

Information Governance Annotated Bibliography

Blair, Barclay. “Making the Case for Information Governance.” Ebook. FCS Information Governance, 2009. <http://barclaytblair.com/2012/02/24/making-the-case-for-information-governance-ebook-on-slideshare/>.

This e-book provides definitions, outlines the barriers and challenges, and discusses the business case for IG. A practical approach to developing an IG program is provided. The author point out that lack of IG opens the organization up to legal exposure and litigation. The IG program needs to be able to withstand the scrutiny of the court system. Falling short can leads to fines and other negative consequences. The author believes that an effective IG program provides a level of assurance that information assets are being managed appropriately.

Buckles, Greg. “Importance of Information Governance.” London: eDJGroup, 2012. <http://chrisdale.files.wordpress.com/2012/08/edj-information-governance-report-2012.pdf>

The eDJ Group conducted an updated survey to look at the state of IG in 2012. At that time, one third of companies had an active IG program, one third stated that they were in the planning stages and one third stated that they either had no program or were unsure. The desire to control information across all departments is a common reason for instituting IG. Executive leadership is needed though the title or position of the executive may vary. Establishing a culture of responsibility for use, storage, and sharing of information is critical. Accountability for information management does not necessarily belong to the CIO although several companies in the survey used this position to lead the IG initiative. A team approach is needed in order for the IG program to be successful. The most important factor in the success of the program is ensuring cross functional communication and cooperation among business units.

Cukier, Kenneth. “Data, Data Everywhere.” London: The Economist, 2010. <http://www.economist.com/node/15557443>.

This is a series of articles on the need to manage the proliferation of information that is occurring in all sectors. It discussed the associated business issues and the need for governance. The amount of digital information increases ten-fold every five years. Currently, only 5% of it is structured but this is changing rapidly. As information becomes increasingly digitized, aggregating and analyzing data is likely to bring bigger benefits. Information created by machines will largely be used by other machines.

DeAbreu Faria, Fernando, Antonio Carlos Gastaud Macada, and Kuldeep Kumar. “Information Governance in the Banking Industry.” 2013 46th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS), 4436–4445, 2013. doi:10.1109/HICSS.2013.270.

This research paper focuses on information governance in the banking industry. It involves a study of thirteen banks in three countries, all with highly developed financial systems: Brazil,

Hong Kong (SAR of China) and the United States. In addition to reporting on the perceived need for IG in today's banks, the study proposes an information governance framework (IGF). It offers a set of “factors” (principles) for informing an Information Governance Framework (IGF) for the banking industry—most of which is likely transferable to healthcare.

Economist Intelligence Unit. (2008). “The future of enterprise information governance.” London: The Economist Intelligence Unit Limited.

Frequently cited thought paper based on a survey of senior executives around the world on the benefits, challenges and risks associated with developing an enterprise-wide information governance strategy.

Egelstaff, Richard, and Marilyn Wells. “Data Governance Frameworks and Change Management.” *Studies in Health Technology and Informatics* 193 (2013): 108–119.

This book chapter discusses steps for developing a data governance framework, including: (1) review best practice and peer organizations to evaluate their methods, (2) devise a strategy and gain support of stakeholders, (3) perform a current state assessment to understand challenges and utilization of data, (4) identify metrics and KPIs, (5) quantify the cost of DG efforts, since quantifying the benefits of DG is more difficult, and (6) track the application and usage of data to ensure that it meets the goals of the organization. The importance of change management in developing and using the framework is emphasized as well as the need for corporate leadership to be aware of its role and responsibilities in data governance.

Fernandes, Lorraine, and Michele O’Connor. “Data Governance and Data Stewardship. Critical Issues in the Move toward EHRs and HIE.” *Journal of AHIMA / American Health Information Management Association* 80, no. 5 (May 2009): 36–39.

This article highlights an aspect of governance that is unique to health care—patient identity management. It discusses the need to address data stewardship as part of data governance. Data governance involves creating a shared understanding of data uses, identifying tools for data analysis and developing a solid data stewardship structure. Effective governance models involve people, policies, as processes as well as technology.

“Generally Accepted Recordkeeping Principles.” ARMA International, n.d.
<http://www.arma.org/r2/generally-accepted-br-recordkeeping-principles>.

ARMA’s Generally Accepted Recordkeeping Principles sets out accepted principles for record keeping with implications for information governance. These principles include: accountability integrity, protection, compliance, availability, retention, and transparency. In addition, the ARMA Maturity Model for Information Governance attempts to paint a more complete picture of what effective information governance looks like. It is based on principles as well as a foundation of standards, best practices, and legal/regulatory requirements. The maturity model serves as a foundation for assessing adequacy of recordkeeping programs by identifying five levels of maturity: Level One – Substandard, Level Two – In development, Level Three – Essential, Level Four – Proactive, Level 5 – Transformational. The Information

Governance Maturity Model will assist organizations in conducting an evaluation of recordkeeping programs and practices.

