risk of operability or system failure
Business Case – The Opportunity

Deans, Chairs, Principal Investigators, Faculty and Clinical Operations

> **Single source of truth** that sheds light across Schools, Departments, Divisions and units

> **Robust reporting that promotes shared understanding and alignment and facilitates collaboration**

> **Timely and reliable information** that supports **proactive decision-making** instead of reactive

> **Reduced number** of disparate and duplicative **side systems**

> **Administrators and staff freed up from manual entry and reconciliation of data in order to support higher value activities aligned with mission**

> **Easier access to information** and insights into funds available for mission-driven activities

> **Real-time updates to projects** such as research grants and gifts

> **Comprehensive, timely management and financial reporting** across all academic and clinical entities and services

> **More time** for activities in the classroom, laboratory, clinic or hospital

> **Improved services** from support staff
Business Case Objectives = Major Transformation

> The following five key financial capabilities were identified by key financial leaders and stakeholders. Prioritization of work that drives improvement in these capabilities will result in the biggest benefits from the UWFT Program

– Accural Accounting
– Monthly Financial Statements (includes Budget and Actual)
– Consolidated accounts receivable
– Inbound and outbound cash flow visibility
– Forecasting/Projections to support short- and long-term planning (Wave 2)
Major Transformation Examples

> Moving from annual close to **monthly close** across enterprise
> Ability to identify key elements of the work breakdown structure required in certain units (e.g., APL Department of Defense)
> Introducing **monthly financial statements including budget to actuals**
> Moving from **cash basis to accrual basis accounting**
> Moving to **consolidated accounts receivable**
> **Transforming reporting processes** to the State, Board of Regents, leadership, bond rating agencies, other external organizations
> **Changing tracking** for investments, cash, gifts/endowment, and debt activities
> Moving to **automated bank reconciliation** process and exception review
> Standardization of **post-award grants** management
Scenario 2a Timeline with 18-Month Readiness

<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></td>
<td>Wave 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness 18 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation 24 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stabilization 12 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wave 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilization 12 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Better Aligned for Success:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Allows More Time to Stabilize After HRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Provides Necessary Time for Readiness Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Allows More Time for Staff Ramp Up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Lower Technical Risk:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Avoids Temporary Integrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Provides More Time for Supply Chain Functionality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Somewhat Higher Program Risk*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Larger Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Paradigm Shift to Enterprise-Wide Decision-Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Competing Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Go-live on biennium close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Shorter Implementation Timeline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Risks will be managed through mitigation strategies*
Scope of UWFT – Scenario 2a TCO

Data was collected to support this framework:

**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 Enterprise Information, Integration & Analytics (EIIA) (Enterprise Integration Platform, Finance Data Warehouse & BI Portal)
- UWM EIIA
- Change Management
- Technical and Functional Readiness

**System Replacement**
- FAS
- McKesson HEMM for UWMC, HMC and NWH
- McKesson HEFM for UWMC, HMC and NWH
- BGT
- OASIS
- FASTRANS
- MyFD
- JD Edwards
- eFECs
- Ariba
- UWMC Bar Interface
- Sage 100 for UWP
- MS Dynamics for UWNC, ALNW
- PAS

1 Valley Medical Center will be integration only
2 Assumes integrations only
3 Includes Effort Certification, Cost Share and Labor Distribution
4 Wave 2
High Level 18-Month Readiness Timeline

**Prep**
- Define Strategic guardrails
- Determine process transformation goals
- Define communication and change mgmt. and training strategies
- Develop Enterprise Requirements Database
- Recruit, onboard and training for key positions
- Hire, on-board, and training readiness team
- RFP, Contract and on-board Readiness Partner
- Detailed Readiness Planning
- Define Foundational Data Model (FDM) Approach and Methodology
- Workday contracting

