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Date: December 2009
To: President Mark Emmert
From: President’s Advisory Committee on Enterprise Risk Management
Re: UW Enterprise Risk Management 2009 Annual Report

The University’s Enterprise Risk Management program keeps growing and changing. The President’s Advisory Committee spent much of its discussions around some of the mega risks that can impair our ability to achieve strategic goals and objectives. In particular, we looked at impacts of an extended financial crisis, and also what risks and opportunities there are for faculty recruitment and retention. The Compliance Council’s focus was expanded to add both Operations and Finance risks, giving it a more comprehensive perspective on internal controls.

That work and more is highlighted in this annual report. Of note:

- The exceptional collaboration across the institution in preparing for a significant spike in sponsored research as a result of federal stimulus (ARRA) funds;
- Human Resources continuing to integrate violence prevention and response programs into the culture of our University; and HR’s advance planning for unprecedented layoffs as a result of the economic downturn, including a major reduction in state funding. Also to help manage and reduce our risks of complaints or claims, the Office of Risk Management coordinated a first ever Employment Practices Liability seminar; and
- Recognition of UW’s ERM work by the Association of Governing Boards for Universities and Colleges and United Educators, noting our ERM Self-Assessment toolkit as “an excellent step-by-step guide on how to identify, assess and mitigate risks.”

Goals for the coming year are to further emphasize a strategic view of risk in the work of the President’s Advisory Committee, and to delegate to the COFi Council responsibility for internal risk assessments and for expanded communications and training throughout the campuses.

It has been noted that the President’s Advisory Committee is one forum where the participants take off their respective organizational division hats, and truly think about risks and opportunities from an institutional perspective. We intend to continue to build on that strength, and are excited about ways in which ERM can assist in identifying and addressing the key challenges we face.

Thank you for your continuing interest and support of our work.
Introduction / Executive Summary

The government of Great Britain assessed the major risks facing its 60 million people. If a country can identify its top risks, what about the University of Washington?

That question, posed at the start of last year’s ERM work, has reshaped the risks we look at and how we think about them. It led to development of a Mega Risks chart, and resulted in PACERM’s new focus on how risks may impact UW’s ability to achieve its strategic objectives.

PACERM had started discussing risks to our ability to recruit and retain top faculty at the end of the prior year, asking Vice Provost Mary Lidstrom to lead a team exploring those risks. Before the legislative session and well before the huge budget cuts, a second group led by Paul Jenny, Vice Provost Planning and Budget, and Doug Breckel, Associate Vice President Treasury, began to identify how an extended financial crisis may impact all our goals and all sources of funds.

As both groups delved into their topics it became evident that when thinking strategically, “risk” has two sides. There is the challenge and impact– the down side typically associated with “risk.” Just as important, there can be an upside where opportunities and new benefits or advantages may be possible, from changes internal and external to the organization.

This insight led to development of new ERM tools and process for teams to identify and evaluate the OPPORTUNITY side of strategic risk questions.

If the past is prologue, then last year’s work set the stage to refocus our ERM goals.

- PACERM will be a forum for discussing strategic risks using UW’s strategic goals to organize the year’s agenda.
- PACERM delegates to COFi Council responsibility to identify and assess internal control risks and to do campus outreach and communications to build risk awareness.
- ERM program, in order expand campus awareness and use of risk tools, will look at ways to train-the-trainer to promote use of self assessment tools.

This positions PACERM to contribute its perspective to the new discussion of “two years and two decades,” an institution wide conversation about where we want the University to be and what we need to do to get there.

Many people are involved in many ways to successfully manage the University’s risks. In particular, this report highlights the excellent work done by: Human Resources, in enhancing our culture of safety, and in planning for and supporting the largest ever round of layoffs due to budget reductions; UW Medicine and the medical centers for their continuing focus on patient safety; and the collaborative work of colleagues across many departments to position UW to compete for ARRA federal stimulus funds for research.

No one knows where the global and national economies will be in two years, nor what resources the University will have for sure. But we can make a range of good estimates, and prepare to address both the challenges, and the opportunities, of the risks we face. ERM provides a framework to bring a common language to those discussions, and forums for raising risks both at the strategic level and internally at controls; and ERM positions us to pursue the question:

What are the University’s top risks?
We have made a strong start during the first three years of ERM at identifying and assessing internal risks for compliance and operations. The ERM program is evolving: We have started to move out of organizational silos and begun integrating institution-wide perspectives, and have introduced a more strategic perspective with discussions about “mega risks” that can impact our ability to achieve the institution’s goals and objectives.

A Sampling of UW Risk Assessments (2006-09)

**Strategic/Mega**
- Extended Financial Crisis
- Faculty Recruit/Retain

**Financial**
- Cash Handling
- Credit Analyses
- Self-Sustaining Operations
- International Tax

**Operational**
- Student Safety
- Occupational Health and Safety
- IT Security
- Global Support / Study Abroad

**Compliance**
- Patient Privacy
- Post-Award Financial Administration
- Pollution / Asbestos

UW Evolution of ERM

- **Risk Categories**
  - Strategic – Mega
  - Financial
  - Operational
  - Compliance

- **Where UW’s program is headed**
- **What we have accomplished**

- **Degree of Cross - Functional Integration**
  - Separate
  - Partial
  - Integration
  - Full

---

4
Recommended Goals for 2010

**President’s Advisory Committee on Enterprise Risk Management (PACERM)**

Members of the executive leadership of the University who prioritize the risk areas for comprehensive assessment, discuss key emerging risks and “mega-risks” (e.g. financial crisis) that may impact UW’s strategic goals, and report to the President annually on the institution’s risk map and recommended mitigations.

**Compliance-Operations-Finance (COFi) Council**

Brings together campus experts whose principal responsibilities include compliance or risk areas (such as human subjects, conflicts of interest, information technology security), along with operational and finance responsibilities, to identify institutional issues, ensure good information is available to the University community, and recommend ways for interested parties to report problems.

