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Objective, Scope, and Approach
Objective

The objective of Deliverable #04: Comprehensive IV&V Assessment Report and Recommendations, was to perform a broad assessment of the major work efforts of The University of Texas at Austin’s (UT’s) Administrative Systems Modernization Program (ASMP). The primary focus of the IV&V project activities are on the Workday HCM/Payroll/Financials solution implementation. This assessment also follows that solution implementation focus.

The assessment provides a broad view of the overall project and baseline for future assessment activities. With these observations and recommendations, the UT project can take timely action to mitigate risks and leverage existing strengths. Overall, the primary objectives were to:

• Identify project processes and activities that are working effectively and considered as strengths;

• Identify project processes and activities that are ineffective and potentially detrimental to project success; and

• Make recommendations based on industry leading practices to address ineffective processes and activities.

The UT leadership, ASMP team, and stakeholders are currently working through the decision process for the go-live date and potential decoupling of the Finance and HCM/Payroll module implementations. That decision will drive the future IV&V activities and plans.
Scope

The scope of the assessment activities included attending project-related meetings, conducting project team and stakeholder interviews, and reviewing relevant project documentation to address the following seven ASMP components as they relate to the Workday implementation:

- Program Management
- Workday HCM/Payroll/Financials Solution Implementation (primary area of focus)
- Data Management
- Technology Architecture
- Application Modernization
- Enterprise Readiness
- Sustainment

The deliverable reports on practices and risks in the following eight areas:

- Management and Organization
- Program Scope, Plans, and Status
- Solution Architecture, Design and Configuration
- Program Governance
- Contract Management
- Security Management
- Change Management and Organizational Readiness Planning
- Test Planning and Execution
Our approach included assessing the areas following KPMG’s IV&V Methodology, a repeatable process for evaluating in-progress implementation activities to determine effectiveness relative to industry standards. The activities that KPMG performed during the assessment included:

- **Applied Industry Standards:** Our team applied pertinent industry standards to the observations, which helped guide our team in developing recommendations.

- **Attended Meetings and Conducted Interviews:** During the assessment period, our team attended project meetings and conducted interviews with key project team members and stakeholders in order to understand the status of the project and associated activities. This allowed our team to identify processes that are working well for the project and those that are not effective.

- **Assessed Documentation:** KPMG reviewed plans, processes and other documentation. KPMG then reviewed these documents against the identified industry standards and applicable elements of the KPMG IV&V Methodology.

- **Compiled Observations:** The KPMG team compiled observations from our analyses to identify areas of strength and weakness of the project.
Approach (continued)

• **Developed Recommendations**: Once the strengths and weaknesses were identified and confirmed, our team developed recommended strategies to address the weaknesses and enhance the strengths, taking into account project constraints. Our recommendations were developed with the goal of being achievable and impactful for the project and UT.

• **Created Final Report**: Upon completion of each assessment area and recommendations, our team developed the final consolidated report that highlighted key findings from across the assessed areas, and corresponding recommendations.

The components and areas specified in the Scope section of this document were identified in the final Statement of Work (SOW), and focus on project processes and procedures. In addition to those areas, we have also included additional observations and recommendations related to the Workday modules. These observations build upon the observations that were previously provided in Deliverable #01: Feasibility Assessment Report. Subsequent IV&V activities will revisit the content from both deliverables.
Executive Summary
Executive Summary: Overall Project

Overall, the project is very complex, and major progress has been made. The project leadership and team have put in significant efforts in order to get it to where it is today.

The project has reached a critical junction where the University leadership, project team, and stakeholders are currently working through the future strategy of the project, and associated plans to move forward. Included will be a determination if the system will go-live in July 2017, and whether the Financials, and HCM/Payroll modules will be implemented in a “big bang” manner, or be de-coupled and implemented independent of one another, with individual, but substantially connected and dependent implementation dates and plans. These decisions are critical, as they will impact all project activities, including our IV&V activities. We continue to support the de-coupling implementation strategy as recommended in Deliverable #01.

After performing this Assessment, the major project concerns are in the areas of Governance and Change Management (specifically campus readiness). All other project related processes and procedures can be honed accordingly as the project progresses. As stated above, the stakeholders are actively involved in the go-live decision making process. This involvement should continue, as significant stakeholder involvement is critical to the overall success of the project. Without full stakeholder acceptance and adoption of the new system functionality, the project will not succeed. Stakeholders should strive to ensure that that they commit the appropriate time and resources for all necessary project activities. Resource capacity and constraints will only increase as additional University-wide initiatives occur; as a result, this is considered a critical risk to the project.
Executive Summary: Overall Project (continued)

While this report focused on project processes and procedures, the readiness of the Workday modules (specifically Financials and Grants) remain a significant concern. It is strongly recommended that UT continue to work closely with Workday to address the known software gaps. Progress has resulted when there is solid interaction between the two organizations. The number of pending Financial functional area decisions also remains a concern, and high attention to these areas should continue.

It is recommended that UT leverage their Workday representatives, request to be connected with the appropriate developers for each of the go-live critical gaps, and work to maintain an active cooperation in order to resolve the gaps. If the project team feels that Workday is not tracking UT requirements or documenting meetings properly, we recommend that the UT team maintain minutes from each meeting with Workday, including (but not limited to) the following sections from the meeting conversation: Meeting Attendees, Discussion Topics, UT Requirements, Action Items (with ownership noted), Next Steps (with ownership noted), and Next Meeting Date/Time.

It is further recommended that the meeting minutes be circulated among the attendees immediately following the meeting, with a request for comment/revision within 3 business days. If no revisions are provided, the minutes should be presumed correct. At the next meeting, the first order of business should be to affirm the minutes from the previous meeting.