**Blue Print**
- Design new FDM
- Operating model strategy
- Execution of top business process transformation and Technical priorities (identified in workshops)
- Define Portfolio Mgmt and Unit Engagement Strategy including business unit remediation of side-side systems, integrations, and business process changes
- Prioritize process inventory
- Document current state and envision future state for example process in each end to end process area.
- Start HRP Remediation Activities
- Define IT Strategy for EDW/BI Portals
- Strategic decision on share/centralized service models
- Update Systems inventory and retirement strategy
- Onboard readiness partner

**Prototype**
- Prototype new FDM
- Prototype future state processes
- Develop use cases
- Prototype playback sessions
- Document Enterprise Requirements in technical requirement database
- Detailed Future State Systems Landscape
- Update Systems Retirement and Remediation Strategy

**Design**
- Complete Workday design Workbook
- Campus Training Strategy defined
- Iterate on Reports, Conversion, and Integration Discovery
- Design Data Integration for Inbound/Outbound interfaces and inventory of system transactions
- Begin Implementation Planning
- Scope FDM converter capabilities
- Develop detailed conversions plan
- Define reports strategy
- Define EDW/BI Portal strategy
Upcoming Activities

> Continue funding discussions with key leadership
> Confirm program approval requirements (e.g., with the State of Washington OCIO)
> Hold Sponsor Onboarding and Guardrails Retreat
> Define methodology and approach to Readiness
> Prepare RFP for Readiness/Integrator
Appendix
HRP Lessons Learned
HP Insights – Challenges/Recommendations

Program Strategy, Leadership, Program Management, Implementation

**Program Strategy**
- Began with a **business focused approach**, but as leadership changed and timing narrowed, a system (technology) approach was taken. This impacted the overall effectiveness of the desired business transformation
- Many requirements were from the perspective of Central and/or how things were done currently in legacy system. A **more successful program should have future state requirements with a customer focus** (including accessibility) program
- Improper **sizing** resulted in **scope** reduction as time lapsed. Had the program been initially right-sized for the aggressive timeline, it may have resulted in a more ideal Phase 1 solution

**Leadership**
- The University should ask itself if it has the **transformational leadership** in place because the UWFT Program will be disruptive. Leadership should lead the transformation effort and not expect the Program to do it on its own, as to what happened for HRPM
- **The Board and Leadership needs** people to tell them things they do not want to hear with conviction and experience taking HRPM as a lesson regarding the TCO, transformation, and scope

**Program Management**
- The shift from managing silo-ed projects to a single connected program was a **major success factor** in the reset
- The program picked up momentum once they adopted the **Agile Methodology** and worked in sprints
- **Basic project management** techniques were not initially adopted, such as not having a consolidated program-wide Risk and Issues log
- Moving into a **team-like environment with Pods** being co-located and embedded in the program made a positive difference

**Implementation**
- **Readiness**: Map current state processes to help define the change impact to adopt future state. Gather all IT systems and source data
- **Design**: Was an issue throughout the program. Processes need to be designed in an end-to-end manner
- **Testing**: Align testing to the requirements and business process; leverage automated testing tools. The testing approach should include trying to break the system; and introduce UAT earlier
- **Prototyping**: Nine prototypes helped enabled a successful Go-Live. Only accomplished by having automated tools
HRP Insights – Challenges/Recommendations

Campus Outreach, Change Management, Resourcing

Campus Outreach
- Mobile deployment units should be sent out earlier
- A representative group “Admin Network” aimed at communication, which later reached over 600, needed more governance and penetration
- An education campaign focused on all of campus, if conducted earlier would have solved a lot of problems and could have exposed many people on campus who never saw a demo of Workday before Go-Live
- The classroom setting for end-user training was most successful and also acted as a testing team

Change Management
- Need a change management plan that has buy-in from leadership and is flexible enough to change as needed
- Need a question-resolution process embedded into campus early on
- Did not talk about “standardization” but found influencer units (ex. A&S, SOM) to be an example to others and talked to leadership about the cost of not standardizing
- Develop a transition team that can go to each unit to bring current state into future state

