Agenda

- Call to Order / Introductions (Andreas Bohman)
- Administrative Updates
  - Workday Sustainment
  - UW-IT Structure and Leadership
  - ERM Initiatives
  - Workday Roadmap
  - TRF Update
- Future of IT Governance (Piet Niederhausen)
- Upcoming IT Strategy Board Meetings (Jacob Morris)
- IT Projects Executive Overview (Jacob Morris)
- Wrap up (Andreas Bohman)

Appendix: Future of IT Governance (reference slides)
Administrative Updates

Andreas Bohman, CIO and Vice President, UW-IT
Alissa Mahar, Associate VP for Operations, UW-IT
Future of IT Governance

Piet Niederhausen
Enterprise Business Architect, Enterprise Architecture & Strategy

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON
## Current Governance Initiatives

### IT Governance 2.0
- Business governance of IT across all UW domains
- Gather broad input and iterate on improvements

### Workday Governance
- Govern HR & Finance applications (Workday ecosystem)
- Establish governance & begin using before UWFT go-live

---

**Gather input across the UW**

**Kick off Working Group**

**Ideate on problems & solutions**

**Prioritize & prototype changes**

**Assess benefits**

---

**Define initial relationship**

**Define & charter**

**Kick off new structure March 2023**

**Assess and improve over time**

---

Iteratively
Reimagining IT Governance in the 2022-23 Cycle

IT Strategy Board

October 2022
Vision & Scope (Why & What)

December 2022
Plan the Change Effort (How)

February 2023
Check In
Input on design of future IT Governance

April 2023
Endorse
Review first iteration of proposed changes for 2023-24

IT Governance Working Group

IT Service Investment Board

IT Service Management Board
Working Group Status Update

Members:

- Ann Nagel - Associate Vice Provost and University Privacy Officer
- Erin Guthrie - Assistant Vice Provost, OPB
- Helen Garrett - University Registrar, Enrollment Management
- Kristal Mauritz-Miller - Chief Administrative Officer, UW Medicine ITS
- Mary Mulvihill - Director and Interim AVP, UW-IT SMO
- Michael Visaya - AVP for Information Management, UW Advancement Services
- Mick Westrick - Director of IT, Foster School of Business
- Mike Middlebrooks - Director of IT, School of Medicine
- Nicky West - Director of Departmental Computing, iSchool
- Thayer York - Director of Technology Services, Law Library
- Tiffany Quatmann - Associate Director, UWFT FRP Readiness Program
- Xiaosong Li - Associate Provost, Research Cyberinfrastructure

Meeting Dates: *Currently being scheduled*
Today’s Workshop

A. **Straw model:** Four key assumptions about future IT governance structures and processes

B. **Two scenarios:** As an IT governance decision-maker, what do you see as benefits or challenges of the straw model?

C. **Direction:** What direction can you give the Working Group for designing future state IT governance?
Prior Input: What should a new governance model improve?

> Ground IT investment decisions in **UW strategic outcomes** and common challenges.
> Clarify IT investment **decision-making** scope and authority.
> Create transparency of **scope, roles and responsibilities** across the various governance groups (IT, Data, etc.).
> Make governance groups **easier to navigate and less cumbersome** - provide a single point-of-contact.
> Governance should **drive standardization** in technology and practices.
> Better manage **risk** from un-governed IT decisions and growing complexity.
Straw Model: Four Assumptions About Future IT Governance

**Domain Groups**
Future IT Governance has the ability to work in domain groups that prioritize and plan IT for different subject areas.

- HR & Finance Applications
- Student Applications
- Governance of IT
- Research

**Routing & Input**
Future IT Governance is able to intake issues, route them, and coordinate input across multiple groups.

**Thresholds**
Future IT Governance has defined thresholds (TBD) for different levels of review and decision-making responsibility.