In addition, it is recommended that UT work with Workday to build a consultant team from one sub-contractor (or as close to a single source as possible), so that all (or a majority) of the consulting team will share the same implementation approach, thus reducing risk. Workday should demonstrate its methodology more clearly in its elements of the project plan.
Executive Summary: Management and Organization

A formal organizational structure is in place for the project, and is staffed by a dedicated team of UT and consultant resources. The project was led by the ASMP Assistant Vice President (AVP), until her retirement at the end of December 2016. The UT CIO has since assumed the program responsibilities until a new program lead is identified.

While there is a sound project organizational structure, the structure does not include the campus IT resources that are responsible for the current systems. Meetings take place with the project team and campus IT resources, however they are not integrated within the project itself. The campus IT resources possess significant knowledge of the business processes and the system that support those processes.

The stakeholders have also reported that they have neither the time nor resources to apply to the project to ensure that their business needs are adequately addressed, nor do they feel that they can train the existing project team in how their units operate.

For Management and Organization, it is recommended that the project:

• Appoint a new ASMP Lead as soon as possible. This is a critical position, and the strong leadership will be needed to drive the new project direction. This individual should have broad University knowledge, and be very involved in the current implementation and decision making process.

• Strengthen the functioning and effectiveness of the Financials Lead role. Also a critical position, this role should be enabled to drive resolution of open FIN decisions, as well as lead the FIN side of the project.

• Consider adding the campus IT resources (specifically AITL) within the overall project organization, and leverage their business process and system knowledge moving forward. This will address stakeholder time and resource constraints, as well as their concerns that the existing project team does not fully understand their business.
Executive Summary: Program Scope, Plans, and Status

For the project, significant formal project planning, status reporting, and communications exist in processes and regularly recurring meetings. Formal project plans and status reports are used.

While several project plans exist, they are not all brought together into one consolidated, comprehensive plan. The decisions regarding the future direction of the project will provide the opportunity to re-plan the project, create a consolidated plan, and overlay it with business events.

The associated status reports focus on lists of tasks and roadblocks, however they should also illustrate project progress against time, a key metric. It is understood that much of this information is included in the Gantt chart. It is recommended to shift to a simple Excel spreadsheet with a list of the tasks, roadblocks and issues, and publish this document in the shared space for relevant parties to view. The issues can thus be documented, tracked, and reported. The re-planning process can be used as an opportunity to re-work the status reporting process.

The stakeholders reported that they feel that the project is not being transparent about the issues that they have raised. They feel that status reports show progress, however there are few updates on resolution of their issues.

For Program Scope, Plans, and Status, it is recommended that the project:

• Create a detailed, consolidated work plan including all project dependencies, and resource requirements/activities/involvement so that they can plan accordingly.

• Provide regular and timely updates on the outcome of project decisions and issue resolution back to stakeholder groups. The list of pending issues and decisions should be added to the current status reporting process.
Executive Summary: Solution Architecture, Design, and Configuration

The Solution Architecture, Design, and Configuration for the project is very complex, with many integrated components. It requires significant active involvement of all project team members and stakeholders.

The stakeholders have reported that the development approach has been to replicate existing processes, rather than transform those processes for efficiency and effectiveness, and make use of the more advanced Workday technology. They have stated that the existing business process flows are being used, when there may be better ways to conduct their business.

They further state that they want to reorganize and standardize the processes, however, they do not have enough time to accomplish this. They feel that they need guidance and support from the leadership to standardize, and that they need to better understand how the technology works to align the process redesign with the technology. They feel they do not have enough insight into what needs to change.

For Solution Architecture, Design, and Configuration, it is recommended that the project:

- Work closely with the stakeholders to understand where their knowledge gaps exist, and share existing project documentation that had previously been published and communicated.
- Determine the strategy to implement business process improvements within the overall project implementation.
Program Governance is critical to the project’s success. This includes Governance at both the University and project team levels. Significant activities are taking place to engage the stakeholders within the implementation decision making process. This is setting the precedent to be followed for further key decision making.

It was reported that a formal decision making process has not been established and followed, and that it takes a long time to make and implement decisions at the executive and project levels. It is felt that there is not collective executive leadership support for the project. It is recommended that the UT President and Provost create a joint communication regarding the critical nature of this project, and the benefits that will be realized through its implementation.

It was also reported that assumptions and decisions being made are not always made as a consensus when appropriate, nor properly recorded, and as a result resurface as open items. This leads to decisions having to be re-reviewed and decisions having to be made again, resulting in re-work. Further, the expressed sentiment is that at times the individuals making decisions may not be the right ones to do so, and decisions are frequently made based on erroneous assumptions.

For Program Governance, it is recommended that the project:

• Assess the current Governance structures and processes, and align them with current leadership direction. Ensure that there is appropriate communications and agreement amongst the President, Provost, and Chief Financial Officer.
• Establish/enhance and adhere to a formal Governance process, which should result in more effective decision making. Ensure that the proper stakeholders are involved at the right levels of decision making, and consensus exists if needed; develop a RACI matrix to facilitate the process. Project control documents should be modified accordingly if they exist, or created if they do not exist, and socialized with all project team members and stakeholders.
The Contract Management process is sound, and has been working effectively.

The policy includes having the PMO oversee the contract management process. Managing contracted scope of services and changes to contract scope involves adhering to the various vendors’ Statements of Work (SOWs).

For Contract Management, it is recommended that the project:

- Continue using the vendor SOWs for all decision making around the contracts.
- Continue documenting and communicating changes regarding the SOWs on the project SharePoint site.
Executive Summary: Security Management

The Security function has a Security Lead role that is responsible for overseeing and coordinating Security-related activities across the project.

From a project-wide perspective, Security does not operate cohesively under own official workstream, and is currently managed in each functional area, independent of one another.

From the Financials Security perspective, the decision around decentralization is impacting the security design, especially with Business Assets. More investigation into Workday’s capabilities must be done in order to meet the business requirements around security for assets.

For Security Management, it is recommended that the project:

- Hold weekly workstream meetings (led by the Security Lead), requiring attendance of the functional area leads with responsibility and understanding of security requirements for their areas. Each meeting agenda should include discussion around overlapping security requirements in order that role, user-based, and intersection security may all be appropriately deployed in a coordinated fashion.
- For Financials specifically, the project team should revisit their views and plans around E2E testing, as security is a key component of E2E testing. It is critical to have as complete as possible, production-like security in place for E2E testing. This will prevent improper visibility of data. It also allows the opportunity to test security settings and role assignments to ensure appropriate security is in place for UAT and for Production.
Executive Summary: Change Management and Organizational Readiness Planning

Significant work has been performed in the Change Management and Organizational Readiness areas. Enterprise Readiness workstreams have been developed, and are being executed. These include a comprehensive set of strategies and plans across change management, communications, training, and organizational alignment.

While these activities have been, and are being, conducted, many stakeholders do not all feel that they are engaged and aware of Enterprise Readiness plans and timelines. As a result, they are unsure if they will receive the necessary support from the Enterprise Readiness workstreams. They also feel that they are asked to make critical decisions quickly to accommodate Workday, and project deadlines are often unmanageable. They do not feel that their issues and concerns are being heard.

In addition, business stakeholders report that while they have been told that Workday was to make them more efficient and save positions, there is conflicting information regarding the personnel required to manage processes in Workday.

Further, some individuals who are provided with project details to be passed onto their groups, are holding this information, and planning to distribute it later in the project timeline. This is preventing varying levels of information dissemination throughout the UT community.

For Change Management and Organizational Readiness Planning, it is recommended that the project:

- Continue to execute strategies and plans with impacted stakeholders. They should meet with the business stakeholders to understand where the perceived issues exist, and address those accordingly.
- Our experience is Workday typically reduces the level of effort for day-to-day processes. Where feasible, include representatives from the stakeholder/business constituency in design and workstream meetings so they can understand the processes being created and see for themselves the level of efficiency or complexity Workday will bring to their specific area of responsibility.
- Mandate the dissemination of readiness information by designated resources.
Executive Summary: Test Planning and Execution

Test planning and the execution of the plan have been in progress.

The Testing Lead’s role is limited to project management of the testing plan; the Finance and HCM functional leads are taking on the majority of the testing roles to lead the testing strategy, develop test scenarios, scripts and execute tests.

Changes to HCM configuration and new design configurations have not been tested since testing was last completed. Further testing is in the project plan, however, this should be expanded and validated with the functional areas for comprehensiveness.

There is a 50% comfort level with the testing completed thus far for Payroll. There are 42 integrations still to be tested. The comfort level would be improved by completing full cycle end-to-end in parallel testing, including all integration points.

For Test Planning and Execution, it is recommended that the project:

• Charge the Testing Lead with creating an overall test strategy for FIN, HCM and Payroll, with an appropriate test plan which addresses each of these three areas. In addition, the Test Lead should drive the execution of the test plan, including coordinating issues resolution and reporting testing metrics daily during end-to-end and parallel testing efforts.

• Perform the planned regression testing for new and updated configurations, and include test scenarios based on updates in WD27 and WD28. Allow enough time for three full parallel payroll tests (9 weeks of testing in a separate tenant), which include all earnings and deductions which flow through the paychecks, as well as payroll-related integration testing. A full parallel test for Grants is also recommended.
Assessment Dashboard

The Project Dashboard presented on the following page provides an “at a glance” view of the status for each of the selected areas assessed. Our team used KPMG standard IV&V methodologies and the rating scale below when assessing each of the areas. The content presented within the Executive Summary and Detailed Findings sections of this document provided the basis for the status of each area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The processes associated with this component areas are on-time and meeting all project objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>The process associated with this component area are, in part, not meeting the project schedule and/or not meeting project objectives. Yellow status assumes there are viable mitigation strategies that can bring the processes associated with this component back in line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>The processes associated with this component area are at risk. There are key blocking issues to meeting the project schedule and meeting project objectives. These issues must be addressed in order to prevent schedule delays or missed project objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>The process associated with this component area are at high risk and must be addressed as soon as possible. There are key blocking issues that have yet to be addressed. The project is not meeting the schedule and very few project objectives are being met. Red status assumes there are no viable mitigation strategies, or the ones in place are not resulting in expected benefits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Assessment Dashboard (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Key Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Management and Organization**               | Amber/Trending Yellow | • Appoint a new Program Lead, and strengthen the functioning and effectiveness of the Financials Lead role, as soon as possible.  
• Where appropriate, include campus IT resources within the project organization. |
| **Program Scope, Plans, and Status**          | Yellow       | • Create an updated consolidated work plan, improving upon the current plan’s level of detail, resource requirements, and dependencies.  
• Provide decisions and issue resolution status to constituents/customers of the program. |
| **Solution Architecture, Design, and Configuration** | Yellow       | • Identify where stakeholder knowledge gaps exist; address accordingly.  
• Determine the strategy to implement business process improvements. |
| **Program Governance**                        | Amber        | • Ensure Governance structures aligns President, Provost, and CFO direction.  
• Adhere to a formal Governance process, engaging all stakeholders. |
| **Contract Management**                       | Green        | • Continue using the vendor SOWs for all contract decision making.  
• Continue documenting SOW changes on the project SharePoint site. |
| **Security Management**                       | Yellow       | • Hold weekly workstream meetings to ensure a coordinated Security rollout.  
• Revisit the views and plans around E2E testing. |
| **Change Management and Organizational Readiness Planning** | Amber        | • Meet with the stakeholders to understand where their issues exist.  
• Include stakeholder representatives in design and workstream meetings. |
| **Test Planning and Execution**               | Yellow       | • The Testing Lead should drive a comprehensive testing strategy/test plan.  
• Perform the planned regression testing for new and updated configurations. |
Detailed Observations and Recommendations
## Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management and Organization</td>
<td>The project is very complex, and has been managed closely by a dedicated project team, led by the ASMP Associate Vice President (AVP). A formal organizational structure is in place for the project. The AVP retired at the end of December 2016. The UT CIO is assuming the program responsibilities until a new program lead is identified.</td>
<td>Identifying a new program lead should be considered a high priority. The individual selected should have a broad knowledge of the University, as well as the technical environment. It is critical that this individual be involved in the current go-live/decoupling decision making process, so they are positioned to execute on those decisions. After the future decisions are made, the project’s organizational structure should be reassessed to ensure it supports the future direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It has been reported that Subject Matter Experts from the various Campus IT groups (specifically AITL) have not been included in early discovery and design activities. These business analyst/developer resources possess significant knowledge about current processes from a business and technical perspective, given that they have developed the existing system.</td>
<td>Moving forward, the project should engage and incorporate these resources into the project structure and organization. This will help ensure that requirements are met, and that associated business decisions are made with the adequate knowledge of the business unit and existing systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was reported by the stakeholders that there has been significant turnover of the project consulting staff, and that the staff does not understand how their units operate. As a result, they feel that there is not consistency within the team, that critical decisions are being made without appropriate knowledge, and therefore requirements are not being adequately defined. They further stated that they do not have the time nor resources to train the project staff in how their unit operates.</td>
<td>As the project structure and plans are revised, the staffing issues should be resolved, filling roles with qualified candidates with knowledge of the University and respective units. As much as practically feasible, limiting consultant turnover will reduce the necessity of knowledge transfer and related delays.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management and Organization</td>
<td>There is a lack of business resources dedicated to the project from the CPUs to support the workstreams through the various implementation phases.</td>
<td>Across all functional areas of the project (including integrations), dedicate resources from appropriate business owner/campus areas, including specific workstreams where there are gaps, to provide adequate and balanced support for design, testing, and knowledge transfer. Devise strategies to backfill for these resources, to ensure that they are able to apply adequate time to the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Scope,</td>
<td><strong>Observations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans, and Status</td>
<td>Formal project planning, status reporting, and communications processes are in place for the project. Regularly recurring meetings take place to address these areas.</td>
<td>Continue to hold existing meetings and communicate out to all project team members and stakeholders. Based on the decisions regarding the project’s future direction, these processes will need to be revisited and revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various project plans exist, however they are not all brought together in one consolidated, comprehensive plan.</td>
<td>Once the future direction is determined, perform a detailed planning process to identify all project tasks, and include those tasks in a comprehensive project plan. Activity dependencies and campus resources need to be specified within the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status reports focus on lists of tasks and roadblocks; however, they could be improved to illustrate progress against time.</td>
<td>Consider restructuring status reports to show, for each work stream:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Green/Yellow/Red Dashboard to demonstrate at a glance overall project status, as well as status of each work stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Accomplishments in the prior week (tasks completed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If still in progress, percent complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Planned/achievable tasks for the next week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Metrics that show progress against time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Issues resolved/decisions made in the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• New risks and issues registered in the reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pending action items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Upcoming scheduled meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Scope, Plans, and Status</td>
<td>The stakeholders feel that the project is not being transparent about the issues that they have raised. The status reports show progress, however there are few updates on resolution of the issues raised.</td>
<td>Provide updates on the outcome of project decisions and issue resolution back to stakeholder groups. Include the list of pending issues to the current status reporting process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Issue/Risk Register defines the various risks and issues documented throughout the project. Some accepted risks have not been updated in several months. In addition, some risks and issues appear to be very high-level.</td>
<td>Provide status updates for accepted risks. In addition, it is recommended to revise high-level risks to include descriptions with specific details, and include mitigation plans and/or risk responses, as applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Master Go Live Gantt Chart shows key project activities and indicates whether an activity is complete, on schedule, or late. The chart does not include the percentage complete values for activities.</td>
<td>Adding the percentage complete for all activities in progress so that proactive measures can be made before an activity is late is recommended. It is also recommended moving to a more simple format such as Excel for tracking issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Technical Architecture team is implementing a more modern, secure, service-oriented architecture to support the ASMP Program and the CSUs, however there is not buy-in and adoption of the tools by the CSUs. The CSUs stated that while some of the tools may be useful, the vision is incomplete, they were not involved in the decision process, and they are unclear whether what has been implemented will meet their needs. In addition, there is considerable concern about the cost to the CSUs in adopting the tools, and whether their budgets can afford those costs.</td>
<td>While there is a vision to support the ASMP program, the vision can only be valid when the stakeholders understand and align with it. It is recommended that the team work with the individuals within the CSUs who will be instrumental in adopting the tools, to understand the issues that they are raising. A further demonstration of the efficiencies and value should be pursued. An open discussion around the associated costs should also be conducted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solution Architecture, Design and Configuration</td>
<td>Stakeholders report that the development approach has been to replicate existing processes, rather than transform existing processes for efficiency and effectiveness, and make use of the more advanced Workday technology. The business processes being put into Workday use the existing flows when there may be a better way to conduct business. The colleges want to reorganize and standardize the processes, however, state that they do not have enough time to accomplish this. They feel that they need guidance and support from the leadership to standardize the business processes. They need to better understand how the technology works to align the process redesign with the technology. They feel they do not have enough insight into what needs to change. Likewise, and as stated earlier, they feel that the project staff must have a better understanding of the business processes to design an adequate solution.</td>
<td>Additional technology overviews should be provided to the CSUs, including insight into the workflows that have been used in the Workday design process. Re-publicize documentation, videos, newsletters, and other materials that already exist to address the stakeholders concerns regarding the business processes. Over-communication and creative channels of communication are key to reaching as broad a group as possible. Identify the specific areas where project staff may need a better understanding of the business processes being rolled into Workday. It is further recommended to work with the campus community to determine the most effective methods of delivery for communications and training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Workday module observations and recommendations are presented in the next section of this document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Governance</strong></td>
<td>A number of interviewees reported that a formal decision making process has not been established and followed, and that it takes a long time to make and implement decisions at the executive and project levels. It was reported that assumptions and decisions being made are not always made as a consensus nor properly recorded, and resurface as open items. This leads to decisions having to be re-reviewed and decisions having to be made again, resulting in re-work. Further, the sentiment is that the individuals making decisions may not be the right ones to do so, and decisions are made based on erroneous assumptions. Project Control documents (e.g., Project Charter, Project Management Plan, Risk Management Plan, Quality Management Plan, Change Control Plan, Staffing Plans, etc.) may not formally exist or may be out of date (were drafted by IBM). While the project may be informally practicing some of the guiding principles normally found in these documents, it is unclear whether the project is executing to these outdated plans.</td>
<td>Assess the current Governance structures and processes, and align them with current leadership direction. Ensure that there is concurrence amongst the President, Provost, and CFO, and that it is clearly communicated to the University as a whole. Establish/enhance and adhere to a formal Governance process (business case/data gathering, authority/approver identification, timing/communication for all decision-making), which should result in more effective decision making. Ensure that the proper stakeholders are involved at the right levels of decision making. Continue to document and publish all decisions. Develop a formal RACI (Responsible, Accountable, Consulted, Informed) matrix to facilitate the process; discuss it with all team members and stakeholders. Update or create Project Control documents that will specify guiding principles and processes for project Governance, and hold the project accountable for executing to the plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Governance</td>
<td>Documentation regarding decision-making exists but can be challenging to locate on the project SharePoint site.</td>
<td>The central document repository should be used for all project governance documentation. In addition, it is recommended to consolidate or archive folders that are no longer relevant to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was reported that downstream dependencies may not be documented or considered when changes are made in Workday. Changes that impact downstream processes may not be communicated timely.</td>
<td>Create/update a list of downstream dependencies and business owners impacted, so they can be notified when there is a change in direction in Workday. Communicate changes promptly so that CSUs will have sufficient time to adjust their systems/processes in response to the change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Risk Register published to the project is reviewed weekly and updated at least once a month. As of 12/8/2016, there are 13 open risks and 1 issue (7 High, 5 Medium, and 2 Low). This number appears to be low in view of the number of concerns being raised by the project and stakeholder communities.</td>
<td>Update the Risk Register with all risks currently impacting the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some risks of a confidential nature that are visible only to the project leadership are tracked informally through emails and PowerPoint presentations.</td>
<td>Create a separate risk register to log and track risks of a confidential nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A preliminary review of risks currently in Open status shows that the information surrounding existing risks do not include the potential impact of the risk.</td>
<td>Update the Risk Register to document potential impacts of the risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract Management</td>
<td>The contract management policy includes having the PMO oversee the contract management process. Managing contracted scope of services and changes to contract scope involves adhering to the various vendors' Statements of Work (SOWs).</td>
<td>As this policy and process appears adequate at this time, continue using the vendor SOWs for all decision making around the contracts. In addition, continue documenting and communicating changes regarding the SOWs on the project SharePoint site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td>The Security function has a Security Lead role that is responsible for overseeing and coordinating Security-related activities across the project. From a project-wide perspective, Security does not have its own official workstream, and is currently managed in each functional area, independent of one another.</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Security Lead hold weekly workstream meetings, which require attendance of the functional area leads with responsibility and understanding of security requirements for their areas. Regularly discuss where security needs may overlap or conflict in order that role, user-based, and intersection security may all be appropriately deployed in a coordinated fashion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Management** | Regarding the Financials perspective:  
• The decision around decentralization is impacting security design, especially with business assets. The current legacy system can restrict access to individual assets however this cannot be done in Workday (e.g., military equipment). UT is working on organizational based security, as it has a significant audit impact.  
• The role mapping is hinged around FDM completion.  
• The project team members reported the plan to have security mapped for UAT does not have as big of an impact for end-to-end (E2E) testing. | It is recommended that the project team revisit their views and plans around E2E testing, as security is important for E2E testing. It is critical to have as complete as possible, production-like security in place for E2E testing. This will prevent improper visibility of data. It also allows the opportunity to test security settings and role assignments to ensure appropriate security is in place for UAT and for Production. |
## Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Management and Organizational Readiness Planning</td>
<td>Enterprise Readiness workstreams have been developed, and are being executed. These include a comprehensive set of strategies and plans across change management, communications, training, and organizational alignment.</td>
<td>Enterprise Readiness should continue to execute strategies and plans with impacted stakeholders and ensure dependencies, timeline, and activities are adjusted as needed to align with the revised project plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It appears that the Enterprise Readiness team members have the right capabilities and adequate capacity to execute workstream activities and prepare impacted stakeholders for the upcoming changes.</td>
<td>Enterprise Readiness should continue to monitor resource capacity as plans are further revised, and execution becomes heavier in preparation for go-live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The CPU teams do not all feel that they are engaged and aware of Enterprise Readiness plans and timelines. They are unsure if they will receive the necessary support from the Enterprise Readiness workstreams, including organizational alignment (e.g., staffing up HR Service Center), training deployment, change impacts affecting CPU processes, etc.</td>
<td>Enterprise Readiness leads should meet with the CPU leads to discuss and clarify scope, plans, timelines, and support to the functional teams. They should ensure that adequate resources are dedicated to the project to support training or train-the-trainer to resources, and organizational alignment plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSUs report that there are competing day-to-day business priorities that conflict with time demands by the project. They feel that are asked to make critical decisions quickly to accommodate Workday, and project deadlines are often unmanageable.</td>
<td>The project team should engage further with the CSUs to address their perceived conflicts and time demand issues. As project requests are made, open channels of communication to assess status of the request and address any obstacles early.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Change Management and Organizational Readiness Planning | Stakeholders have felt that the project team is not listening to their concerns and their pushback is disregarded. Efforts to inform and assist stakeholders have been underway including:  
• Discovery Groups to help identify change impacts, discrepancies for Workday vs. current business processes, and the level of change needed  
• Business Process Workshops which incorporates stakeholder group representatives who take project information and materials back to their units  
• Change Overviews to assist units to make policy changes. | Continue to include the business stakeholders in all decision-making activities; however, appoint a key leader with authority to decide on any impasses between organizations to ensure Workday related processes are as efficient as possible. It is understood that appointing a decision-maker is a complex matter in a University setting; however, someone must be in a position to prevent key decisions from being derailed by impasse.  
Further, listen to stakeholder concerns, conduct needed analysis, and provide feedback on resolutions. Follow up on conflictive topics to help avert the frustration and discontent that currently exists. |
|                 | Stakeholders report that they have received conflicting messages – Workday was to make them more efficient and save positions; however, there is a sense that more staff with higher qualifications will be needed to process day-to-day work through Workday.  
Due to resource constraints, the stakeholders state that they are operating at “bare-bone” levels, and do not have the budget to meet the Workday personnel demands. | It is recommended this concern be addressed through outreach and education. As quickly as possible, key stakeholder representatives should be given Workday demonstrations regarding the business processes relevant to their areas. This will help them understand what Workday will and will not do for them. |
# Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Management and Organizational Readiness Planning</td>
<td>Critical functionality gaps will potentially create issues for stakeholders, who are ultimately responsible for those functions after go-live. Some members of the stakeholder community have reported that there is little confidence that Workday can support all important processes, and that there appear to be no workarounds for those processes. These include multi-sourced faculty compensation, annual budgeting, salary adjustments, cost transfers, inter-departmental transfers, inventory, transaction reconciliation, grants and contracts, multiple funding sources, shopping cart technology, EHR, liability insurance billing, e-commerce, purchasing, integrating with USAS (State accounting system), and complicated credit card reconciliation processes, and others.</td>
<td>Determine the functionality that will/will not be there at go-live. For each, create a strategy for how the specific function will be addressed. The strategy needs to address process, resources, the associated technology, if applicable, integration, and ongoing support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Planning and Execution</td>
<td>The Testing Lead’s role is limited to project management of the testing plan; the Finance and HCM functional leads are taking on the majority of the testing roles to lead the testing strategy, develop test scenarios, scripts and execute tests.</td>
<td>Charge the Testing Lead with creating, and driving the execution of an overall test strategy and individual plans for FIN, HCM and Payroll. Consider adding resources to the testing team if functional teams do not have bandwidth to continue developing and executing test scenarios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes to HCM configuration and new design configurations have not been tested since testing was last completed. Further testing is in the project plan, however, this should be expanded and validated with the functional areas for comprehensiveness.</td>
<td>Perform the planned regression testing for new and updated configurations, and include test scenarios based on updates in WD27 and WD28. Allow enough time for three full parallel payroll tests (9 weeks of testing in a separate tenant), which include all earnings and deductions which flow through the paychecks, and associated integrations. A full parallel test for Grants is also recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a 50% comfort level with the testing completed thus far for Payroll. There are 42 integrations still to be tested. The comfort level may not be there until an entire month is processed in parallel end-to-end, including all integration points.</td>
<td>Allow sufficient time to complete a minimum of two full, end-to-end parallel testing cycle in which all variances are resolved or explained. A third parallel cycle is recommended to enable a focus on how to process payroll and further development of the payroll checklist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was reported that not all HR business resources were included as UAT tester roles – some resources did participate, while others participated as “observers”.</td>
<td>Dedicate resources to perform UAT, and encourage them to bring examples of their own day-to-day work to use as test cases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Test Planning and Execution     | During unit testing for Financials, it was identified that there were too many test scenarios, and that they were not vetted with the consultants. The Workday leads helped scale back the unit testing scenarios. A similar situation could be encountered on E2E, where the net is cast wide. Recently there was an appointed test lead on the UT side, however there was not a testing lead on the Workday side. It was reported that some Workday leads were not willing to get involved with helping out with scenarios. | Moving forward, the following recommendations are suggested:  
• Gather input from all of the CPUs for the E2E scenarios.  
• Validate that for each design decision, there is a corresponding test scenario.  
• Verify the number of scenarios can be completed within the timeline with appropriate resources.  
• Ensure logistics are in place and all participants have been identified ahead of time.  
• Appoint a testing lead from Workday to vet scenarios from a functional perspective and work alongside the UT test lead.  

A working end-user environment or sandbox will be needed to run practice transactions, learn how the system will react to unit data, and assist in defining data mappings.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

It is understood that data validation is currently a process during each build and throughout E2E. In addition, once E2E is complete and the majority of issues are resolved, a sandbox will be provided where users can run mock transactions that will further identify any data-related issues/concerns. This plan should continue throughout the duration of the project.
Additional Workday Observations and Recommendations
## Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Workday Financials | Regarding the Internal Service Providers (ISPs) at the University:  
• Departments are charging each other for services (e.g., IT charging other departments for internet and telephone).  
• The University informs the ISPs the services they can provide and how much they can charge; there exists strict rules on what grants can be charged for different services.  
• ISPs view this as revenue for their department; departments getting charged see it as expenses charged to their department. The University does not see it as revenue/expense, so for reporting they eliminate the activity; the activity posts to specific ledger accounts to be excluded for reporting.  
• There is difficulty given that it is new functionality - UT has over 1,000 ISPs, and as a result it is time consuming to set up and configure; significant testing will need to be performed.  
• Workday has been in the process of resolving bugs, so the revenue team has now begun working on configuration. | The University should continue to partner with Workday to move product development forward; University representatives should continue to be a full participant in resolution completion.  
Sufficient testing time should be built into the project plan so that all new functionality can be fully and properly tested. |
**Detailed Observations and Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Workday Financials** | **Internal Service Providers (continued):**  
  - E2E testing will prove whether the solution works to a level of satisfaction given the large volume.  
  - There are many integrations related to the ISP transactions.  
  - A component of configuration is associating the spend category with the revenue category.  
  - Spend categories and revenue categories have their own hierarchies for ISPs.  
  - Regarding ISP transaction initiated by the department booking revenue, the business process functionality still needs to be addressed so it does not just go to cost centers being charged, but routes for approval to the department booking the revenue.  
  - ISPs are set up similar to suppliers, so roles cannot be associated, as it is not an organization. | All test scenarios should be defined ahead of time in preparation for E2E testing.  
  For instances where a spend category may be used for ISP and non-ISP expense, review APRs to see if there is a way to identify an ISP dimension in the spend rule to drive to two different ledger accounts – one for regular expense and one for ISP expense. |
|                 | **Shared services was recently dissolved, before each unit could opt in or opt out of using the shared services group. A decision on how decentralized the processes will be defined is pending.** | **This pending decision should be considered a high priority as it has a broad impact on security design, business process design, testing, and change management.** |
|                 | **Regarding integrations, the SciQuest integration has specific requirements that Workday needs to comply with. Banking integrations are addressed at this point.** | **Continue to further flesh out the unit and E2E testing requirements for these integrations, as well as all integrations.** |
## Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workday Financials</td>
<td>The Banking and Settlement business processes are not fully designed, and the unit testing has not completed. Our opinion is that the Workday lead responsible for this functionality is inexperienced in this area.</td>
<td>Appointing a new Workday consultant for Banking and Settlement should be considered. Attention and priority should be given to completing the design of the business processes, and a comprehensive plan for unit testing processes and system testing the integrations be created. In particular, close communication with the banks for integration test planning is critical.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Data Model (FDM)</td>
<td>The project team manages the design and efforts of the FDM, and the business units determine the values for the FDM dimensions. The units have stated that they prefer to hear clarity on how projects/programs will be used from the Chief Financial Officer’s (CFO’s) and Provost’s office, rather than the central ASMP team. The CFO’s and Provost’s office await making the decision until they hear from the units.</td>
<td>Determine where the uncertainty exists between the CFO’s/Provost’s office and the business units. Once determined, collectively agree on who will be charged with the decision making and/or how disagreements will be resolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Vice President (VP) of Procurement left the University, and lower level employees were not comfortable making decisions for Procurement. During playback sessions, it was determined that business units were not involved in the decisions made by the previous VP. Design decisions were revised and reviewed with Internal Audit and CFO. The new Director of Procurement and Payment Services has recently joined the team.</td>
<td>Make a priority for the new Director to escalate the decisions around the procurement processes, and whether they will be centralized or decentralized.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Financial Data Model (FDM)** | There has been difficulty with defining values for programs and projects. Below are related observations:  
  • Today, each unit defines their activities and determines criteria for how the activity will be used. As a result there is no clear way to determine if something should be a project or program in Workday.  
  • Additionally, not all programs and projects are budget checked, therefore a new custom worktag was created to track activities that will be budget checked.  
  • Projects can be events, funding allocations, or anything that has a start/end date (like a startup package), not only capital projects.  
  • Some units view startup packages with start/end dates, some view it as an allocation that they have in perpetuity.  
  • The Deans determine how the startup packages are used.  
  • Centrally, it has been communicated that everyone is to use packages as a project. If they do not have an end date, it should be set for 50 years out. | There should be a mutual agreement on the guidelines for what will be a project or a program – centrally and at the unit level.  
Specifically, Deans and the project team need to agree on how to classify startup packages in Workday. |
## Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Financial Data Model (FDM)      | Observations regarding mapping 10 digit account string and confirming the order of the driver worktags:  
• In the legacy system, there is a 10 digit account string including the cost center, fund, gift, grant, etc. There is a descriptive field in the profile of each account to describe the activities associated with it (correlating to a project or program in Workday). Mapping this 10 digit account string to Workday is critical for the internally developed UT integrations, so the correct driver worktags (and their related worktags) can populate correctly on transactions.  
• Mapping this account string to the State’s ERP system is difficult as well.  
• Gift, grant, cost center, and fund have been straightforward to map; there have been little to no issues with them. | The difficulties stem from the issues on decision making and defining a program versus a project, as discussed above. There is a dependency on these areas to properly map the 10 digit account string in the legacy systems to Workday. |
|                                 | There are 12 Custom Worktags and 9 (7 Financials) Custom Organizations identified. | The Custom Worktags and Custom Organizations need to be reviewed. The team should verify the definition and purpose of each custom dimension to ensure dimensions are not overlapping. 15 Custom Worktags and 10 (financials) Custom Organizations are allowed for every client. Being close to the limit poses a risk if there are new requirements in FIN, HCM or PAY in the future. |
## Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Data Model (FDM)</td>
<td>The units were asked to map approximately 15,000 unit codes into Workday cost centers. The mapping is not one-to-one, and it was reported that there is not enough information about how the new system works to accomplish the task; nor is there adequate time or resources to accomplish the task. Trying to map has raised more questions, and units feel there is little guidance, documentation, or assistance to find the answers. This will impact GL data conversion, integration design, and testing. The CSUs provided their initial FDM values in December 2016, and the project team is currently loading these values into a Workday tenant.</td>
<td>Key decision makers within each of the units should be identified, and a determination made for who they will report to for escalating questions/concerns/and requirements. Further, the project should consider assigning project resources to assist the units with the mappings, with a dedicated counterpart in each business area. A conversion specification document to record source to target data transfers and transformation rules for each data element should be created. It is recommended that the FDM values from the CSUs, once loaded into the tenant, are reviewed and validated with the CSUs. In addition, these values should be reviewed for potential redundancy, and streamlining should be employed wherever possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HCM/Payroll</strong></td>
<td>The HCM ASMP Leads feel they are on track for a 2017 go-live and do not feel there are any major gaps or show stoppers that would affect readiness for production.</td>
<td>HCM ASMP Leads should continue to work through project plan activities and finalize design, configuration, and testing of open items (e.g., benefits eligibility employee types).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The HCM Stakeholders are concerned about a July 2017 HCM go-live due to the August semester start period and the many transactions that occur across faculty and students during this time frame.</td>
<td>As part of the current implementation decision making process, consideration should be given to a Fall 2017 (or appropriate) HCM go-live, to occur after commencement of the Fall semester to avoid the challenges of competing priorities, resource constraints, and catch-up transactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The HR Business Leads and ASMP Team Leads feel that the HCM/Payroll ASMP Lead has been successful in their role, and has the necessary skills and experience to lead the Workday HCM implementation.</td>
<td>Continue to engage the HCM/Payroll ASMP Lead’s expertise to support the various workstreams and key decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The HR CPUs are lacking the information required to plan for sustainment, including process variances (e.g., manual workarounds, audits/reports), changing roles, resource needs for ASMP post go live, and staffing up the CPU.</td>
<td>Continue to conduct sustainment working sessions to understand and plan for changing processes, changing roles, resource needs, staffing requirements, budget implications, etc. Include relevant and impacted stakeholder groups in sessions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Detailed Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Area</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM/Payroll</td>
<td>The sustainment planning process appears to be well-organized and documented thus far. Nonetheless, there appears to be a disconnect with the campus IT community for sustainment planning. Campus IT continues to express concerns that many processes that persist at the time of Go-Live and beyond impact CSUs and must still be decided, documented and communicated to campus.</td>
<td>Engage with the campus IT community to explore their concerns, and address any processes of import to the user community that have yet to be considered in the sustainment planning process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Meetings Attended

- Initial Meeting with Project Leadership, November 2, 2016
- Initial Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Overview Meeting with ERP Implementation Director, November 2, 2016
- Initial Meeting with Chief Information Officer, November 3, 2016
- Workday Context Overview Meeting with ERP Implementation Director, November 3, 2016
- Initial Meeting with ASMP Associate Vice President, November 8, 2016
- Initial Meeting with Enterprise Readiness Director, November 8, 2016
- Meeting with UT Austin President and CFO, November 10, 2016
- ASMP All-Hands Meeting, November 18, 2016
- Meeting with CUBO, December 1, 2016
- Meeting with PMO Project Manager, December 1, 2016
- ASMP Weekly Team Meeting, December 1, 2016
Meetings Attended and Interviews Conducted

Meetings Attended

• Meeting with ERP Implementation Director, December 2, 2016
• ASMP Town Hall Meeting, December 6, 2016
• ASMP Weekly Team Meeting, December 8, 2016
• Meeting with EDAM Senior Business Analyst, December 13, 2016
• Meeting with Chief Financial Officer, December 13, 2016
• Meeting with Chief Information Officer, December 13, 2016
• AppMod Meeting, December 14, 2016
• ASMP Weekly Team Meeting, December 15, 2016
• Financial Readiness Coordinators Meeting, December 15, 2016
• Informal Meeting with Enterprise Readiness Director, December 15, 2016
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Interviews Conducted

- TxAdmin Group, November 8, 2016
- Academic Business Officers Group (TxAdmin), November 9, 2016
- Benefits ASMP Lead, November 9, 2016
- Benefits Director, November 9, 2016
- HCM/Payroll ASMP Lead, November 9, 2016
- HR Director, November 9, 2016
- HCM/Recruiting ASMP Lead, November 9, 2016
- Academics Personnel Lead, November 9, 2016
- Grants Lead and Team, November 10, 2016
- Academic Affairs Personnel Director, November 14, 2016
- Integrations Lead (HCM/FIN), November 14, 2016
- Testing Lead (HCM/FIN), November 14, 2016
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Interviews Conducted (continued)

• HR Director and Benefits Director, November 14, 2016
• Enterprise Readiness Lead ASMP, November 14, 2016
• HCM Change Management Lead ASMP, November 14, 2016
• FIN Change Management Lead ASMP, November 14, 2016
• Communications Lead ASMP, November 14, 2016
• Organizational Alignment Lead ASMP, November 14, 2016
• Training Lead ASMP, November 14, 2016
• Integrations Lead (HCM/FIN), November 14, 2016
• Data Conversion Lead, November 15, 2016
• Spend Lead, November 15, 2016
• WD FDM Lead, November 15, 2016
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Interviews Conducted (continued)

- Budget Lead, November 15, 2016
- Customer Accounts Lead, November 15, 2016
- OFA Lead, November 15, 2016
- Financial Accounting Lead, November 15, 2016
- Processing/Business Operations, Accounting Lead, November 15, 2016
- Processing/Business Operations, Cash Management Lead, November 15, 2016
- Processing/Business Operations, HR, November 15, 2016
- Processing/Business Operations, Payroll Lead, November 15, 2016
- Processing/Business Operations, Purchasing Lead, November 15, 2016
- Security Lead, November 15, 2016
- Project Management Office (PMO) Lead, November 17, 2016
- Data Management Lead and Application Modernization Lead, November 18, 2016
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Interviews Conducted (continued)

- Chief Financial Officer, December 13, 2016
- EDAM Director, December 13, 2016
- Chief Information Officer, December 13, 2016
- Technical Architecture Director, December 14, 2016
- IT Campus Officers, December 14, 2016
- Security Officer, December 14, 2016
- Internal Auditor, December 14, 2016
Documentation Reviewed
Documentation Reviewed

- ASMP Communications Plan
- ASMP Communications Strategy
- ASMP Content Strategy
- ASMP Program Overview (Roadshow presentation)
- Change Impact Analysis
- Critical Gaps
- Financial Business Decisions Workgroup
- HCM Open Decisions and Issues
- HCM Workshop Overviews
- Integration Inventory – Finance
- Integration Inventory – HCM
- Issues Log
Documentation Reviewed (continued)

- Issues with Workday
- Master ASMP Workday Go Live Gantt Chart
- Project Organization
- Readiness Coordinator Presentations
- TXAdmin Key Points Regarding Workday
- UT Austin Critical Gaps as of November 2016
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