Resourcing
- Was not properly resourced from the start, began with 70 FTEs, now at 150 FTEs
- More campus resources needed to be embedded into Pods earlier in the process, these resources should go back to campus iteratively
- If you want to attract and retain the best and brightest, there needs to be a plan with the capacity to retain and develop talent which comes from the top
- The majority of contributed labor was not factored into the TCO, additionally all staff should be at least 50% contributed and embedded in the program
- Each Pod should include: Campus, Project Managers, UW IT, Training and Change Management
- Need on the ground Consultants who know Workday and Higher Education not just the system
- Need clear Consultant communication and an ownership matrix should be developed
- Pair Consultant and UW staff earlier in the process for knowledge transfer
- Adequate time should be allocated for onboarding and ramp-up, should leverage the toolkit and have new hires spend ½ a day going through the it before joining their team
Working w/ State

- Understand the State’s requirements and constraints (old technology) that are not readily available nor documented
- Do not be afraid to pushback and explain to them why they should accept proposed solution

Technical Strategies

- Establish early on a document management methodology and train people to use it effectively
- Leverage tools and processes that reflect typical SDLC
- Automate data collection activities and leverage tools to build reports from the outset. Need tool other than Excel
- Leverage the guidelines for integrations developed during the HRPM program
- Have both functional and technical specifications for conversions well documented
- Build reports early on and leverage these to show end users the system

Post Go-Live

- When selecting the Go-Live date, also consider the physical day of the week. This coupled with the end of the academic year all had an impact on HRPM’s Go-Live and quality of conversion data
- Without the Integrated Support Center (ISC) the program would not have been successful, this needs to be scoped properly
- Did not expect ticket volume to be as high as it was the first two weeks
QUESTIONS
UW-IT FY 2019 Investment Planning Update

Erik Lundberg
Assistant Vice President, Research Computing, Collaboration & Strategy, UW-IT
FY 2019 Investment Planning Process and Status

> Streamlining our internal Investment Planning process
> Putting strategy up front in the process
> No scoring this year
> We will be coming back to you
Oversight of University IT Projects

APS 2.3 Governance and Process

Erik Lundberg
Assistant Vice President, Research Computing, Collaboration & Strategy, UW-IT
IT Project Oversight Recent Chronology

1. Governor’s Directive 16-01 - *Critical Systems List*
   - Jan, 2016

2. OCIO Policy 114 - *Change Mgmt of IT Systems*
   - Mar, 2016

3. Update of APS 2.3 - *IT Acq & Investment Policy*
   - May, 2017

4. Updated OCIO Risk Assessment Tool & Process
   - May, 2017

5. Oversight of large IT projects at UW
   - May, 2017
Update of APS 2.3

“Policy on IT, Telecommunications and Networking Projects and Acquisitions”

> Previous policy update: July 2005
> Updated May 2016 to describe the new IT Governance process
   — IT Strategy Board has oversight responsibilities for all major investments (HR/P and other major ERP projects)
   — IT Service Investment Board has oversight responsibilities for other significant UW-IT investments
> Exemptions - Academic & Health Care by statute, Small (UW)
> UW Investment Procedures/Guidelines
Update of APS 2.3 -- Exemptions

> An "Academic Exemption" project or acquisition, which is only available to technology acquisitions, projects, or infrastructures that are primarily for conducting research, or other scholarly activities, or for instructional activities. However, *proposed academic applications that are enterprise-wide in nature relative to the needs and interests of other State institutions of higher education must be disclosed by VP UW-IT to the State CIO*.

> A “Health Care-related Exemption” for “Medical, clinical, or health care application including business and administrative applications” is exempt from State CIO approval and reporting, *but is subject to institutional reviews, approvals, and oversight, and must be conducted in accordance with a memorandum of understanding between VP UW-IT and UW Medicine*.