**PACERM Goals – Expand an institution-wide discussion of strategies**

- Advise the President on management of risks which may critically impact our ability to accomplish our goals, and on opportunities which may enhance our ability to achieve our goals.
- Be a forum for emerging institutional risks.

**COFi Goals – Enhance the assessment and communication of internal risks**

- Engage in a continual, cross-functional process that results in effective prioritization of institutional responses to compliance, financial, operational risks, and considers the impacts to strategic objectives and UW’s reputation;
- Assure the institutional perspective is always present in risk and compliance management discussions;
- Identify strategies to address emerging risk and compliance management issues;
- Support risk and compliance management training and outreach efforts throughout the University;
- Provide external auditors and regulators with information about the University’s risk and compliance programs;
- Avoid the creation of additional bureaucracy by minimizing redundancy and maximizing resources
RECOMMENDED GOALS FOR 2010 - continued

**ERM Program Goals**

1. Support PACERM contributions to the 2y2d discussions, with focus on LEARNING and DISCOVERY.

2. Support COFi Council in its assessment of internal Compliance, Operation, and Finance risks in the context of 2y2d discussions

3. Expand use of ERM tools through a “train the trainer” effort. Build capacity to respond to unit level and alternatives analysis ad hoc requests.

---

**Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) – UW’s Model**

- Assess risks in the context of strategic objectives, identify inter-relation of risk factors across the institution, not functionally.
- Cover all types of risk: Compliance, Financial, Operational, and Strategic.
- Foster a common awareness that allows individuals to focus attention on risks with strategic impacts.
- Enhance and strengthen UW’s culture of compliance while protecting the decentralized, collaborative, entrepreneurial nature of our institution.

---

UW’s President’s Advisory Committee on Enterprise Risk Management is the one place where participants set aside their individual organizational perspectives, and really think about the major risks and opportunities from an institution-wide view.

V’Ella Warren and Ana Mari Cauce
Co-Chairs, PACERM
The 2008 ERM report previewed the concept of a “Mega Risks” chart. It starts with risk management practices and assessments looking internally at controls, and where failure of controls may impact ability to achieve UW’s goals. The University’s five strategic goals are the next layer, and each goal includes multiple objectives, originally developed as part of the 2006 budget process. A circle of mega risks surrounds it all: those external forces and factors over which single entities such as UW do not have control, but which can significantly impact the ability to achieve objectives. Mega risks include such events as: natural disasters, pandemic, political upheavals, and regulatory intervention. PACERM asked two subgroups to consider strategic risks using this new model. [See Appendices for Summary Pictures for both of these assessments.]

### Extended Financial Crisis

Planning and Budgeting and Treasury took the lead in projecting cash flows for several years, based on changes anticipated in all major revenue sources. The extended financial crisis/recession has impacted:

- **Core Education** funds, resulting in significant state budget cuts, reduction of income from endowment and investments, with some offset from higher tuition.
- **Medical revenue**, from patient charges and insurance payments, modest trend upward but recognizing UW’s medical centers take a disproportionate share of patients without coverage and must absorb costs of uncompensated care.
- **Research**, generally trending upward, with a huge but short term increase coming in federal stimulus funds.

**Top Risks:** Impact on learning environment for students. Lack of funding for facilities, equipment to increase research capacity. Erosion of culture of compliance.

**Top Opportunities:** Attract diverse, excellent student body. Expand global reach. Mandate internal changes and seek external relief to improve integrity, compliance, stewardship.

### Faculty Recruitment and Retention

The Office of Research convened faculty and academic leaders to consider the threats and opportunities for UW’s ability to attract and retain top faculty:

- What are the risks that prevent or delay achievement of Faculty Recruitment and Retention objectives?
- What are the opportunities that could facilitate achievement of objectives?

Starting with the four objectives for this goal, the team realized that three more objectives were equally important: improve the environments for both research and instruction; and to improve recognition of excellence.

**Top Risks:** Impact of increased administrative burden. Cost of doing research not in line with peers. Resources (such as start up packages, space) not competitive.

**Top Opportunities:** Improve recognition of excellence. Improve environment for instruction. Facilitate collaborations in learning and discovery. Improve environment for research. Provide competitive compensation for faculty.
ASSESSING OPPORTUNITIES – A NEW ERM PROCESS

Risk management literature often notes that “risk” has two sides: threats, which can impede or detract from achieving goals; and opportunities, which can be used to achieve goals. Our ERM model was developed for Internal Controls, and was built on the ‘threat’ side of risk, with a focus on risks to compliance, operations, finance, and strategy.

Thinking about Mega Risks this year, and looking at impacts on UW Strategic Goals, led to:

First, a simplification of the risk/threat analysis to omit a rating of Likelihood and to modify the Impacts rating scale into a Threat level scale; and

Second, addition of both guidance for identifying Opportunities, and an associated Benefits level scale [see box].

Identifying Opportunities – Internal and External

Within existing or attainable resources, and given the Mega Risk(s) being evaluated for impacts on Strategic Goals, we ask teams to think about:

Internally, what can we change to facilitate achievement of objectives? Such as reorganizing, consolidating, innovations; and

Externally, what is changing and how might we use it to facilitate achievement of objectives? Such as demographic trends, advantage over competitors, regulatory relief.

Estimating Benefits and Gains

What positive impact (i.e. upside) would a potential opportunity have on our ability to achieve objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit Levels</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>Little or no impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Low opportunity; may make some improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate opportunity; will improve achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Significant opportunity; major improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Outstanding opportunity; significantly enhance capability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ERM continues to build on an established base of processes and tools for identifying, assessing, mitigating, and monitoring significant risks. Areas of beneficial activity/goals from last year’s annual report are outlined below as format for this year’s accomplishments, referencing the original seven recommendations from 2006.

