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About the Options Analysis
Background

• The Illinois Interoperability Project is tasked with designing and developing a sustainable governance model for the Illinois Healthcare and Human Services Framework Project (the Framework).

• The Framework is a seven-agency collaborative focused on the development of a modern, horizontally-integrated system to support the core processes of service delivery.

• The Framework’s key goals are to improve service access and delivery; increase operational efficiency and program integrity; and, create a capacity for sophisticated analysis and data driven decision-making across the Illinois healthcare and human services space.
Purpose of the Options Analysis

• In order to design and develop a governance model for the Illinois Framework, the Illinois Interoperability Project Team (Team), will evaluate and compare two potential Framework project governance models.

• After analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of each model, the Team will recommend a draft governance model for the Illinois Framework.

• The Team will present the governance models to various stakeholders who will review the options and reach consensus to select the final Framework governance model.
Choosing a Framework Governance Model

- The following stakeholders will decide on the final governance model for the Illinois Framework:
  - State of Illinois Chief Information Officer (CIO)
  - IL Framework Director
  - IL Framework Executive Steering Committee (ESC)
    - The ESC is composed of Agency Heads, representatives of the Governor’s Office, and representatives of federally-funded health and human services initiatives (MMIS, ACA, and HIE).
- Although the stakeholders will use the options analysis to consider the costs and benefits of various governance models, the stakeholders may or may not choose one of the options outlined in this presentation.
- Additionally, the options in this presentation are not mutually exclusive; the stakeholders may decide to combine options or choose various elements from each.
- Ultimately, the stakeholders will develop a model that is unique to the Illinois Framework.
Developing the Options

• This options analysis evaluates two governance models: Option A and Option B.
• Both Options include the governing bodies that were designated in the Illinois Framework Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA), signed in 2012. These bodies are:
  • The Executive Steering Committee (ESC)
  • The Operational Committee (OC)
  • Subcommittees
• Both Options also include additional governing bodies that were proposed in the Framework Request for Proposal (RFP). These bodies are:
  • Subject Matter Experts (SME)
  • Advisory Council
• Both Options include a Project Management Office (PMO). The Framework PMO was established in October 2012.
Developing the Options

- Options A and B present various ways of engaging the governing bodies. The ways of engaging the governing bodies are described by the following categories:
  - Membership
  - Responsibilities
  - Frequency of Meetings
  - Decision Making
  - Interacts With (who the governing body interacts with within the entire Framework governance structure)
  - Reports To (who the governing body formally reports to within the entire Framework governance structure)
  - Time Commitment
  - Form of Communication (how the various bodies within the Framework governance structure communicate)

- An example of how Option A and Option B might differ according to these categories is that Option A requires consensus in decision making while Option B does not.
About the Analysis

• The Interoperability Team performed in-depth research on best practices on project governance and interviewed a series of subject-matter experts from states and local municipalities around the U.S. [see “Best Practices Research Research Summary”]

• From the research and interviews, the Team developed six “attributes of good governance.” These are:
  • Shared vision
  • Executive Leadership
  • Formalization of Structure
  • Clear Decision-Making
  • Adaptable
  • Transparent Communications and Processes

• **Option A and Option B** were evaluated against their ability to meet these six attributes of good governance.
About the Analysis

• The Options Analysis is also based on findings from the following:
  • In-depth discussions with the Framework PMO and project advisers, Stewards of Change.
  • The Framework Stakeholder Engagement Project, which interviewed Agency Directors on the preferred structure of the Advisory Council.
  • Successful governance models in similar interoperability projects. For example, the subcommittees suggested in this presentation are modeled on National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) subcommittees.
About the Analysis

• An example of how the Team used its research findings to perform the options analysis:
  • One interviewee indicated that the success of her governance model was partly due to the fact that she did not allow designees at her meetings. All other interviewees agreed that not allowing designees in meetings helped build trust amongst participants; however, some governance models do allow designees. Therefore, the Illinois Interoperability Team compared a governance model that does not allow designees in meetings (Option A) to a model that does allow designees (Option B). The Team weighed the strengths and weaknesses of each option, ultimately preferring the option that better represented the attributes of good governance.
Options Analysis
Current State of Framework Governance

• Agency Directors interact, but it is unclear how often they interact and if they interact formally.
• It is unclear when and if Agency CIOs interact.
• Agency decisions happen in silos.
• There is no higher court of appeals for decision-making.
• The need to develop a governance structure is reaching a critical stage.
  • Decisions that affect multiple agencies are already being made by other means.
Assumptions when Developing the Options

- The rules and responsibilities identified in the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) are binding.
- Committee members will actively participate in the governance process.
- There will be continued support from the highest executive level.
- Federal funding for State interoperability will continue to drive Framework and ESC activities.
- The ESC will develop the criteria that determines which issues reach their level of decision making.
**Description of the Options**

*In general, the two options have the following characteristics:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership:</strong> Allows no designees in meetings; Advisory Council is a “committee of committees”</td>
<td><strong>Membership:</strong> Allows designees in meetings; Advisory Council is a workgroup of a larger State Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibilities:</strong> Same as Option B (written in IGA)</td>
<td><strong>Responsibilities:</strong> Same as Option A (written in IGA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of Meetings:</strong> Meets more often than Option B</td>
<td><strong>Frequency of Meetings:</strong> Meets less often than Option A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Making:</strong> Consensus when decisions are made</td>
<td><strong>Decision Making:</strong> Majority rules voting (one voice, one vote) if consensus is not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interacts With:</strong> Designees are not allowed to interact with members of other governing bodies</td>
<td><strong>Interacts With:</strong> Designees are allowed to interact with members of other governing bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reports To:</strong> same as Option B</td>
<td><strong>Reports To:</strong> same as Option A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Commitment:</strong> More time commitment than Option B; full-time PMO</td>
<td><strong>Time Commitment:</strong> Less time commitment than Option A; part-time PMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form of Communication:</strong> More in-person communication than Option B</td>
<td><strong>Form of Communication:</strong> Less in-person communication than Option A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>agency directors, CIO, Representatives of GOMB, CMS, MMIS, HIE, ACA, and others as designated by CIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Policy, Operations and IT staff identified by ESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaisons</td>
<td>one or more well seasoned staff members from each agency identified by ESC, may also be a member of OC, or SME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>designated by liaisons, may also be the liaison or member of the OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMO</td>
<td>includes director, staff in the following areas; program, business, technical, communications &amp; change mgmt, and administrative (clerical) staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Committees; 1. Communications &amp; Change Management 2. Business Architecture 3. Technical Architecture 4. Legal Privacy Confidentiality</td>
<td>comprised of stakeholders from various levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Council</td>
<td>committee of committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option B</strong></td>
<td><strong>Membership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESC</strong></td>
<td>agency directors or their designees, CIO, Representatives of GOMB, CMS, MMIS, HIE, ACA, and others as designated by CIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OC</strong></td>
<td>Policy, Operations and IT staff or their designees identified by ESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liaisons</strong></td>
<td>one or more well seasoned staff members from each agency or their designees identified by ESC, may also be a member of OC, or SME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SME</strong></td>
<td>designated by liaisons, may also be the liaison or member of the OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PMO</strong></td>
<td>includes director, staff in the following areas; program, business, technical, communications &amp; change mgmt., and administrative (clerical) staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Committees;</strong></td>
<td>comprised of stakeholders from various levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisory Council</strong></td>
<td>Human Services Commission Workgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strengths: Option A

Option A

- No designees makes for better representation
- Regular monthly in-person meetings creates greater engagement and fosters trust
- Consensus decision making creates more buy-in, ownership, and accountability
- Advisory Council leverages existing committees
- Because decisions must reach consensus, this requires more informed decision making
- A full time PMO ensures daily and efficient project management
Strengths: Option B

Option B

- Designees can represent committee members if they are unavailable
- Decisions are made even if consensus is not reached
- Allows for more ways to communicate than Option A
- Because consensus does not need to be reached, the governing body could have potentially faster decision making
Weaknesses: Option A

Option A

• Requires fairly ample time commitment from committee members
• Because consensus must be reached, decision making may take longer
Weaknesses: Option B

Option B

- Because designees are allowed, there is less buy-in, ownership, and engagement
- The Advisory Council would require formation of additional workgroup
- Because decisions can be made by a vote, there may be less informed decision making
- A part-time PMO would not provide as effective project management
Risk Analysis: Options A

Option A

• If committee members are not able to come to a meeting, they are not represented
• If consensus is not met, then a decision is not made
• Scheduling difficulties may delay meetings
Risk Analysis: Option B

Option B

- Members feel less involved if designees attend on their behalf, or if meetings are not attended in person
- If a vote is called, members may not be happy with decisions
- Members will have loss of interest
## Attributes of Good Governance: Option A v. Option B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Better Option?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared vision</td>
<td>A shared vision is developed by consensus by the ESC members themselves (no designees).</td>
<td>A shared vision is not necessarily developed by consensus or by the ESC members (designees).</td>
<td>Option A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Leadership</td>
<td>ESC members are committed to attending meetings and actively participating in the governance process. This may result in greater knowledge and more buy-in.</td>
<td>ESC members may send their designees to participate in the governance process. This may result in gaps of knowledge and less buy-in.</td>
<td>Option A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalization of Structure</td>
<td>A full-time PMO can manage the administrative functions related to convening meetings and implementing decisions.</td>
<td>A part-time PMO will convene meetings and implement decisions on a limited basis.</td>
<td>Option A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Decision-Making</td>
<td>Consensus requires that all members agree to the decision being made.</td>
<td>Majority rules voting means that some members may not be pleased with decisions being made.</td>
<td>Option A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable</td>
<td>Frequent meetings allow decisions to be made in a timely manner. Governing bodies can respond to changes quickly.</td>
<td>Less frequent meetings create lag time between when changes happen and when responses can be made.</td>
<td>Option A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent Communications and Processes</td>
<td>The Advisory Council is composed of internal and external participants of all agencies.</td>
<td>The Advisory Council is a workgroup of a State Commission, which may or may not represent all agencies.</td>
<td>Option A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

• The State of Illinois Interoperability Project Team recommends that the Illinois Framework Executive Steering Committee select **Option A** because it meets all of the attributes of good governance.
Next Steps
Next Steps

• The Interoperability Team will work with Framework Stakeholders to decide upon - and implement - a governance model for the Framework.
• Framework stakeholders will develop the processes and procedures needed to implement the model.
• Examples of the documentation required to formalize the Framework governance model are found on the following slides, including:
  • A roles and responsibilities matrix
  • A project governance organization chart
• Other documents include:
  • A charter
  • A vision statement
# Roles and Responsibilities Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Decision</th>
<th>ESC</th>
<th>OC (and subcommittees)</th>
<th>Advisory Council</th>
<th>Liaisons</th>
<th>SMEs</th>
<th>PMO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-to-day technical issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-to-day business issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy and security issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R=Responsible; A=Accountable; C=Consulted; I=Informed

To be decided by Framework ESC, Project Director and CIO
Organization Chart

To be decided by Framework ESC, Project Director and CIO
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