

Center for Digital Government's Digital States Performance Institute

2014 Digital States Survey Analysis – Washington

The 2014 Center for Digital Government Digital States Survey response from the **State of Washington** continues to demonstrate progress and improvement over their 2012 submission.

This is reflected in an overall grade of **B+**.

A grade of "B" indicates:

The state is trending up. Demonstrated results in many categories. Leadership is using modernization to change entrenched practices to prepare for more sustainable operations. Incentives for collaboration are in place. Measures used in key areas. Cuts tend to be made across the board.

2014 GRADING CRITERIA:

- Strategy, approach, implementation or actions are shown to be consistent with and in support of State priorities and policies to improve operations and/or services (30%)
- A quantifiable and demonstrable return-on-investment, in hard dollar savings and/or soft dollar benefits has been achieved that demonstrates IT has increased government's capacity to meet growing demand for service more efficiently (20%)
- Demonstrated and verifiable progress over the previous two years; either through a new initiative or through incremental improvement of an existing program or effort (15%)
- Innovation or creativity of solutions or approaches (15%)
- Demonstration of effective collaboration including multi-jurisdictional and inter-departmental (10%)
- Demonstration of successful measures of transparency, privacy and security (10%)

Center for Digital Government's Digital States Performance Institute

RESPONSE HIGHLIGHTS:

Washington received its highest comparative scores in the following categories:

- **Application Development (Response 1D) –(90 out of a possible 102 points)**
 - Washington's focus on Agile Development and the use of the SAATY metrics for use in making investment decisions is both very innovative and candidates to be recognized as best practices.

- **Cyber Security (Response 1E2) - (93 of a possible 102 points)**
 - Washington's made two very significant innovative investments in Security Management with their "Securing the Human" online training and the Public Regional Informational Security Event Management (PRISEM).

- **Energy Management (Response 1F2) – (94.5 of a possible 102 points)**
 - Washington demonstrated very healthy alignment with the Governor's energy management policies by their initiatives at their main data center. This was accomplished by reporting strong quantifiable results. Washington also received additional credit in this topic as they discussed Energy Management efforts outside of the data center including personal computing policies, smart building efforts and other statewide initiatives. This is also a potential best practice.

- **Performance Benchmarking (Response 1I) – (91.2 of a possible 102 points) -**
 - Washington indicated strong practices in this area. The use of Socrata's StateStat cloud system which is modeled after the Maryland StateStat solution to measure KPIs and publicly report on performance benchmarks is a best practice.

- **Policy Alignment, "Big Picture" (Response 1A) – (177 of a possible 204 points)**
 - In many ways, response 1A is the most important single response of the survey. The state did a good job tying information technology investment and management to the Governor's five top goals (Education, Economy, Energy/Environment, Healthy/Safe Communities and Efficient/Effective and Accountable Government). This response contained the substance, connection to planning and made clear the apparent commitment to execution necessary to be a successful "Digital State." Success with this response bodes well for the future. Further improvement is possible with more information about the

Center for Digital Government's Digital States Performance Institute

quantified benefits and outcomes of the initiatives that support the Governor's priorities.

PROGRAMS OR IMPLEMENTATIONS THAT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS POTENTIAL, NATIONAL "BEST PRACTICES."

- Agile Development
- SAATY Metrics for Analytics and Investment Decisions
- SANS Institute "Securing the Human" Online Security Training
- Public Regional Information Security Event Management (PRISEM)
- Energy Management Program
- Results Washington, <http://results.wa.gov>, a cloud-based StateStat performance benchmarking solution
- Automated Infrared Roadside Screening (AIRS) system

Washington received its lowest comparative scores in the following categories:

- **Governance (Response 1G) (78.3 out of 102 points)**
 - Washington described a number of governance practices including the use of the SAATY metrics and the CIO's \$100,000 innovation allowance that were very creative. Along with the agile development focus, this is certainly creating a less bureaucratic operation. However, less bureaucracy can result in less project control and they failed to address this issue. They did not discuss processes in place to help manage projects more effectively, as they failed to provide any information or quantifiable data to support if the new governance processes were helping to improve the overall on-time, on-budget performance of projects.
- **Online Services (Response 4B) – (79.5 out of a possible 102 points)**
 - Washington has a large number of online services including the national recognized Health Benefit Exchange (HBE). While these are innovative, they are randomly organized and can be better marketed and presented. In addition, other than data provided regarding the number of insurance sign-ups through the HBE, there was limited information provided about the use, benefits and outcomes from these services.

Center for Digital Government's Digital States Performance Institute

- **Mobility (Response 4C) – (72.6 out of a possible 102 points)**
 - While the CIO has established “Improving government through mobile technology” as the first of the five strategic objectives, there has been less progress than in many other states. The State’s policy of not setting standards for mobile development is a serious weakness in terms of ensuring security and privacy, accessibility and other key factors. The lack of any discussion of responsive design standards further demonstrates a weakness in this area.

GENERAL AREAS OF SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENT to bring **Washington** up to par with “A” states:

- Washington’s responses in this survey indicate a major improvement over prior survey submissions. However, one area of significant improvement still needed across many response areas was identified when evaluators sought to determine if “quantifiable and demonstrable return-on-investment, in hard dollar savings and/or soft dollar benefits has been achieved.” In general, Washington’s lack of ROI discussions and limited benefit/outcomes discussions are the major weaknesses in the overall submission. Exceptions did exist in both the Energy Management response (1F2) and in the specific responses for Finance, Administration, Procurement and Human Resource Management (2A2) and Transportation (2D2). These responses should be used as model answers for other questions.

SUMMARY OF GENERAL COMMENTS FROM EVALUATORS:

- Good progress
- Discuss Benefits and Outcomes more in future submissions and provide more quantitative results.