- Executive decision
- Domain level decision
- Local decision

**Analysis**
Future IT Governance is enabled by functions that provide key analysis and support - such as:

- Business analysis
- Strategy management
- Architectural support & review
Two Kinds of IT Governance Scenario

In Scenario 1:
A decision is needed to prioritize & possibly fund a project against investments across domains.

In Scenario 2:
A standard or strategy is needed for guiding investment in multiple solutions over time.
Scenario 1: Project

Several business units agree on a shared need for enterprise data to support institutional reporting. The best fit solution would be in Workday, with some impacts on other systems. Based on a recent similar project, the work is beyond the capacity of existing teams and will cost about $500k. A decision is needed to prioritize & possibly fund a project against investments across domains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Group</th>
<th>Routing &amp; Input</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Strategy &amp; Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share &amp; prioritize proposed needs &amp; solutions</td>
<td>Ensure input from Data Governance, CISO, etc.</td>
<td>Assess for impact, risk, other criteria</td>
<td>Prioritize an investment plan across domains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your input:

**Advantages**

**Challenges**

**Ideas & Questions**
Scenario 1: Directions for the Working Group

Directionally, what should the IT Governance Working Group design for? Assume that the Working Group would propose iterations toward your goals.
Scenario 2: Strategy

Several units operate different CRM solutions. Others are planning projects. Needs vary; while a single solution is unlikely, some shared needs do exist, but have not been fully evaluated yet. The total spend on all existing and new solutions over the next 5 years will be at least $5 million. **A standard or strategy is needed for guiding investment in multiple solutions over time.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Group</th>
<th>Routing &amp; Input</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Strategy &amp; Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate shared needs; propose a strategy</td>
<td>Ensure input from Data Governance, CISO, etc.</td>
<td>Assess existing solutions, other institutions, etc.</td>
<td>Endorse and follow a strategy for investment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your input:

**Advantages**

**Challenges**

**Ideas & Questions**
Directionally, what should the IT Governance Working Group design for? Assume that the Working Group would propose iterations toward your goals.
Recap: Four Assumptions About Future IT Governance

### Domain Groups
Future IT Governance has the ability to work in **domain groups** that prioritize and plan IT for different subject areas.

**Such as:**
- HR & Finance Applications
- Student Applications
- Research

### Routing & Input
Future IT Governance is able to intake issues, **route** them, and coordinate input across multiple groups.

### Thresholds
Future IT Governance has **defined thresholds** (TBD) for different levels of review and decision-making responsibility.

**Such as:**
- Executive decision
- Domain level decision
- Local decision

### Analysis
Future IT Governance is enabled by functions that provide key **analysis** and support - such as:
- Business analysis
- Strategy management
- Architectural support & review
Directionally, should the Working Group design changes based on these assumptions of the Straw Model?

1. Design for **domain groups** in future IT Governance
2. Design for **routing** of issues and **input** on issues across groups
3. Design **thresholds** for levels of review and decision-making
4. Design for supporting functions to provide **analysis** (such as business analysis, strategy management, and architectural support & review)
Upcoming Strategy Board Meetings

Jacob Morris
Interim Associate Vice President for Research Computing & Strategy

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON
IT Strategy Board Meeting Schedule and Cadence

Academic Year 2022-23 (Current)
- October 2022
- December 2022
- February 2023
- April 2023
- June 2023 (Proposed addition)

Fiscal Year 2024 (Future)
- August 2023
- October 2023
- December 2023
- February 2024
- April 2024
- June 2024

1. Suggest adding a June 2023 meeting to continue the providing feedback to the IT Governance 2.0 working group

2. Suggest moving to a more frequent meeting cadence to reduce gap between April and October meetings. Meetings would be canceled when lacking sufficient agenda.
UWFT Combined Quarterly Report & IT Project Portfolio Review
## Executive Summary - 12/31/22

### Enterprise Systems Remediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Overall Project Health</th>
<th>Budget Rating</th>
<th>Schedule Rating</th>
<th>Scope Rating</th>
<th>Resource Rating</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Issues Rating</th>
<th>Actual Cost</th>
<th>Budget †</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance Transformation</td>
<td>Mark Richards, Chris Mercer</td>
<td>UW</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>$245,019,000</td>
<td>$339,906,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Program</td>
<td></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>Paula Ross</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>$24,661,047</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Gail Rogers</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>$39,387,953</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Management</td>
<td>Jeff Bishop</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>$7,479,644</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>Elise Barho</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>$7,023,695</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Enterprise Systems Remediation

| UW Medicine                     | Dale Matheson          |              |                        | ★             | ★              | ★            | ★                | ↓                   | $19,657,775      | --              |
| Research Administration          | Suzanne May            |              |                        | ★             | ★              | ★            | ★                | ↓                   | $11,142,674      | --              |
| Finance Readiness Program       | Jeanne Marie Isola     |              |                        | ★             | ★              | ★            | ★                | ↓                   | $9,374,016       | --              |
| Integrated Service Center       | Greg Koester           |              |                        | ★             | ★              | ★            | ★                | ↑                   | $2,916,977       | --              |
| UW-IT                           | Rob McDade             |              |                        | ↑             | ↑              | ★            | ★                | ↑                   | $6,699,134       | --              |

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

#### Unit Readiness

- Overall readiness of academic, medicine and administrative units
- The program created an enhanced engagement plan for the units which enables prioritization of critical issues and allocates resources across pillars to address those items. Two testing resources have been assigned to the units. The Systems Design Support (SDS) retirement sessions have also begun.

#### Side System Remediation

- Overall status outside the Core Program and Enterprise Systems
- Some campus units are behind in their deliverables and escalations are proceeding to assist them as well as working with them to help determine which E2E cycle they will participate in. Few of the 30-40 inbound systems that need to integrate with Workday has engaged with the platform.

**9 separate projects under one Combined Program, plus 2 areas of work across the campus**

† The total cost and budget for the project include the initial Readiness project ($23M). Also included in the central budget are Contingency, Reserves and Executive Director funds; and underspending within sub-projects will be moved to Reserves in the central budget on a monthly basis.

**Notes:**

(A) Overall, FT has the same Overall health. It is likely to move up and down a few points, and generally stay yellow through go-live.
## UW Enterprise IT Projects

### Project Portfolio Executive Summary - Dec 31, 2022 (Final)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Sponsor</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>Resource Rating</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Issues Rating</th>
<th>Actual Cost</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance Transformation Combined Program</td>
<td>Mark Richards, Chris Mercer</td>
<td>3 - OCIO</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>⬇️</td>
<td>⬇️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>$245,019,000</td>
<td>$339,906,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement CRM Replacement</td>
<td>Julie Brown, Tamara Josserand</td>
<td>3 - OCIO</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>$4,665,000</td>
<td>$5,533,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM Data Analytics Warehouse</td>
<td>Mo Broom, Richard Goss</td>
<td>2 - UW</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>$5,993,000</td>
<td>$6,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Document Management System Replacement</td>
<td>Anja Canfield-Budde</td>
<td>2 - UW</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>$1,851,000</td>
<td>$3,006,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesforce Conversion</td>
<td>Frank Hodge</td>
<td>2 - UW</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬇️</td>
<td>⬇️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>$3,454,000</td>
<td>$3,488,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School Admissions Modernization</td>
<td>Joy Williamson-Lott</td>
<td>2 - UW</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>$151,000</td>
<td>$545,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWF AIMR</td>
<td>Tim Rhoades</td>
<td>1 - UW</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>$216,000</td>
<td>$403,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradescope</td>
<td>Aaron Timss</td>
<td>1 - UW</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>⬆️</td>
<td>$267,000</td>
<td>$267,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8 projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Cost</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$261.6M</td>
<td>$359.3M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

(A) The total cost and budget for the project include the initial Readiness project ($23M). Also included in the central budget are Contingency, Reserves and Executive Director funds; and underspending within sub-projects will be moved to Reserves in the central budget on a monthly basis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Operations</th>
<th>Executive Leadership</th>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Major Projects Interdependencies Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Integrated Service Center | Ann Anderson | Major Projects |  | Overall rating: Yellow  
Although the ISC has numerous open projects, the largest projects are:  
- **UW Finance Transformation** – FT Program work has increased to include more readiness activities such as Payroll Accounting, FDM, Security and Sustainment Model decisions. ISC is highly involved in cutover and go live planning and will participate in upcoming UWFT Dress Rehearsals.  
- **HR Hierarchies** – As part of the UW FT Project, the UW's financial Organization Code (“Fin Org”) is being retired and replaced by a Workday Custom Organization (aka Alternative Hierarchy) to capture UW-HR’s institutional reporting hierarchy.  
**Issues:**  
- Our project work continues to be fluid and heavily dependent upon state statutes and regulations. Any new large project work is submitted and reviewed by the Workday Committee for prioritization and, if needed, resourcing and funding.  
- The yellow rating relates to the impacts of FIN (UW’s legacy finance system) we are working through, some unknowns remain as the program continues their work and we anticipate design recommendations regarding impacts to our current configuration and processes.  
- The ISC is moving into UW-IT and planning is in process. |
| UW-IT | Andreas Bohman | Major Projects |  | Overall rating: Yellow  
- **Workday Support and Operating Model**: A major new focus for UW-IT is defining the future sustainment of Workday Finance (post go-live), including the transition of ISC into UW-IT. This is critical work for the University, and further increases the strain on key UW-IT resources.  
- **Advancement CRM**: (ADV) project new go-live timeframe set for April 2023, exact date TBD. Monitoring for impacts due to overlap with FT deployment window. All UW-IT work on track.  
- **UW FT**: Closely monitoring scope for UW-IT teams, as additional areas emerge that require IT solutions. |
### UW Enterprise IT Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Oversight Level Key</em></th>
<th><em>Project Health Key</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overseen by UW management and staff. Requires OCIO approval and reporting if over delegated authority.</td>
<td><strong>Overall Risk Rating of 5-10 is Green</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. OCIO approval required and regular project reporting. Quality Assurance (QA) reporting required, maybe internal or external. OCIO may recommend project to be full Technology Services Board (TSB) oversight.</td>
<td><strong>Changes to scope, budget, or resources have placed project at some risk. Project has the potential for delays, cost or scope changes.</strong> <strong>Overall Risk Rating of 11-17 is Yellow</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. High severity and/or high risk, subject to full TSB oversight, which includes TSB approval, written reports to the TSB, periodic status reports to the TSB by the agency director and staff, and submission of other reports as directed by the TSB. External QA reporting required.</td>
<td><strong>Major changes to scope, budget or resources have placed project at critical risk. One or more of the following must change in order to proceed: project schedule, resources, budget, scope.</strong> <strong>Overall Risk Rating of 18-25 is Red</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TAKEAWAYS, NEXT STEPS

Andreas Bohman
Vice President for UW-IT and CIO

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON
QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION
Appendix: Future of IT Governance

Andreas Bohman
Vice President for UW-IT and CIO

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON
IT Governance Boards

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

Information Technology enables the UW mission and accelerates innovation and discovery. Technology itself is not the outcome.

Why reimagine IT governance?

The needs of the UW should drive information technology decision-making across the institution; IT Governance should be the vehicle for the UW to drive these decisions.
Current State: IT-related governance at the UW

**Washington State OCIO**

Oversight of UW Enterprise IT Projects, tracked on behalf of the UW by UW-IT’s governance structure

---

**UW-IT**

Three tiers with 4 boards plus groups specific to divisions or services (e.g., ITAC)

---

**Bothell & Tacoma**

Bothell Technology Advisory Committee
Tacoma Campus Technology Committee

---

**Computing Directors**

Forum for communication on strategic IT issues

---

**UWA IT Providers**

30+ IT providers in campuses, schools, colleges, and other units, each with IT governance structures

*Example:*
- Workday Governance (ISC)

---

**UW Finance Transformation**

Several program-specific governance groups

---

**Workday Guardrails**

Reference architecture process

---

**Security, Privacy & Risk**

CISO’s Security Advisory Board
Enterprise Risk Management
Privacy Office

---

**UW Data Governance**

Three tiers of data domain councils plus task forces

---

**UWM IT Governance Partnership**

Three tiers with 60+ groups by line of business/function

---

**Additional Groups**

UW councils and committees related to IT, and external groups.
Scoping IT governance

> What areas should IT governance connect up?
> How might we drive decisions & action between these areas?
Adjusting the focus & maturity of IT governance

- **Track** major IT projects to mitigate risk & assure success
- **Rationalize** existing/proposed IT services to reduce costs & increase benefits
- **Roadmap** & execute future IT services based on business needs
Broad authority and focused action

Countless IT decisions

IT at the UW

Governance has broad authority

Governance takes focused action

Alignment on shared goals & values

Key strategic initiatives

With insight into the overall portfolio
What should IT governance look like in 5-10 years?

**Investment**
- IT investments are driven by institutional outcomes
- IT roadmaps for these outcomes are shared, prioritized, and resourced

**Projects**
- IT projects are well planned for success, value, and risk mitigation
- Paths for innovative projects as well as highly managed projects

**Value**
- Technology enables student success, research, and the UW mission
- The UW has the right IT services at the right time at the right cost with well-managed risk

---

**Desired Outcomes**
- Prioritized Roadmaps

**Resources**
- Well-managed projects

**IT Services**
- Enabling the UW mission
As part of a long-term core systems roadmap, developed process maps for all major business processes.

Processes are linked to IT solutions.

When new IT solutions are proposed, governance evaluates what is needed in the relevant process area.

Benefits:
- Less redundant IT investment; better use of existing investments.
- Better shared understanding of university business processes and how they are supported.
Example: Yale University

> Business stakeholders lead IT governance in domain-oriented pillars (committees)
> Each pillar recommends IT investments for the whole university within its domain
> An executive committee merges the recommendations and brings them into the university's annual budget process
> Includes funding the one-time cost as well as ongoing costs of services
> Benefits:
  ─ Single clear path for prioritizing investment in new shared services
  ─ Transparent link to larger existing budgeting process
IT Strategy Board: Why make changes now?

- Govern Workday (and related core business systems) to maximize the UW’s investment and meet needs across the UW.
- Mitigate increasing cybersecurity threats and risk from un-governed IT decisions and growing complexity.
- Take opportunities to standardize and create shared solutions, to reduce complexity and increase compliance.
- Increase transparency in how governance works now across all domains; clarify decision-making authority.
IT Strategy Board: *What should a new governance model improve?*

- Ground IT investment decisions in UW strategic outcomes and common challenges.
- Clarify IT investment decision-making scope and authority.
- Create transparency of scope, roles and responsibilities across the various governance groups (IT, Data, etc.).
- Make governance groups easier to navigate and less cumbersome - provide a single point-of-contact.
- Governance should drive standardization in technology and practices.
Funding paths for IT services

Proposed service change
A need to establish a new service or expand an existing service, including any of:
- Initial transition costs
- Ongoing operating costs
- Growth over time

Flexibility in existing budgets
- Efficiency gains, carryovers, vacancies, etc.
- Retirement of other services

Provost Reinvestment Fund (PRF)
- Typically one-time funding
- Side-by-side with all other (non-IT) proposals

Technology Recharge Fee (TRF)
- UW-IT only; for a fixed set of shared services
- Sometimes adjusts over time

HR/Payroll & Finance Fees
- UW-IT only; specific to Workday
- May adjust over time?

Chargebacks (fee for service)
- For services that scale linearly with usage
- Such services also have initial & retirement costs

Grants
- External grants for services that support, e.g., sponsored research

Currently, no unified governance decision-making over these paths
Changes often require decisions about >1 funding path