A. Consider what external “mega-risks” may impact UW’s ability to achieve its strategic goals.

Uncontrollable elements such as recession, energy shocks and demographic changes are variables that every entity must consider in devising its risk strategy. We propose to use a mega-risks model to engage the PACERM in discussions of how such risks may impact the University’s ability to achieve its five strategic goals. This will contribute to the original recommendation of:

Recommendation - Integrate key risks into the decision-making deliberations of senior leaders and Regents.

The President’s Advisory Committee on ERM met throughout the year to discuss key risk topics.

- PACERM embraced the concept of Mega Risks [see Chart in Appendices] making it easy to engage in discussions of UW’s Strategic Goals and the risks that may impact achievement of strategic objectives.

- PACERM formed two mega risk subgroups to apply ERM processes at a strategic level: Extended Financial Crisis; and Faculty Recruitment and Retention. See previous section on Strategic Views of UW Risks and Opportunities for summary of that work.

- PACERM discussed preliminary perspectives of the Working Group led by V’Ella Warren, that is assessing UW’s Technology structure, services, and financing/budget models. Two ERM risk assessments related to that work were shared with PACERM: Financial Oversight of Self-Sustaining Units which has developed checklists appropriate for all campus units with recharge revenues; and UW Technology Investments, to identify areas at most risk for consideration of prioritized future resources.

UW Medicine continued to pursue important initiatives in patient safety and quality care, making it a prioritized component in the 2008 UW Medicine Strategic Plan, and engaged in board-level discussions to define and develop patient safety/quality care metrics for Board reviews. See next section for highlights on Medicine’s initiatives.
2009 ACCOMPLISHMENTS - continued

UW Medicine also scored well with the American Medical Student Association “PharmFree Scorecard” regarding policies on interactions with pharmaceutical and device industries. With an overall grade of “B” UW Medicine is in top third of programs nationwide.


A review of the University’s ERM efforts identified a need for the Council to go beyond a focus on compliance. The review concluded that the Council should expand its scope to include financial and operational risks. In August 2008 the Compliance Council name was changed to the Compliance, Operations, and Finance (COFi) Council to reflect this new focus. This change in focus will address three of the original recommendations:

Recommendation - Create an integrated, institution-wide approach to compliance which is consistent with best practice.

- COFi refocused its work to add Operations and Finance risks to its Compliance considerations. Council membership was changed to improve ability to respond to the full spectrum of risks. COFi topics included:
  - Challenges coming from extended financial crisis;
  - American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) rules and regulations;
  - Changes in HIPAA;
  - New requirements for “Red Flag” rules around identify theft;
  - Discussed legal aspects and potential liabilities of conducting risk assessments; and
  - Reviewed risk assessments for biosafety labs, and for financial oversight of self-sustaining units.

Recommendation - Create a safe way for interested parties to report problems.

- Work continued in 2009 to identify the individuals and departments responsible for accepting reports on various types of concerns on campus. This information will be utilized to update our compliance web site. Implementation of an anonymous reporting hot line was put on hold due to budget constraints resulting from the extended financial crisis.
2009 ACCOMPLISHMENTS - continued

Recommendation - Minimize surprises by identifying emerging compliance and risk issues.

- COFi Council agendas included a regular item to report “Regulators on Campus”
- Both PACERM and COFi agendas invited members to share and discuss any “Emerging Risks” they saw in their areas
- Cross-functional teams worked diligently to prepare UW for addressing the risks and opportunities in the ARRA funding [see discussion of ARRA Federal Stimulus Funds in following section]

C. Continue to build the ERM program with the Office of Risk Management.

*ERM webpages will be enhanced. The self-assessment toolkit will be widely distributed and departments supported in their use of it. We will continue to follow up with risk owners on the progress they make with mitigation plans, and expand the monitoring to include all of the completed comprehensive assessments. Using the model developed by CISO for its own performance metrics, we will develop an institutional level version that summarizes progress on all the key risk indicators. This addresses two more of the original recommendations:

Recommendation - Ensure that good information is available for campus community.

- UW’s Self-Assessment toolkit identified by Association of Governing Boards and United Educators, in their survey of higher education risk practices, as “an excellent step-by-step guide on how to identify, assess and mitigate risks.” [see comment by Frank Vinik, United Educators]

- A first ever Employment Practices Liability seminar* was a free, six hour in-service update on topics related to employment practices liability, presenting practical information on how to reduce likelihood of discrimination complaints or claims. Organized by the Office of Risk Management, it brought together both staff experts and guest speakers.

My conversations with you and your staff were invaluable in helping me write the report, and the guide written by UW is one of the best guides on ERM that I have seen. Thank you for taking the time to help and allowing us to include the UW guide in the resources section.

Frank Vinik
United Educators
2009 ACCOMPLISHMENTS - continued

- Human Resource’s planning and training on layoffs* ensured that processes and practices were compliant and responsive to employee needs in light of the unprecedented layoffs resulting from state budget reductions.

- Human Resources continued to integrate the SafeCampus* and other violence prevention activities into UW’s culture.
  * more information on these topics highlighted in next section

Recommendation - Check progress on compliance and risk initiatives.

- New comprehensive assessments completed:
  - Study Abroad; natural disasters, and injury/illness are top risks for faculty and students.
  - UW Technology Investments; Data Security, that disrupts services or exposes data, and Business Continuity, that disrupts facilities or fails to resume operations, are the highest risks.
  - Financial Oversight of Self-Sustaining Units; part of larger Working Group review of UW Technology services and finances; finds impact of economy on revenue streams as greatest risk.
  - International Tax; developed risk model to apply country by country to determine overall UW exposure.
  - ARRA Recovery Plan; preliminary use of ERM to identify risk areas and accountability objectives.
  - HFS Alternatives Credit Analysis; assessed alternatives as to timing and scale of proposed projects; see comment by Eric Godfrey.

Student Life has benefited from the application of ERM process in a couple of important areas, including student safety . . . [and] was especially significant when we applied it to our new housing master plan. ERM enabled us to conduct a financial stress test, identify potential risks, and develop mitigation strategies . . . that helped University leadership make an informed decision on moving forward with the housing project.

Eric Godfrey, Vice President /Vice Provost
Student Life
2009 ACCOMPLISHMENTS - continued

D. New audit leadership.

The coming year will see the start of a new Executive Director for Audits, who will bring a new perspective on the use of enterprise risk management in identifying and assessing key institutional risks. That person will facilitate the COFi Council, and provide crucial guidance for our ERM program. This addresses another of the original recommendations:

**Recommendation - Maintain strong audit team with ability to proactively identify problems and collaboratively recommend solutions to appropriate decision-makers.**

Richard Cordova started in July, and offers the following observations about UW’s audit team: “I am very pleased to be taking on the challenge of providing leadership to the Audit function here at the University of Washington. Audit has a strong experienced team that I look forward to leading into 2010. We will set out goals which focus on collaboration within our team and with our ‘clients’. Our first step is to create a new Internal Audit Risk Assessment and Annual Plan for 2010, which focuses on the strategic, operational, compliance and financial risks of the University.” See also Richard’s comments on ERM below.

**OTHER WAYS IN WHICH WE MANAGE UW’S RISKS**

**Employment Liability Seminar** - In May, 130 University employees attended a first Employment Practices Liability seminar, a six-hour event conceived and coordinated by the Office of Risk Management. Presentations by both UW staff and guest speakers covered an array of topics related to employment practices liability, and presented practical information for managers on how to reduce likelihood of discrimination complaints or claims:

- Trends in employment claims and complaints;
- Employment law update, new or revised statutes, and recent case law;
- Overview of state ethics law and UW policies;
- Why individuals file claims, importance of employee perception of treatment by managers;
- Performing quality employment investigations.

Richard Cordova, Executive Director
UW Audits
2009 ACCOMPLISHMENTS - continued

**RECOGNIZING**
**HUMAN RESOURCES**
for its work in
**MANAGING KEY RISKS**

**UW SafeCampus Update** - Now in its second year of operation, the Violence Prevention and Response Program has become more integrated into UW's culture through the SafeCampus public information campaign, a violence prevention component in the new employee orientation for staff, and an ongoing presentation effort available to the community-at-large and by request to specific groups or departments.

Staffed by a team with experience in violence prevention, victim advocacy, and program management, the team responds to calls from the three SAFE phone lines. The phone lines operate 7x24, and serve the Seattle, Bothell and Tacoma campuses. Phone response staff help callers clarify their concerns, identify immediate risk mitigation steps, connect callers with University or community resources, and arrange for follow-up as needed.

Program enhancements and the volume of services provided are outlined in a SafeCampus report in the Appendices.

**Preparing for Unprecedented Layoffs** - Economic realities prompted Human Resources to initiate a full scale review and reengineering of layoff policies, processes, and resources for classified and professional staff to ensure that UW layoff processes and practices are contemporary, compliant, and responsive to the needs of affected employees, their managers, and the University.

With a philosophical approach that the layoff process should be grounded in respect and dignity, major revisions were implemented in all aspects of the layoff process. Communications and support planning started early with briefings and forums that helped employees deal with the uncertainty of the situation. New tools and trainings were created to guide leaders through the workforce planning process and implementation of reductions. Employees impacted by layoff received updated resource packets and were offered extensive career transition services through Professional & Organizational Development (POD) free of charge. UWHR staff and HR administrators were supported with new tools for layoff implementation and a new workforce planning and layoff database was developed for tracking purposes.

Risk mitigation protocols (including UWHR assuming responsibility for administering professional staff layoffs and reductions) were developed to allow for early identification and resolution of potential problems and to ensure compliance with President Emmert’s directive to provide 60 days notice to employees laid off in 2009 due to budget cuts.

Partnering with others also played an important role in risk mitigation. UCIR, EEO and the Office of the Attorney General reviewed processes. The Layoff Administration Projects final report can be found in the Appendices.
2009 ACCOMPLISHMENTS - continued

ARRA FEDERAL STIMULUS FUNDS – NEW RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES

UW emphasizes collaboration in plans for managing new requirements.

Several UW divisions have pooled ideas and resources to work cooperatively in identifying ways to comply with added ARRA requirements.

Office of Research – Office of Sponsored Programs – Effectively process significant increase in proposals and awards, and subcontracts.

Grant and Contract Accounting – New, expanded reporting requirements, in addition to reports usually required for sponsored research awards.

Human Resources – Tracking and reporting positions/"jobs" created with stimulus funds, and streamlining the hiring process.

Not Business as Usual – New reporting requirements create complexity and risk of non-compliance. The UW team built on the HR ‘data mart’ to import 97 required data elements, needing principal investigators to add only 2 elements each quarter.

Severe Consequences for Not Reporting Properly – There will be increased audits. Repercussions can include: termination of awards, loss of funding; debarment from receiving future funds; national visibility could impact UW’s reputation.

Active monitoring and reporting of UW’s compliance with ARRA awards will continue for the two year duration of the funding.

UW MEDICINE CONTINUES TO ADVANCE ITS PATIENT SAFETY INITIATIVES

UW Medicine – Harborview Medical Center (HMC), UW Medical Center (UWMC), UW Physicians Neighborhood Clinics (UWPN), UW Physicians (UWP), Airlift Northwest (ALNW), and the UW School of Medicine (SOM) continue to focus on Patient Safety and Quality of Care as a top priority. Several major steps towards accelerating the quality and safety agenda include:

- Prioritization of Patient Safety and Quality as a focused component of the UW Medicine Strategic Plan.
- Engagement of the UW Medicine and HMC Boards in discussion of UW Medicine Quality and Safety Strategic Goals and Metrics, with focus on: Reductions in Preventable Deaths, and in Hospital Acquired Infections; and Improvement in Core Measures of Care, in Ambulatory Health Measures and Patient Satisfaction.
- Implemented the work plan for improvement based on the University HealthSystem Consortium (UHC) focused assessment of the UW Medicine patient safety and quality program. Each hospital improved on the UHC Quality and Accountability Performance Scorecard to be above the mean.
- Implementation of surgical checklist before surgical procedures, and leading statewide efforts to promote use of the checklist in every hospital and operating room in the state.
- Funded and implemented additional training modules for residents and fellows to improve infection control, reporting of quality or patient concerns, and the safety of patient procedures.
- Developed a system-wide procedure and training module for disclosure of adverse events to patients and families.
- Funded and planned for opening of Harborview Simulation Laboratory, part of UW Medicine Institute for Simulation and Interprofessional Studies (ISIS), to improve the quality of health care education and improve patient safety and outcomes.
Since 2006 the University of Washington has engaged in an Enterprise Risk Management program. As part of that program, the Compliance, Operations, and Finance (COFi) Council represents the University's strategy for creating a more comprehensive institutional risk perspective without sacrificing existing organizational structures. It is the formal mechanism for convening representatives from each significant institutional risk area.

The Council is organized under the umbrella of the President’s Advisory Committee on Enterprise Risk Management (PACERM). The Council includes 26 members representing 20 different risk areas within the University. Meetings are facilitated by the Executive Director of Internal Audit, and were held five times over the past year.

A Steering Committee is responsible for directing the work of the Council, making recommendations to PACERM on the Council’s work plan, and acting as the subject matter expert/liaison for risk assessments or projects. The Committee members include representatives from the key UW-wide areas of research, patient care, human resources, finance, budget, IT security, risk management, and internal audit.

2009 Accomplishments

The Steering Committee’s planning for 2009 Council activities led to development of a recommendation to expand the Council beyond a focus on compliance, by adding operational and financial risk considerations to the Council’s work. A revised Council charter was developed and approved by PACERM. Modifications were made in the charge and composition of the Council and Steering Committee to improve the University’s ability to respond to the full spectrum of risks and opportunities. Operational and financial risks were incorporated along with compliance risks in the presentations, discussions, and other interactions of the Council.

The past year has presented many challenges in the form of the extended financial crisis which required significant attention from the Council. In addition, there were new rules and regulations related to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), and the “Red Flag” or identity theft act. Sub-committees were established and discussions held with the Council to address the emerging risks posed by these events.

In order to strengthen our culture of compliance, the Council discussed how to communicate information and risks to others, explored the myths and realities about legal liabilities, and shared information about regulators on campus. The Council also reviewed and the results of the risk assessments performed for Biosafety level 3 laboratories and for the financial oversight of self-sustaining units.

Work continued in 2009 to identify the individuals and departments responsible for accepting reports on various types of concerns on campus. This information will be utilized to update our compliance web site. Implementation of an anonymous reporting hot line was put on hold due to budget constraints resulting from the extended financial crisis. The development of metrics for measuring and reporting of achievements is still under consideration and will continue in 2010.

2010 Goals

- Engage in a continual, cross-functional process that results in effective prioritization of institutional responses to compliance, financial, operational risks, and considers the impacts to strategic objectives and UW’s reputation;
- Assure the institutional perspective is always present in risk and compliance management discussions;
- Identify strategies to address emerging risk and compliance management issues;
- Support risk and compliance management training and outreach efforts throughout the University;
- Provide external auditors and regulators with information about the University’s risk and compliance programs;
- Avoid the creation of additional bureaucracy by minimizing redundancy and maximizing resources.
President’s Advisory Committee on Enterprise Risk Management – Members 2008-09

V’Ella Warren, Senior Vice President, Finance and Facilities, co-chair
Ana Mari Cauce, Dean, Arts and Sciences, co-chair
Phyllis Wise, Provost
Sandra Archibald, Dean, Evans School of Public Affairs
Timothy Carter, Graduate and Professional Student Senate
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Human Resources – Managing Key Risks
- SafeCampus Progress Report
- Layoff Administration Review Project Report
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British Threat Report Says Flu Pandemic Would Have Most Impact

By JOHN F. BURNS

CAMBRIDGE, England — In its first published rating of the potential threats facing Britain’s 60 million people, the government said on Friday that a flu pandemic, not a terrorist attack, was likely to have the greatest impact.

The assessment came in a report known as the National Risk Register, ordered by Prime Minister Gordon Brown as part of an effort to enhance Britain’s readiness to deal with threats to national security. The document was compiled on the basis of previously classified estimates from a wide variety of government departments, including MI5, the domestic intelligence agency.

A flu pandemic was rated only fifth in a list of the most likely threats but first in terms of its public impact. The assessment said that half of the population, about 30 million people, could be infected, that up to a million of them might need hospital care, and that 50,000 to 750,000 might die.

The Cabinet Office, the executive arm of 10 Downing Street, said in the report that the government had stockpiled enough doses of an antiflu drug to “treat all those who fall ill in a pandemic of similar proportions” to, among others, the epidemic of the so-called Spanish flu of 1918, which was estimated to have killed more than 20 million people around the world.

“The government is collaborating actively with international partners on prevention, detection and research, and is taking every practical step to ensure that the U.K. is prepared to limit the internal spread of a pandemic and to minimize health, economic and social harm as far as possible,” the report said.

The report listed the most likely threat to national security as another attack on the country’s transport network similar to the one on July 7, 2005, when Islamist terrorists launched suicide attacks on London’s transit system, killing 56 people, including the four bombers. It said the country’s railway system, including subway systems in London and other cities, remained the most vulnerable element of the transport network, ahead of airports and airlines because of the higher levels of security given to air transportation.

The second most likely threat was given as attempts to penetrate and subvert vital computer networks by foreign governments and others, the report said.

Britain remains “subject to high levels of covert non-military activity by foreign intelligence organizations,” the report said. “They are increasingly combining traditional intelligence methods with new and sophisticated technical attacks, for example attempting to penetrate computer networks through the Internet.”

One British newspaper, the Evening Standard, quoted unidentified officials as naming China and Russia among the foreign governments involved in those efforts.

Also put ahead of a flu pandemic in the report’s list of most likely threats were a terrorist attack in a crowded place and a bout of severe weather. Coastal flooding as a result of climate change was considered to be the second most damaging threat, after a flu pandemic. Severe inland flooding was listed to be about as likely as a chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear attack by terrorists.

Families were urged to take their own precautions against the variety of threats by stockpiling food and water as well as having a battery-run radio, a flashlight and a backup system of home heating in case the power fails. They should also make backups of important documents on computers, and they should arrange for alternative means of personal transport if the public transit system fails, the report said.
## Extended Financial Crisis - Estimating Impact on UW Strategic Goals and Objectives

**Risk Assessment Work Group:** Ann Anderson; Doug Breckel; Sue Camber; Elizabeth Cherry; Bruce Ferguson; Jeff Follman; Eric Godfrey; Paul Jenny; Mary Lidstrom; Gary Quarfoth; Martha Somerman Patricia Spakes; Kathryn Waddell

**Focus:** Considering the extended financial crisis and estimated cash income projections, what may the impacts be on UW’s strategic objectives? What potential benefits might there be from opportunities?

### TOP RISKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve and enhance the learning environment for our students: Increase in class size; fewer Faculty and TA’s; less hands on lab opportunities.</td>
<td>Disastrous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide facilities and equipment to increase research capacity: No capital budget for next biennium; ICR is tapped out; some equipment/renovation money but just “a drop in the bucket.</td>
<td>Disastrous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversee and improve UW's culture of compliance: Budget cuts may be short-sighted; remaining staff pulled in too many directions, quality suffers and mistakes get made; “everyone so busy just turning the crank”; all the new requirements as part of stimulus money.</td>
<td>Serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide infrastructure to enable efficient communication to develop innovative and novel collaborations: Networks are resource dependent; physical infrastructure currently okay but people resources are in trouble; stimulus money depends on people to implement.</td>
<td>Serious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOP OPPORTUNITIES – From Internal Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the highest level of integrity, compliance, and stewardship: Mandate use of internal electronic systems, e.g. eProcurement; Incentivize schools and colleges to be more flexible, e.g. tuition sharing; Renegotiate existing contracts for outside services, leases, etc.</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the reach of UW across the globe: Leverage UW structures, what we have learned in global support, partner with others; “Locally global” experience; Seattle is a global center with many different and culturally diverse communities nearby; partner with other institutions, local organizations to give students exposure to those cultures without having to travel abroad.</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOP OPPORTUNITIES – From External Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the highest level of integrity, compliance and stewardship: Develop and apply measures of institutional outcomes. Changes in state regulations such as: bid limits; invest in corporate stocks; foreign banking; contracting out for services.</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract a diverse and excellent student body and provide a rich learning experience: Develop and apply measures of institutional outcomes; Applications are up, diversity up, Pell Grant eligibility up; students at private, out of state schools &quot;want to come home&quot; – opportunity for strong class composition, “shape the class” – revisit financial aid policies; Broader definition of “learning environments” to take into account U District and North of 45th; buy more property now even though that means taking more risk; possible public-private partnerships to develop.</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating Validation:** INTERMEDIATE. Excellent team expertise in range of roles in senior leadership and perspectives. Understand UW and national landscape/peers.
Recruiting and Retaining Faculty - Estimating Impact on UW Strategic Goals/Objectives

Risk Assessment Work Group: Gerald J. Baldasty; Cathryn Booth-LaForce; Cheryl A. Cameron; Jeffrey M. Cheek; Paul B. Hopkins; Richard S. Karpen; Mary Lidstrom; Sheila A. Lukehart; Mari Ostendorf

UW Strategic Goal: Attract and Retain an Outstanding and Diverse Faculty

Focus: What are the risks that prevent or delay achievement of Faculty Recruitment and Retention objectives? What are the opportunities that could facilitate achievement of objectives?

TOP RISKS – Improve the environment for carrying out research

Increased administrative burden: Required trainings; Antiquated processes; Lack of information; Lack of coordination that causes inefficiencies and inconsistencies; “Real” vs. “unnecessary” rules resulting in risk avoidance rather than risk management approach; Delays in startup of new budgets, particularly subcontracts; Time consuming and inefficient processes, “rules” vs. “service” culture.

Cost of doing research not in line with peers: Senior graduate students not allowed to drop to 2 credits or have reduced tuition, as many of our peers do; Difficulty of out-of-state waivers for graduate students.

Resources not competitive: Start-up packages low; Research and teaching space not sufficient or of poor quality; Core facilities/services not competitive; Difficulty of setting up recharge or cost centers; Bridge funding not sufficient.

TOP OPPORTUNITIES – From Internal Sources

Improve recognition of excellence: Coordinate with department chairs, nominating committees and UW marketing to spotlight top performers through reception and recognition events, newsletters, UW web site, small cash awards.

Improve the environment for instruction: Departments have transparent policy on buyouts and teaching loads; Provide staff support for maintaining instructional labs; A larger number of large, high quality lecture halls; Move to large class/high faculty support model. Best practices for teaching without TAs. Credit for cross department teaching.

Facilitate collaborations in learning and discovery: Provide incentives for departments to open classes to non-majors. Reduce institutional barriers to dual degrees at the graduate level.

Improve the environment for carrying out research: Simplified process for creating recharge or cost centers; Reduce cost of dissertation tuition for students enrolled for 2 units; Provide training opportunities for staff involved in large proposal efforts; Invest suitable fraction of portfolio (perhaps on per faculty basis) in staffing, facilities (equipment/spaces), and operating budgets. There are the first to go and slowest to rebuild in tough times. Flexibility of instruction.

TOP OPPORTUNITIES – From External Sources

Improve the environment for carrying out research: Increasing involvement of faculty in start-up companies, More international research; Be nimble enough to deal with changes in accountability and reporting; Respond to compliance mandates and minimize admin burden.

Provide competitive compensation for faculty: Cafeteria benefits plan.