> A “Small Project Exemption” - from UW oversight
   — Level 1;  
   — less than $1M project;  
   — single department impact;  
   — no impact on central systems or resources
Oversight Levels - Ranking

The level of approval and oversight required on a given project is determined through the assessment of project risk and severity. The highest level evaluation in a category determines the severity or risk level for that category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Severity</strong></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Severity</strong></td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Severity</strong></td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oversight Levels - Criteria

Risk and Severity are each rated using four categories of criteria using a Risk/Severity Calculator.

The highest level evaluation in a category determines the severity or risk level for that category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Impact on Clients</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
<th>Impact on State Operations</th>
<th>Failure or nil consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk - Probability</th>
<th>Functional Impact on Business Processes or Rules</th>
<th>Development Effort &amp; Resources</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Capability &amp; Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New OCIO Risk Assessment Tool

Conduct Concept Review to Confirm UW Oversight

UW Oversight

State Oversight

Level 1

Level 2

Level 3

18

34

45

72

Negligible

Low

Moderate

High
# 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></td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Project*</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Small Project*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>single-dept</td>
<td>(Level 2, 3)</td>
<td>single-dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>multi-dept*</td>
<td>&lt;12 Mo</td>
<td>multi-dept*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 12 Mo</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 12 Mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 5</td>
<td>Oversight Level</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 5</td>
<td>Total Project Cost (Investment Cost &amp; System Life Cycle Cost)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.A</td>
<td>Project Plan</td>
<td>-- Q 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Approvals required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec.</th>
<th>UW CIO Approval or Concurrency</th>
<th>8.A</th>
<th>Q 5.A</th>
<th>Q 5.B</th>
<th>concur</th>
<th>concur</th>
<th>concur</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>X (A)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.B</td>
<td>UW IT Gov Board Oversight, Advice, Recommendation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>maybe</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>

## State CIO Approval

| Sec. | State Office of Financial Management (for Financial & Admin systems) | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

## Project Status Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec.</th>
<th>Qtrly Status Reports to UW CIO</th>
<th>10.C</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>Q 1</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>X (B)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.B</td>
<td>Qtrly Status Reports to UW IT Gov Board</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>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.C</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</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>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.C</td>
<td>Status Reports to State CIO</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>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oversight of IT Projects at UW

> Current large projects
  — HR/Payroll Modernization
  — Transportation System Improvement Project
  — Pharmacy Inventory Management System

> Other significant projects
  — Burke Customer Management
  — Continuum College Admissions
  — Marketo
Oversight of IT Projects at UW

> Process and procedures in three areas...
  — UW-IT projects – *established process*
  — UW Medicine projects – *established process*
  — Other acquisitions and projects – *A challenge: How do we manage for this sector?*

> Realms
  — administrative - *subject to all OCIO reporting and governance requirements*
  — academic (instructional and research) - *exempt from OCIO oversight*

> Drivers – *why we care*
  — expectations for central resources - *need to prioritize, fund, etc.*
  — security - *greater emphasis now, and growing rapidly*
  — accessibility - *increasing emphasis*
  — sustainability - *Climate Action Plan, energy efficiency, etc.*
  — avoiding duplicative services
  — strategic fit
  — accountability to OCIO for administrative systems
Oversight of IT Projects at UW

> How we manage large “distributed” IT projects
  — Intake through UW-IT website
  — Communications (awareness)
Oversight of IT Projects at UW

IT projects and acquisitions
Your guide to reporting requirements for technology investments at the UW

On This Page
- About the policy.
- Our online tool for determining policy requirements.

About the policy for all IT projects and acquisitions at the UW

All information technology (IT) projects and acquisitions at the University of Washington (UW) must comply with the UW's policy governing how projects are reported and tracked and how money is spent, regardless of the funding source. This policy is outlined in the UW's Administrative Policy Statement on Information Technology, Telecommunications and Networking Projects and Acquisitions (APS 2.3).

This website is your guide to what you need to do to comply, and provides an online tool to help you identify the requirements for your specific IT project or acquisition.

Who should follow this policy?
The rules for technology investment and stewardship guidelines apply to every IT project or acquisition within any unit or conducted by any individual throughout the University of
QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION