AGENDA

> Call to Order
> Faculty Council – IT Governance check in
> Data Governance
> State of Higher Ed productivity platforms
> UW Finance Transformation
  – UWFT Combined Quarterly Report
  – Update from 4/22 sponsors meeting
> IT Project Portfolio Executive Review
> Final meeting agenda
> Wrap up
Faculty Council – IT Governance

Tom Halverson
Professor, College of Education

Chris Laws
Professor, Astronomy, College of Arts and Sciences
Destination One: Execution & Success

UW Medicine & SCCA – Now live on Epic for 4 weeks

Execution

• No downtime since go live
• 18,500 tickets resolved
• Excellent UW and Contracted Super User support
• Task Forces rapidly developed and deployed to solve more complex issues
• Over 25 daily IT/operational area meetings (ED, Radiology, etc)

Top Areas of Success

• Documentation Templates
• Order Sets
• Secure Chat/Haiku (19K/weekday)
• Integrated Record
• Adoption – BCMA (94%) / CPOE (98%)
• Training – tip sheets/videos/SU/Rounding
Epic statistics since Go-Live

3/27 – 4/20

- >50M Real-Time Interface Messages
- >8M Conversion Messages
- >8M Conversion Messages
- >22,400 Unique Logins
- >9,500 Concurrent users
- >8,500 Patients on Oncology Treatment Plans & 59k+ Orders
- >64M Workflows Completed

- 835k Lab Orders
- 534k Meds Dispensed
- 2.6M Total Orders
- Care Everywhere: 755k Records Received
- 1M Records Sent
- ~$6.5M MyChart Collection
- $602M+ In Revenue
- 23.5k total – 18.5k closed - A Ticket Closed Every 2 Minutes!
Epic has over 1,000 standard go-live metrics. 91 of the most important metrics are displayed on the Go Live Dashboard. This is an example of 2 of those metrics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>4/18</th>
<th>4/17</th>
<th>4/16</th>
<th>Thresholds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical:</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of appropriate medication administrations in which the patient’s barcode and the medication were scanned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCMA Scanning Compliance</td>
<td>UWM (SA 20): 93.9% - Montlake: 93.6% - HMC: 95.1% - NW: 91.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCCA (SA 245): 93.3% SCCA (SA 20): 97.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UWM (SA 20): 94.0% - Montlake: 93.8% - HMC: 94.8% - NW: 91.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCCA (SA 245): 92.6% SCCA (SA 20): 95.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UWM (SA 20): 94.3% - Montlake: 93.7% - HMC: 95.1% - NW: 93.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCCA (SA 245): 85.9% SCCA (SA 20): 94.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rev Cycle:</strong></td>
<td>The amount of charges expressed in AR days in charge review workqueues</td>
<td>8.7 days</td>
<td>8.5 days</td>
<td>8.3 days</td>
<td>The lower the better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Billing Pre-AR Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top Issues (Bold = still active)

- **Procedure/OR/L&D areas** – documentation, billing/supplies, whiteboards
- **Patient Flow/ADT** – between facilities, procedure areas, **hybrid/specialty units**
- **Printing** – label printers, specimen labeling
- **Access** – security templates, role definitions
- **Ambulatory** – procedures, referrals
- **Cores** – treatment teams/attendings, lists, handoffs, **phone numbers (Epic)**
- **Radiology** – worklists, **IR workflows**
- **Transplant** - immunosuppression, **committee presentations**, reporting
Transitioning: D1 Project to ITS Operations

- Go-live Teams Transition
  - Inactivating command center channels
  - Keep super user Teams channels, monitored by CMIO / informatics / training
- Epic Hotline & Help Desk Management
- Webform & Incident Intake
- SDM Queues
- Weekly communications instead meetings
- Project close-out items
  - Documentation, regression test scripts, knowledge articles, ...
  - PSIs
- Willow ambulatory 5/17 and Ellkay clinical go-live 5/15
New Support/Partnership Model

Ongoing support and partnership – providing value to the organization

- Ongoing Super User Program with dedicated manager
- Physician Liaison Program
- Epic Clinical Hotline and Helpdesk 24/7
- IT Governance – prioritization and design
- Weekly newsletters
- Continuing work on stabilization

Learning from D1 – continuing the partnership
Outlined below is an overview of the upcoming phases post D1 go-live

- **Go-Live/ Stabilize**: April
- **Stabilization / Early Optimization**: April 26 – July
- **Epic February 2021 Upgrade**: May 4 – September 12
- **Continuous Improvement**: Mid-July – September+

- 5/15 Ellkay Clinical Go-Live
- 5/17 Willow Ambulatory Go-Live
- 9/12 Epic 2021 Upgrade Go-Live
Workforce feedback

• “Staff have been talking about how “slick” the tool is once it’s working. Everything is so much smoother, and we have more information than we’ve ever had.” - NW OR Nurse Manager

• “SCCA spirits are good. We have a few big issues we’d like to knock out of the way. People are feeling better and are already excited to have Epic. If we can get those issues resolved, then we’ll be ready and excited for Monday.” – Ada Mohedano, SCCA Director of Clinical Analytics and Business Intelligence

• “We have been walking the floors and the nursing staff is in good spirits; smiling and working through the problems.” – Readiness Coordinator at Montlake

• “While rounding at Montlake, the overall tone and feel is pretty good. People are smiling and nurses are frankly asking advanced-level questions you normally see on day 3.” – UW Medicine informaticist at Montlake

• “I had a patient go into the ED over the weekend and the experience was just amazing! The monitoring of the patient’s status, the notes from the ED, lab orders and results. Everything! It was just so much better!” - Hall Health provider

• “Seriously, Teams is a game changer. So impressed by the information sharing going on here and the searchability!” – UW Medicine Provider

SCCA reporting transition is going well, support has been excellent, and they are impressed with how quickly issues are resolved. It’s been “a great partnership”.

Quote from Nursing Super User at UWMC-Montlake 5SE ICU, after seeing Heparin Protocol in the system:

"It's Fantastic - I literally jumped for joy when I saw it"
QUESTIONS
Data Governance

Phil Reid
Vice Provost of Academic and Student Affairs, Office of the Provost

Ann Nagel
Associate Vice Provost and Institutional Privacy Official, Office of the Provost
KEY CONCEPTS

What is Data Governance?

DATA GOVERNANCE: “[T]he exercise of authority and control (planning, monitoring, and enforcement) over the management of data assets”¹

Why does UW need it?

> To make better decisions

> To ensure we are managing data well…with an institutional lens

> To get more value from data…while managing cost and risk

¹ Data Management Body of Knowledge
UW DATA GOVERNANCE WORK, TO DATE

FOUNDATIONS
• Roadmap, maturity model, change management cycle, website, etc.

TASK FORCES
• Country Codes
• Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Codes
• Finance Transformation and Data Governance Intersections
• Organization Codes

DATA STEWARDSHIP
• New approach to data stewardship with Data Domain Councils

INTAKE
• Process & form
RE-ENVISIONING DATA STEWARDSHIP

THE JOURNEY

✓ Reviewed Prior Data Trustee and Data Custodian Model
  ✓ Gathered Input on Prior State and Ideas for Future State from Data Custodians and the DG Ops Committee

✓ Completed Benchmarking
  ✓ Conducted Benchmarking with Higher Education, Industry, and Research and Consulting Groups

✓ Completed Needs Assessment

✓ Proposed New Data Stewardship Model
  ✓ Drafted a Summary and Strawman Proposal

✓ Reviewed and Approved New Model
KEY CONCEPTS

What is Data Stewardship?
DATA STEWARDSHIP: “Accountability and responsibility for data and processes that ensure effective control and use of data assets… to help an organization get value from its data.”

Why does UW need it?
To create a cohesive approach across and within data domains
To address data issues specific to domains (e.g., policy, quality definition and classification, access, architecture, and analysis)
To get more value from data…while managing cost and risk

1 Data Management Body of Knowledge
UW DATA GOVERNANCE & DATA STEWARDSHIP

Stewardship

Institutional Data Stewards
Executives (e.g., VPs) who represent the entire domain in strategic discussions
Liaise

Data Domain Council Chairs
Select leaders (e.g., AVPs) who represent the domain council's interests at the enterprise level
Collaborate

Data Sub-domain Stewards
Leaders (e.g., AVPs, directors) who represent the data within a business area

Governance

Data Governance Steering Committee
Enterprise, cross-domain focus on strategic decision-making

Data Governance Operational Committee
Enterprise, cross-domain focus on process, policies and solutions
Liaise / Collaborate

Data Domain Councils
Focus on topics unique to each council's domain

Business / IT / Other Stakeholders

Unit leaders
Sr. leaders (e.g., Deans, VPs, directors) who promote data governance in their unit, ensure unit strategy aligns, resolve unit-specific data issues, and escalate, as needed

Other data-responsible groups
(e.g., Research Reporting Group, Privacy Steering Committee, Tri-campus Institutional Research Group)

Data-responsible individuals/teams
Subject matter experts on data or systems who uphold stewardship in their work (e.g., data scientists, analysts)
UW DATA DOMAINS

- Finance
- Human Resources
- Advancement & Alumni Relations
- Research
- Property & Space Management
- Academic
# Data Governance Leadership

Steering Committee Chair - Phil Reid  
Operational Committee Chair – Ann Nagel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA DOMAIN</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL DATA STEWARD (IDS)</th>
<th>DOMAIN COUNCIL CHAIR</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Sarah Hall</td>
<td>Ann Anderson</td>
<td>Charge issued. IDS and DCC added to DG Committees. Council met 2x with meetings planned every other month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Mindy Kornberg</td>
<td>Rachel Gatlin</td>
<td>Charge issued. Initial meeting scheduled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>Mary Gresh</td>
<td>Michael Visaya</td>
<td>Evaluating sub-domains and identifying council members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Jim Kresl</td>
<td>Rick Fenger</td>
<td>Evaluating sub-domains and identifying council members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Phil Reid</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Identifying council chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property and Space Mgmt</td>
<td>Lou Cariello</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Identifying council chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATA STEWARDSHIP ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

UW DATA STEWARDS AT VARIOUS LEVELS…

> Help anchor the people, process, and technology change

> Represent the concerns of others and needs of the entire UW.

> Accountable and responsible for data and processes

UW DATA DOMAIN COUNCILS…

> Address data issues specific to their domains, e.g.,
  – planning
  – policy
  – data definition and classification
  – quality
  – access
  – inventory
  – issues response
  – communication and training
  – architecture
  – analysis
EXPECTATIONS OF DATA STEWARDS

COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP

> Works across siloes
> Elicits a range of input
> Cooperates
> Focuses on collective success
> Builds trust
> Results in transparent decisions
> Benefits the UW as a whole
UW DATA GOVERNANCE & DATA STEWARDSHIP

**Stewardship**

**Institutional Data Stewards**  
Executives (e.g., VPs) who represent the entire domain in strategic discussions  
Liaise

**Data Domain Council Chairs**  
Select leaders (e.g., AVPs) who represent the domain council's interests at the enterprise level  
Collaborate

**Data Sub-domain Stewards**  
Leaders (e.g., AVPs, directors) who represent the data within a business area

**Governance**

**Data Governance Steering Committee**  
Enterprise, cross-domain focus on strategic decision-making

**Data Governance Operational Committee**  
Enterprise, cross-domain focus on process, policies and solutions  
Liaise / Collaborate

**Data Domain Councils**  
Focus on topics unique to each council's domain

**Business / IT / Other Stakeholders**

**Unit leaders**  
Sr. leaders (e.g., Deans, VPs, directors) who promote data governance in their unit, ensure unit strategy aligns, resolve unit-specific data issues, and escalate, as needed

**Other data-responsible groups**  
(e.g., Research Reporting Group, Privacy Steering Committee, Tri-campus Institutional Research Group)

**Data-responsible individuals/teams**  
Subject matter experts on data or systems who uphold stewardship in their work (e.g., data scientists, analysts)
Data governance includes unit leaders and IT subject matter experts from UW-IT, UW Medicine, Office or Research, and UW Bothell.

How should data governance liaise with IT governance?

How can IT governance help ensure data governance decisions are implemented in systems?
QUESTIONS
State of Higher Ed Productivity Platforms

Erik Hofer
Associate Vice President for Academic Services, UW-IT
QUESTIONS
UW Finance Transformation

Aaron Powell
Vice President for UW-IT and CIO

Brian McCartan
Vice President for Finance, UW Finance & Administration
## UW FT Combined Program

### Executive Summary - 3/31/2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Sponsors &amp; Leaders</th>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Overall Risk &amp; Project Health</th>
<th>Budget Rating</th>
<th>Schedule Rating</th>
<th>Scope Rating</th>
<th>Resource Rating</th>
<th>Issues Rating</th>
<th>Actual Cost</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance Transformation Program</td>
<td>Brian McCarten</td>
<td>UW</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>$60,499,000</td>
<td>$269,246,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aaron Powell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Ed Loftus</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Gail Rogers</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Management</td>
<td>Jeff Bishop</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>Elise Barho</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Enterprise Systems Remediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Sponsors</th>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Overall Risk &amp; Project Health</th>
<th>Budget Rating</th>
<th>Schedule Rating</th>
<th>Scope Rating</th>
<th>Resource Rating</th>
<th>Issues Rating</th>
<th>Actual Cost</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW Medicine</td>
<td>Sarah Cantwell</td>
<td></td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIS</td>
<td>Diego Bartholomew</td>
<td></td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Readiness Program</td>
<td>Jeanne Marie Isola</td>
<td></td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Service Center</td>
<td>Greg Koe ster</td>
<td></td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW-IT</td>
<td>Rob McDade</td>
<td></td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Departmental Systems Remediation (Campuses, Schools, Colleges, Departments, Auxiliaries)

#### Unit Readiness
- Overall readiness of academic, medicine and administrative units
- Piloting a unit readiness dashboard process that leverages unit readiness to track and status unit-level readiness

#### Side System Remediation
- Overall status outside the Core Impl. Program and Collab Partners
- Piloting a resource allocation process to engage units in determining scope of work and effort required for remediation efforts, at unit level

### Notes:
- The UW FT Combined Program Status Report has been reformatted to align with the new organizational structure. It is a composite of four of the five Program Areas, with the fifth, Enterprise Systems, broken out into its constituent Projects. Overall Ratings are computed as the average of all five constituent projects; except that Schedule is 'maximum' of others. Budget and spend for individual program areas has not yet been determined.
- Individual Program Pillars and Enterprise Remediation areas rate their own status, based on current state, and with the perspective that overall Program reset options are under consideration.

* Overall Risk & Health Key at end of report

- ▲ Improvement over previous quarter
- ▼ Setback from previous quarter

9 separate projects under one Combined Program, plus 2 areas of work across the campus.
Given the complexity of the transformation that the UW seeks, the decision was made to introduce a period of time – called Architect Validation stage (AVS) – to the schedule to evaluate the program’s ability to successfully achieve the planned go-live date within the outlined scope, schedule and budget initially submitted to the UW Board of Regents.
Overall Program Status: Red

Several elements led to a shift in program status, including:

- Incomplete detail in support of a fully integrated plan for work outside of Workday configuration
- Organizational structure that did not enable effective execution of deliverables to plan
- Complexities in the technology space were more extensive than assumed at initial baseline
- New scope, including identification of the need for a Financial Data Repository
- A significant change in course to the approach for shared services
Systems Remediation: Lessons Learned

> Early estimate of the change impact to legacy systems is challenging

> Design the solution from an end-to-end perspective from the start. Legacy systems remediation is dependent on a shared understanding between functional and technical

> Delays in making functional design decisions impedes technology requirements and design

> Best to identify commonalities among legacy system remediations and share as early as possible (e.g., Foundational Data Model)

> Make systems dispositioning decisions as early as possible, giving more time for remediations

> Post go-live operating model has significant impacts on systems remediations
New UWFT Organizational Chart

Provost

Sponsors

Brian McCartan  
VP Finance

Aaron Powell  
VP UW-IT/CIO

Chris Mercer, Overall Program Oversight & Management

Change Management
  Jeff Bishop

Functional
  Ed Loftus

Technical
  Gail Rogers

PMO
  Elise Barho

Enterprise Systems
  ISC
    Greg Koester
  ORIS
    Diego Bartholomew
  FRP
    Jeanne Marie Isola
  UW-IT
    Rob McDade
  UWM
    Sarah Cantwell
Objective: To provide options and recommendations to program sponsors to validate and adjust as appropriate the comprehensive UWFT program scope, schedule, and budget. This includes revising program structure and operations to support improved collaboration.
AVS Exit Criteria

The successful completion of the following exit criteria will be evaluated by the UWFT program sponsors at the April 2021 meeting:

> Updating Program scope: amending the Program Baseline, as reviewed by the UW Board of Regents in December 2019

> Updating Integrated Program schedule

> Updating Program Budget and Funding plan (draft)

> Updating Program processes and structure

> Establishing criteria and clear accountability by which any ongoing shifts in the program will be determined
Recent AVS Accomplishments

> New five pillar org structure established and roles for each pillar defined. Ongoing discussion around how to further align program work

> Scope/Schedule/Budget committee have a potential approach

> Training Strategy has been finalized and is being shared with key stakeholder groups

> Tenant build 1.5 was completed two weeks ahead of initial schedule

> Initial reporting inventory was completed, capturing more than 1,100 reports that fall within and outside of Workday
## Sponsor’s Role – AVS Exit Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exit Criteria</th>
<th>March Sponsor Meeting</th>
<th>April Sponsor Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updated Program Scope</td>
<td>&gt; Confirm FDR in scope&lt;br/&gt;&gt; Receive update on current program scope</td>
<td>&gt; Confirm full program scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated integrated program schedule</td>
<td>&gt; Overview of Op model road map&lt;br/&gt;&gt; Overview of schedule options</td>
<td>&gt; Review updated Integrated Schedule&lt;br/&gt;&gt; Confirm Op model structure, road map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Budget and Funding Plan</td>
<td>&gt; Receive update on progress of budget and funding; review budget/funding principles</td>
<td>&gt; Review status of updated resource plan for all program elements&lt;br/&gt;&gt; Initial “top down” budget/financial plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Program Processes and Structure</td>
<td>&gt; Review high-level Program Structure</td>
<td>&gt; Review additional detail on updated program structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria and Clear Accountability</td>
<td>&gt; Receive update on Change Control Process (see page 35 within the Program Management Plan)</td>
<td>&gt; Review of decision-making process, recommendations for revision&lt;br/&gt;&gt; Approval of Change Control Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario</td>
<td>Current Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Implementation July 2022 (currently approved approach)</td>
<td>Workday go-live possible, but would leave breakages with systems and loss of functionality across campuses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phased Functionality</td>
<td>Requires substantial throw away work for interim integrations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher long-term costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approach not recommended by Workday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Medicine First</td>
<td>Unresolved complexities in payroll, integrations with FAS, complexity (multiple sets of books, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requires substantial throw away work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Year Extension – Full Implementation July 2023</td>
<td>Most feasible approach of options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimized throw away work and loss of functionality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does require additional money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Timing (add-on of budget forecasting tool)</td>
<td>Range of options still under evaluation: Timing could be – 9/23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTIONS
IT Project Portfolio

Executive Summary

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

### Project Portfolio Executive Summary - 3/31/2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Oversight Level</th>
<th>Overall Risk &amp; Project Healthitative</th>
<th>Budget Rating</th>
<th>Schedule Rating</th>
<th>Scope Rating</th>
<th>Resource Rating</th>
<th>Issues Rating</th>
<th>Actual Cost</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance Transformation Combined Program</td>
<td>Brian McCartney</td>
<td>3 - OCIO</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,499,000</td>
<td>$269,246,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aaron Powell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destinations One</td>
<td>Tim Dellit</td>
<td>3 - UW</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$151,000,000</td>
<td>$159,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement CRM Replacement</td>
<td>Julie Brown</td>
<td>3 - OCIO</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,761,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Trials Management System</td>
<td>John Slattery</td>
<td>2 - UW</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,952,000</td>
<td>$15,704,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM Data Analytics Warehouse</td>
<td>Adam Wilcox</td>
<td>2 - UW</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,325,000</td>
<td>$5,031,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum Online Apps</td>
<td>Marlon Buchanan</td>
<td>2 - UW</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$213,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Space Management Modernization</td>
<td>Tim Rhoade</td>
<td>2 - UW</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>(E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIM Online Program Management</td>
<td>Anind Dey</td>
<td>2 - UW</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$198,000</td>
<td>$216,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Records</td>
<td>Ann Anderson</td>
<td>1 - UW</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$536,000</td>
<td>$887,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWT Slate</td>
<td>Menitha Hynes-Wilson</td>
<td>1 - UW</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$94,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EvanTEL</td>
<td>Alison Cullen</td>
<td>1 - UW</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradescope</td>
<td>Aaron Timms</td>
<td>1 - UW</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 projects

### Notes:

- **(A)** The UW FT Combined Program has been reformatted to align with the new organisational structure of the Program, with Pillars, and five Enterprise System Remediation projects.
- **(B)** Congratulations to the UW Medicine teams for successful go live of Destination One.
- **(C)** DAWG successfully integrated with the new Epic data in Destination One.
- **(D)** Continuum College has not indicated what progress is being made nor what issues there may be to complete the Salesforce enterprise data update and restart the Online Apps project.
- **(E)** Congratulations to Campus Space Management for successful migration of facilities inventory data from legacy system to new InVision solution.
- **(F)** Congratulations to the Information School and the MSIM Online program for start of its first classes in Spring quarter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Operations</th>
<th>Executive Leadership</th>
<th>Major Projects Interdependencies Assessment</th>
<th>Note: ISC and UW-IT resources are tracked within the major projects’ budgets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Integrated Service Center | Ann Anderson | UW Enterprise |  - **Workday Feature Release** 2020 R1 – Workday’s five-week release window began February 6, and ended with the Feature Release on March 13. Approximately 400 regression tests were executed. The release went smoothly and system downtime was minimal (about 13 hours).  
  - **COVID-19** – ISC team members continue with support of COVID-19 related activities (e.g. benefit eligibility, payroll data corrections, over-payment monitoring, unemployment benefit verification, attestations, etc.) with some of the workarounds done manually, impacting available resources.  
  - **Financial Transformation** – Key open questions around scope, schedule and budget with impacts to the ISC to be determined.  
  - **Reporting Adoption Project** – A customer-focused, customer-driven project to improve functionality, efficiency and ease of using Workday HCM Reporting. Expected completion extended one month, until end of April, and includes customer testing and peer demos. A follow on project will give University unit and central analysts access to baseline HCM, Compensation, and Payroll reports in Workday. This is a collaborative effort with UW Data Custodians, UW-IT, OBP, and Campus Unit Analysts to develop the model for these new roles. Implementation expected to roll out during Q2.  
  - **Calendar Year End** – An annual project to prepare and deliver tax accounting to university employees and benefit recipients in accordance with state and federal tax requirements. Tax forms and submissions have been completed with corrective tasks remaining as they arise. Closure extended one month, to May 17, 2021, due to IRS extension of the tax deadline.  
  - **2021 FSA/DCAP Events** – PEBB is offering employees currently enrolled in a Medical FSA or DCAP for 2021 three opportunities during 2021 (March, June and September) to change their elections without a qualifying event. This effort requires collaboration across multiple ISC tiers and teams. It will be a front-loaded effort (start date - end date) - once built for the March event, we will be able to turn on/off for the June and September events. |
| UW-IT | Aaron Powell | UW Enterprise |  - Critical operations in support of remote teaching, learning and research remain top priority. Some UW-IT resources remain dedicated to supporting D1 go-live. Overall Health is borderline Yellow / Red.  
  - **UWFT** – FT initial review of program status by new PMO and technical leadership shows significant gaps and open design decisions in some areas and insufficient staffing levels in many areas across the program. This will make it difficult for technical teams to make progress, inform new schedule / budget estimates with confidence, and puts current schedule at risk. Morale is extremely low.  
  - **ADV CRM** – Project did not meet the March 31, 2021 Phase 1 go-live date. No new Phase 1 go-live has been set; but ADV not currently expecting impact to November 2021 go-live target. UW-IT monitoring for potential scope changes to UW-IT systems. Slow turnaround times on ADV decision-making increase risk, as some UW-IT teams will enter period of no availability due to year-end processing (this blackout time period is documented in the MOU b/w UW-IT and ADV). |
QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION