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Huron Highlights

- Formed in 2002
  With approximately 200 professionals

- 2019 revenue of $877 million

- HURN
  Publicly traded on the Nasdaq since October 2004

- More than 3,800 full-time professionals with leading expertise

- Headquartered in Chicago
  with domestic and international offices

- In 2019
  Huron served more than 1,800 businesses and institutions, including 350 new clients
900+ education experts
500+ education clients

Including all of the top 100 Research Universities.

Your satisfaction and success is our ultimate goal, and we make every effort to continuously exceed expectations.

> 9 out of 10 average client satisfaction
Today’s Goals

• Understand the Objectives of the Project
• Align on Core Data Management Concepts
• Understand Your Participation
Why Improve Data Management?

**REPORT MISALIGNMENT**
Common line items do not tie out, results differ based on report source, resulting analysis is incomplete and out of date.

**DATA EVERYWHERE**
Data is ungoverned and has many sources; which takes a long time to gather and prepare for reports.

**DATA ACCESS**
Users struggle to get needed data or they are unsure where to go for data and reporting.

**DATA & REPORTING**
Where is the data coming from? What happened to it along the way?

**NO LINEAGE**
Systems are out of sync thus reporting timing can vary. Low confidence in report results vary during monthly reporting cycles.

**TIMING & SYNC ISSUES**
Reports have varying formats, locations, and accessibility.

**NO DEFINED STANDARDS**

“Data Governance is the formal execution and enforcement of authority over the management of data and data-related assets.” – Robert Seiner
Master Data Management delivers and synthesizes domains for 360-degree view of any data and any relationship, including interactions and transactions, regardless of instruction silo or source system, on-premises or in the cloud.
Reporting and Analytics Best Practices

Consistent & Reliable Information

- Standardized reports – Quality over quantity
- Provide consistent definition of key attributes and metrics
- Few/No reporting errors or inconsistencies
- Repeatable process for investigating anomalies

Efficient & Repeatable Processes

- Provide financial and economic implications of decisions
- Active management of data assets; agile and rapid integration of new data
- Leverages advanced analytics; entering the realm of big data and machine learning

Leading Reporting Organization

- Automate report generation and distribution
- Leverage reporting tools as designed “right tool for the job”,
- Core systems and processes are stable and not primary focus of investment

Forward Looking

- Provide a consistent, well understood data access
- Support diverse community of data consumers with different needs (Transactional, Analytical, Real-Time, Snap Shots)
- Variety of data access points

Ubiquitous Access

- Core systems and processes are stable and not primary focus of investment
Project Approach

**Information Gathering**
- Workshops
- Leadership Interviews
- Documentation Review

**Assessment**
- Eight-dimension assessment framework
- Define the current state of data analytics and data management maturity

**Align to Best Practices**
- Introduce and discuss key best practices and the maturity models

**Define North Star**
- Establish the aspirational future state vision
- Define the attributes of the organization, people, process, and technology requirements.
- Highlight top of mind analytics priorities and desired metrics

**Develop Roadmap with Prioritized Projects Aligned to Vision**
- Detailed project charters
- Timeline aligned with the priorities
- Development of future state models and architectures needed to support the transformation
Current State Assessment Approach

Surveying and assessing, defining and designing across eight critical perspectives

- **Strategy** — are the enablers clearly described and understood?
- **Organization** — does the structure support the strategy?
- **Process** — are the processes effective and efficient?
- **Metrics** — are the right measures utilized?
- **Data** — is the data required to support decision-making available?
- **Applications** — does software enable and enhance the processes?
- **Architecture** — is the correct infrastructure in place?
- **People** — do the training, tools and processes effectively enable the workforce?
Current State Scoring Legend

The assessment measures current capabilities against the Analytics and Enterprise Data Management and Integration Maturity Models across the eight perspectives represented on the right.

Scoring is based on a simple five-tier grading scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significantly Advantaged</td>
<td>little improvement</td>
<td>maintaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahead of the Curve</td>
<td>targeted improvement</td>
<td>continuous improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Advantage – At Par</td>
<td>meaningful improvement</td>
<td>target for roadmap initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behind the Curve</td>
<td>significant improvement</td>
<td>target for priority roadmap initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significantly Disadvantaged</td>
<td>extensive improvement</td>
<td>target for the highest priority roadmap initiatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analytics Maturity Curve

0. Unaware
- Varying levels of transactional reporting
- No analytics

1. Basic
- **Spreadsheet anarchy**
  - Transactional application centric
  - Some isolated descriptive analytics
  - Ad hoc analysis dominates
  - Information firefighting with little to no governance
  - Data is siloed with sources and accuracy regularly debated

2. Opportunistic
- **Descriptive analytics**
  - LOB/departmental orientation
  - Focus on migration from spreadsheets to analytic tools with tool proliferation driving up costs
  - Fragmented, siloed data quality and insight initiatives
  - Rudimentary attempts to formalize information requirements
  - Progress hampered by culture; organizational barriers and inconsistent leadership and incentives
  - Disjointed strategy; not business-relevant

3. Standardized
- **Diagnostic analytics**
  - Projects cross business boundaries
  - Technology standards emerge
  - Model-based decision capabilities to support decision makers
  - Different content types still treated differently
  - Agile emerges
  - External data sources are readily integrated
  - Initial business focused analytics strategy and vision
  - Business executive becomes analytics champion
  - BI Competency Center established

4. Differentiated
- **Predictive analytics**
  - Automated sense and respond capabilities tightly integrated into information governance and business processes
  - Analytics are indispensable fuel for performance and innovation, and linked across programs
  - Enterprise program management mentality
  - C-suite executives champion and communicate best practices
  - Business-led/driven, with CDO
  - Analytics inked to outcomes with ROI metrics

5. Transformative
- **Prescriptive analytics**
  - Driving enterprise and industry transformation
  - Prescriptive analytics with decision automation emerging - Sense and respond capabilities that use a mix of machine learning and AI methods to continually adapt and optimize to dynamic conditions
  - Analytics are central to business strategy and influences investments
  - Enterprise performance culture; strategy and execution aligned and continually improved
  - Outside-in perspective
  - CDO sit on board
Data Management Integration Maturity Curve

0. Nonexistent

Data viewed as a transactional byproduct
• No governance
• No recognition of enterprise need
• Limited, proprietary tools
• Custom code – project byproduct
• Roles defined within silos
• Controls applied inconsistently, if at all
• Data quality issues not addressed
• No business or IT executive sponsorship

1. Ad Hoc

Data viewed as a departmental asset
• Tool proliferation
• Cost “chaos”
• Emerging, siloed governance
• Some roles and processes defined
• Growing awareness of impact of data quality issues
• Funding project by project
• IT executive sponsorship

2. Fragmented

Data viewed as a departmental asset
• Formalized initiative
• Competency center
• Standards and best practices sharing
• Formalized governance
• Information infrastructure roadmap
• Consistent, scalable processes and tools; reduction in manual processes
• Process outcomes, including data quality, are more predictable
• Business & IT executive sponsorship

3. Standardized

Data viewed as an organizational enabler
• Effectively used for driving business strategy
• Mature planning and governance
• Standards globally applied
• Management of risks related to data
• Data management performance metrics
• Data consistency and availability
• Measurable improvements in data quality

4. Managed

Data valued as a differentiator
• Information is trusted and leveraged across the organization
• Automated data services
• Dynamic metadata-driven data management and data integration environment
• Highly predictable processes
• Reduced risk
• Well understood metrics to manage data quality and process quality

5. Optimized

Data exploited for transformation
• Information is trusted and leveraged across the organization
• Automated data services
• Dynamic metadata-driven data management and data integration environment
• Highly predictable processes
• Reduced risk
• Well understood metrics to manage data quality and process quality

What data? What data issues?
Future State Vision

1. The “North Star” is defined as the ultimate aspirational vision. It establishes direction for Roadmap development.

2. The Rationalized “North Star” establishes the distance to the Roadmap objectives after cost/benefit analysis is applied to the “North Star.”

Many organizations can meet their strategic goals without total achievement of all perspectives of the aspirational “North Star.”
## Roadmap Outcomes

### Insights Strategy
- Develop roadmap to address operational, management and analytics needs
- Identify key required dashboards & reports
- Define how data is consumed
- Define the prioritization approach for development and requirements gathering
- Define and align on the key metric definitions

### Reporting Organization Model
- Determine model for delivering reports across the institution (central vs. decentralized model)
- Determine process for sharing information
- Determine alignment of reporting organization with data stewards, and analytics goals
- Recommend who should participate in the reporting organization

### Data Governance and MDM Plan
- Develop framework and roadmap for Data Governance Implementation
- Establish Data Governance objectives
- Identify Master Data Domain Approach and Prioritization
- Recommend standardized and repeatable processes
- Determine project vs. institution Data Governance Goals

### Technology Recommendation
- Assess data management, reporting and analytics gaps in future state
- Rationalize and consolidate existing technologies
- Recommend and evaluate technologies to address gaps
- Determine impact of moving to new technologies
- Develop roadmap for implementation of new technologies
Project Timeline

- Reviews
  - Current State
    - Assessment
  - Future State
    - Unconstrained Visioning
  - Roadmap Development
    - Initiate Project
      - Project Start
        - Participants and Schedule
        - Documentation
        - Survey
      - Formal Kick-off
    - Update and Send Survey
    - Analysis
    - Workshops
    - Visioning
    - Prioritization
    - Architecture
    - Roadmap

- Timeline:
  - Project Start: 05/23
  - Project Finish: 06/20
  - Updates:
    - 07/04
    - 07/18
    - 08/01
    - 08/15
    - 08/29
    - 09/12
Your Participation - Survey

Who
All participants will receive - Everyone Has A Voice!

What
Designed to collect information about data management pain points and aspirations at a subject area level.

Why
Best mechanism to ensure feedback from all stakeholders is collected

When
• Sending - Week of the 4th
• Due - TBD

How it will be used
To understand the current state of Data Management across WSU and to assess the maturity level
Your Participation - Workshops

**Who**
Targeted audience based on survey findings.

**What**
4 types of workshops designed to collect information to better understand survey findings.

**Why**
To deep-dive on divergent topics and prioritize aspirations.

**When**
Between July 19th and August 18th

**How it will be used**
To provide inputs for the roadmap and conceptual architecture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Data Governance</th>
<th>Reporting Functional</th>
<th>Reporting Technical</th>
<th>Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Governance</td>
<td>• Data Governance&lt;br&gt;• Master Data Management (MDM)</td>
<td>• BI Tools&lt;br&gt;• Transactional Reporting&lt;br&gt;• Operating Reporting&lt;br&gt;• Management Reporting&lt;br&gt;• Analytical Reporting&lt;br&gt;• People and Org</td>
<td>• Existing Data Structures, Sources, Tools&lt;br&gt;• Data Access and Security&lt;br&gt;• IT and Business Relationship&lt;br&gt;• Architecture Cloud vs. On-prem Impacts</td>
<td>• Reporting Stakeholders&lt;br&gt;• Historical Data Current Challenges&lt;br&gt;• Future Vision&lt;br&gt;• Metrics and KPIs&lt;br&gt;• Operational vs. Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Leads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Governance Leads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Architects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Warehouse Admins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Architects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and Integration Leads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Leads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WSU Participants**
- Functional Leads
- Reporting Leads
- Data Governance Leads
- IT Architects
- IT Architects
- Data Warehouse Admins
- Data Architects
- Infrastructure and Integration Leads
- Reporting Leads
- Project Sponsors
- Steering Committee
- Key Functional Leads from each domain
- Visionaries (regardless of level)
Questions

- Reach out to us at this Email
- Website
  - Will Update with Content as the Project Evolves
  - Unanswered Questions and Recording from this Session
  - FAQ