Rating Validation: INTERMEDIATE. Excellent team expertise in range of roles in academic leadership and perspectives. Understand UW and national landscape/peers.
COMMUNICATIONS, OUTREACH & TRAINING

- UW Alert messages now forwarded to residence hall students through Housing & Food Services own notification system. 5,576 residence hall students currently registered.
- UW Alert activated nine times between August 08 – March 09: one test, four incident-related alerts, four suspended operation alerts.
- UW Outdoor Alert activated three times between August 08 – March 09: two tests, one incident.
- SafeCampus website averaged 130 visits per day.
- SafeCampus posters mailed to building coordinators in September 08.
- SafeCampus bathroom campaign posters mailed to building coordinators in September 08 and January 09.
- SafeCampus brochures and training flyers mailed to student leaders, deans, chairs, and administrators in April 09.
- SafeCampus information has been incorporated into medical center’s new employee orientation and annual workplace violence training.
- VPRP, Medical Centers HR, and Public Safety departments have collaborated on providing the Campus Violence Prevention training to Medical Centers departments upon request.
- Campus Violence Prevention presentation has been updated to include response strategies for an active shooter situation.
- Using POD’s registration and attendance database to record names of persons attending Campus Violence Prevention presentations.
- 914 people attended in-person training sessions (22 department-specific training sessions provided by UWPD and HR Operations; 9 campus-wide training sessions open to faculty, staff, and students; 48 safety talks/worksite security reviews conducted by UWPD).

STATISTICS

UWPD Crime Victim Advocacy

Assisted 62 community members between September 08 – March 09.
- Enrolled two victims in the Washington State Address Confidentiality Program.
- 10 court accompaniments for protective court orders.
- Facilitated the legal breaking of one apartment lease.

UW CareLink Utilization

Services include counseling sessions, legal and financial services, and referrals.

Total new cases increased by 20% over previous year.
- January-December 2008: 1788 total new cases - 6.7% utilization rate
- January-December 2007: 1436 total new cases - 5.6% utilization rate

Current UW Alert Sign-ups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW Seattle</td>
<td>10,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell</td>
<td>1,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Tacoma</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget Sound</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMC</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Location</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Husky Night Walk Call Volume

![Graph showing Husky Night Walk Call Volume from September to December]
### Violent Prevention & Response Program Quarter Report

#### Number of Issues Reported - 117 total
1/01/09 - 3/31/09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count by Issue Type - 117 total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violence-actual Breakout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inappropriate Behavior Breakout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Date: April 29, 2009

---

**STATISTICS continued**

![Bar chart showing SafeCampus Reported Issues and Assessment Activity by Month.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/08</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/09</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/09</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*continued on next page*
VIOLENCE PREVENTION & RESPONSE PROGRAM QUARTER REPORT continued

Person Experiencing the Concern (87 total)

| 10 | UW Faculty - Non-Supervisor |
| 4  | UW Faculty - Supervisor     |
| 3  | UW Graduate Student        |
| 3  | UW Graduate Student Employee |
| 8  | UW Staff - Supervisor      |
| 11 | UW Undergraduate Student   |
| 1  | UW Undergraduate Student Employee |
| 2  | Public                     |
| 1  | Unknown Identity           |
| 1  | Other                      |

Person Causing the Concern (102 total)

| 4  | UW Faculty - Supervisor (1) |
| 4  | UW Graduate Student         |
| 20 | UW Graduate Student Employee |
| 17 | UW Staff - Non-Supervisor   |
| 13 | UW Undergraduate Student    |
| 2  | UW Undergraduate Student Employee |
| 6  | Public                      |
| 13 | Public Patient              |
| 13 | Public Parent               |
| 4  | Public Penaeplship          |
| 4  | Public Unknown Identity     |
| 2  | Other                       |

Person Reporting the Issue (125 total)

| 4  | UW Faculty - Non-Supervisor |
| 7  | UW Faculty - Supervisor     |
| 7  | UW Graduate Student         |
| 22 | UW Graduate Student Employee |
| 30 | UW Staff - Non-Supervisor   |
| 8  | UW Undergraduate Student    |
| 36 | UW Undergraduate Student Employee |
| 4  | Public                      |
| 1  | Public Unknown Identity     |
| 3  | Other                       |

ix
LAYOFF ADMINISTRATION REVIEW PROJECT REPORT – AUGUST 2009

PROJECT OVERVIEW

It had been several years since the last comprehensive review of staff layoff processes, materials and resources at the University of Washington. Economic realities prompted Human Resources to initiate a full scale review and reengineering of layoff policies, processes and resources for classified and professional staff, under the leadership of the Layoff Administration Steering Committee and Team Leads. All existing resources and processes were reviewed and updated, as appropriate.

With the primary purpose to ensure that UW layoff processes and practices are contemporary, compliant, and responsive to the needs of employees, managers, and the University, the team's efforts demonstrated an extraordinary degree of collaboration and partnership with individuals from every unit of Human Resources.

Major revisions were implemented in all aspects of the layoff process. New tools and training were created to guide leaders through the work force planning process and implementation of reductions. Employees impacted by layoff received updated resource packets and were offered extensive career transition services through POD. UWHR staff and HR administrators were supported with new tools for layoff implementation. HRIS created a new workforce planning and layoff database.

As the gravity of the financial situation became increasingly clear, increasingly robust tools and training were created to support all stakeholders in layoff implementation, at times with short notice. Risk mitigation protocols were developed to allow for early identification and resolution of potential problems. Updated protocols and forms were published to ensure compliance with President Emmert’s directive to provide 60 days notice to employees. Human Resources assumed responsibility for administering Professional Staff layoffs and reductions.

RISK MITIGATION

Robust protocols were implemented in Campus Operations to facilitate early identification and mitigation of potential risk factors associated with high volume layoffs and reductions. Early planning meetings were held with UW leadership to review and discuss applicable policies or bargaining agreement rules. Tools such as the “Administrator’s Guide to Layoff,” “the Manager’s Guide to Conducting a Layoff Meeting” and the Layoff Communications Planning Guide were provided to assist UW leaders in making sound decisions driven by business necessity and implementing those decisions in compliance with applicable rules. UWHR conducted a detailed case by case review of the justification for each layoff and evaluated aggregate data regarding unit composition. To ensure consistent and rules compliant implementation of layoffs and reductions, UWHR evaluated past practice to ensure clarity on interpretation of contracts, Washington Administrative Code and applicable policies. Discussions were held in advance with union leaders to inform them of UW layoff procedures and to notify them of impending actions. Upon request by the union, specific layoffs were informally reviewed in additional detail.
As HR Operations moved forward with implementing new systems in the midst of large volumes of layoffs, there came a great need to review various business processes in light of how information needed to be collected, entered into the new SharePoint system, and shared with various stakeholders. In March, Heather Harvey transitioned to Campus HR Operations, from her previous role in UTemp Staffing and began providing much needed project coordination in reviewing business practices and creating revised processes and workflows that work in coordination with HR’s new technology. Heather has been able to serve as a liaison between HR Operations and HRAIS in working out a number of issues related to systems implementation. She has continued to audit the system to allow for robust and accurate reporting of information. In addition, in July, Medical Centers HR appointed Steve Marty to serve as a point person, providing similar support with technical and process issues that arise. Having representatives from both Campus Ops and Med Center Ops working together with HRAIS will allow for the possibility for standardization in business practices and create opportunity for efficiencies.

Having to revise business processes, while in the midst of implementing new technology, while also challenged with an increased volume of layoffs, created a great deal of stress for all involved. While the height of the volume of layoff has appeared to lessen for now, there are still outstanding issues with regard to business process and systems implementation that have not fully been realized. That is to say, there are still “bugs” that need to be worked out in order to have clearly defined and complete procedures (see list of outstanding issues below). There has been great value achieved through the successful working relationship that has been created between HRAIS and HR Operations, and there is a strong recommendation that this coordination remain on-going indefinitely.

The following is an overview of completed processes:

**Administrative Processes Defined and Drafted:**

- Reports available in Report Services tool for tracking information on employees notified of layoff
- Creation of updated layoff packet content available in SharePoint
- Procedure completed for entering & uploading information from Option Selection Forms into SharePoint
- Procedure completed for scanning layoff documents & uploading to SharePoint
- Process for document staging and records retention
Anticipated To Be Completed by end of August:

Migration of current rehire lists to SharePoint

Procedure for management of rehire lists in SharePoint

Training for Employment Staff on new rehire list business process, in light of transition to SharePoint

Procedure creation and training of staff on processing seniority calculations using new SharePoint tools

The following is an overview of work in-progress:

Manual Processes That Need to be Automated Through SharePoint:

Workflow and deployment of reporting of BU layoff notifications to Labor Relations

Workflow and deployment of reporting of layoff notifications to Employment Teams (for follow up communications to be performed with affected employees)

Method of requesting individualized benefit summaries from the Benefits Office

Ability to pull report (out of SharePoint) of Administrators for follow up communications

Other Outstanding Issues:

Revision/Addition of layoff status and reasons for cancelation in SharePoint

Update procedure for processing a prostaff reversion in SharePoint (to include documenting status of classified layoff while maintaining original prostaff layoff, printing of Option Selection Forms, etc.)

Review of remaining layoff seniority units for population in SharePoint (Med Centers)

Review/Addition of administrator and appointing authority information in SharePoint

Look up in OPUS of calendar views for seniority calculations (to add to SharePoint)

Review/Revision of HRC Checklist with applicable workflows in light of current business process

Review/Update current documents, templates and tools still in draft form in SharePoint

Add additional documents, tools, and guides to SharePoint

Fine tune process for Disparate Impact Analysis and Risk Review

Review possibility of revising process for assessment creation in SharePoint to provide streamlining and simplification of processes
RECOMMENDATIONS

Implementation of unprecedentedly high volumes of layoffs and reductions, concurrent with the rollout of new tools, provided a unique opportunity to rapidly assess the effectiveness of the new systems. During initial implementation, assessment of usability occurred as tools were still in stages of development. Regrettably but understandably, this led to a high sense of urgency, stress and frustration. Despite these factors, many issues critical to implementation of rules compliant layoffs and reductions have been identified early and rapidly corrected. SharePoint now offers many very effective tools relating to seniority and layoff units that allow the Operations units to rapidly and accurately obtain necessary data to appropriately implement layoffs and reductions within compliance of rules. The layoff administration review team strongly recommends an ongoing commitment of resources dedicated to a comprehensive phase 2 review of SharePoint and ancillary tools for bug fixes and enhancements. We recommend that issues not necessarily directly driven by compliance be included in the scope of the phase 2 review. The layoff administration review team will reconvene again in January 2010 to specifically identify remaining bugs and to recommend potential additional system enhancements. In order to sustain the currency, accuracy, and rules compliance of the tools created, we also recommend an annual review of resources and tools.

Additionally, we recommend that robust internal processes, similar to those implemented in Campus Operations to ensure speedy resolution of problems, accuracy of records and appropriate document retention, be considered for replication in Medical Centers Operations. Campus Operations has been compiling a list of infrequently asked questions (I-FAQ’s) which we recommend be preserved and disseminated as appropriate within UWHR for ongoing utilization. We anticipate that an I-FAQ would be available for distribution in September.

Campus Operations has experienced some challenges in obtaining current information to allow accurate and effective evaluation of employees’ current qualifications for “specific position requirements” for potential placements into “employment options”. We recommend that ongoing attention be dedicated to establishing a process to resolve these challenges in order to ensure thorough evaluation of employees’ qualifications before an employment option is offered. This will allow employees a greater opportunity for success in their new positions.

Some employees expressed confusion relating to ongoing access to University technology such as email and secured websites. We recommend that access to technology for individuals facing layoff be evaluated and information be made readily available to laid off individuals and their managers.

Finally, we recommend that President Emmert’s directive to provide a 60-day notification period be discontinued as scheduled, October 31, 2009.