“Governance from the Ground Up Launching Your Information Governance Initiative.”

SAP white paper, 2012.

[http://www.sapexecutivenetwork.com/files/Governance_from_the_Ground_Up_\(EN\).pdf](http://www.sapexecutivenetwork.com/files/Governance_from_the_Ground_Up_(EN).pdf)

Information governance encompasses both strategy and execution. It is business driven. Many organizations have attempted to initiate IG but have failed to get it off the ground. The most common reasons for this include failure to launch (team meets but initiative goes nowhere), hiding behind the team (no one taking the lead), absence of data management (presence of data management in-house but business side of organization is unaware), unwillingness to assign decision rights (no authority to hold people accountable for results), assuming an immediate enterprise focus (inability to make the case for IG). Formalizing the role of data stewards with the authority to fix data problems solves the issue of having no one to “own the data.” The ideal IG project begins with a small business problem to be solved. Establish new smaller processes and ensure that they are repeatable and can scale to the next project. This proof of concept is what can put IG into practice and set the stage for an information-enabled organization.

Hulme, Tony. “Information Governance: Sharing the IBM Approach.” *Business Information Review* 29, no. 2 (June 1, 2012): 99–104. doi:10.1177/0266382112449221

Discusses IBM’s history with IG as well as offering a repeatable process and thoughts about automating IG. May be helpful in development of assessments of effectiveness of maturity of organizational IG.

“Information Governance Benchmark Report in Global 1000 Companies.” GCOC – The Council. Accessed February 17, 2014.

<http://public.dhe.ibm.com/software/data/sw-library/ecm-programs/CGOC.pdf>

This is a 2010 report that details the results of an IG survey of legal, records, and IT staff in Global 1000 companies from ten industries. Challenges and barriers to IG are highlighted in the report. An IG maturity model is included in the report to assist with addressing barriers. The top IG initiatives that were planned in the next 1-3 years included activities around risk reduction and cost reduction. The report suggests that no single department can be solely responsible for the IG process. Collaboration among stakeholder groups was identified as a key success factor for an IG program.

Judah, Saul. “Use a Principles-Based Information Policy to Drive Effective Governance.” *Gartner*, May 2013.

IG requires a balanced approach through which effective management of risk, compliance, related policies are used to achieve business objectives. Well-defined policies help establish the principles and guidelines to ensure the scope of information governance is maintained. The steps

to managing policies include the following: (1) Evaluate the scope of existing policies. (2) Assess if each policy is fit for its purpose. (3) Create clear alignment between business objectives and information policy. (4) Define SMART information policy principles. (5) Make information policies active instruments for Information Governance. (6) Use Metrics to drive behavioral improvement.

Kanaan, Susan. “Health Data Stewardship What, Why, Who, How: An NCVHS Primer.” July 2009. Accessed March 28, 2014. <http://www.ncvhs.hhs.gov/090930lt.pdf>.

Health data stewardship involves responsibility for assuring appropriate use of health data and liability for inappropriate use. The purpose of stewardship is to obtain the greatest benefit from effective and appropriate use of data while minimizing risk. Health data stewardship has become more urgent with the rise in electronic health data; recognition of the value of electronic data in improving population health; acceleration in the use of information technology; and awareness of the risks associated with inappropriate uses of data. Anyone who collects, views, stores, exchanges, analyzes, or uses electronic health data is responsible for data stewardship. Essential practices include transparency about use; identification of the purpose for data use; participation of individuals; security safeguards and controls; de-identification; data quality, including integrity, accuracy, timeliness, and completeness; limits on use, disclosure, and retention; oversight of data uses; accountability; and enforcement.

Khatri, Vijay, and Carol V. Brown. “Designing Data Governance.” *Commun. ACM* 53, no. 1 (January 2010): 148–152. doi:10.1145/1629175.1629210.

This research based article draws distinctions between governance and management and provides a framework for data governance. It purposefully does not distinguish between data governance and information governance and provides a decision matrix which can be used to design a data governance initiative

Kooper, M.N., R. Maes, and E.E.O. Roos Lindgreen. “On the Governance of Information: Introducing a New Concept of Governance to Support the Management of Information.” *International Journal of Information Management* 31, no. 3 (June 2011): 195–200. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2010.05.009.

This paper from the University of Amsterdam provides a conceptual definition of information governance as “the set of activities aimed at establishing a normative foundation to facilitate and stimulate sense making interactions.” It discusses the background of IG as an extension of IT governance principles, but makes the point that there is an important difference between the two.

Laney, Douglas. “The Birth of Infonomics, the New Economics of Information.” Gartner, October 2012.

This Gartner report discusses issues associated with the valuation of information as a business asset. Infonomics is an economic theory developed by Gartner that recognizes information as being an asset. Accounting theory can therefore be applied for managing information in the same manner as any other enterprise asset. At its core is a set of seven principles: 1. Information

is an actual asset. 2. It has both potential and realized value. 3. Its value can be quantified. 4. It should be accounted for as an asset. 5. Information's realized value should be maximized. 6. Information's value should be used to help budget IT and business initiatives. 7. Information should be managed as an asset. By embracing the principles, organizations can achieve benefits in operational and financial performance.

Logan, Debra. "Hype Cycle for Enterprise Information Management." Gartner, July 2012.

Defines and discusses the components, including organization and roles, associated with enterprise information management (EIM); identifies the maturity of EIM as "adolescent" and predicts that this "transformational" activity will become mature in 5-10 years. Strategies to begin valuation of information will drive and be driven by EIM

O'Kane, Bill. "Nexus of Forces Boosts Information Governance and MDM." Gartner, November 2012.

The increased visibility of the information component of the Nexus of Forces (mobile, social, cloud and information) is boosting the need for information governance and leading to the creation of the new executive role of chief data officer (CDO). The new executive role of chief data officer is responsible for ensuring that materially valuable business information is valid, verifiable, managed, true, appropriately private and interoperable. The CDO meets the role's challenges partly through policies that assign some responsibilities to business data stewards and others (operational responsibilities) to IT data custodians. The role of the CDO is to lead in the management of information as a business asset. Effective use of information across the organization will impact how technology is used to support information governance.

"Redefining the Role of Health Information Management in the New World of Information Governance" Iron Mountain with co-author Linda Kloss, available online at <http://www.ironmountain.com/Knowledge-Center/Reference-Library/View-by-Document-Type/White-Papers-Briefs/R/Redefining-the-Role-of-Health-Information-Management-in-the-New-World-of-Information-Governance.aspx>

Discusses HIM's evolving role and transition from a focus on paper and low value task and activities to the more strategic functions and roles associated with IG in health care. The white paper looks at current state and best practices that will enable HIM professionals to move to IG.

Reeves, Mary G, and Rita Bowen. "Developing a Data Governance Model in Health Care." *Healthcare Financial Management: Journal of the Healthcare Financial Management Association* 67, no. 2 (February 2013): 82–86.

This article describes the data governance evolution and model used to address data from the EHR at Vanderbilt University Hospitals. The EHR was often inaccurate or incomplete and posed a potential risk to patient safety, confidentiality and data quality. The article points out that making a solid business case for data governance is crucial for securing buy-in from executive management and organizational stakeholders. It is important to align business and IT strategies to ensure that resources are available for data governance. Data governance should be

a priority for healthcare leaders.

Reno, Danielle, and Sandra K Kersten. "Getting Serious about Information Governance." *Journal of AHIMA / American Health Information Management Association* 84, no. 5 (May 2013): 48–49.

The article described the data governance start up activities at Sutter Health. Recommendations for developing an information governance program include: 1. Create a vision to drive change by addressing business need such as a breach or reimbursement issue resulting from a management or data integrity issue. 2. Convene a steering committee, assign key roles, and engage executive leadership. 3. Define program's scope. 4. Conduct a current state assessment. 5. Develop a time frame– it could take 12-18 months just to get started. 6. Identify areas to achieve impact through an incremental approach. The goal is to ensure information assets are managed and controlled.

Rosenbaum, Sara. "Data Governance and Stewardship: Designing Data Stewardship Entities and Advancing Data Access." *Health Services Research* 45, no. 5 Pt 2 (October 2010): 1442–1455. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6773.2010.01140.x.

Discusses data governance within the context of access to health information for clinical and health services research. This includes the role of the data steward whose function is to ensure trustworthiness of data, including its acquisition, storage, safeguarding and usage as well as ensuring that patient rights are respected.

"Sedona Conference Commentary on Information Governance." Available online at <https://thesedonaconference.org/publication/The%20Sedona%20Conference%20AE%20Commentary%20on%20Information%20Governance>

This commentary from the Sedona Conference, a legal think tank, explains the need for comprehensive information governance from a compliance and risk management standpoint. With a focus on records and information management, privacy and security, and e-discovery, it offers a set of eleven recommendations for organizations to address in information governance programs.

Selby, Judy and Sherer, James. "A Year End Review of Information Governance." *Inside Counsel*. (2013). Accessed February 19, 2014. <http://www.insidecounsel.com/2013/12/20/a-year-end-review-of-information-governance>

IG requires strategic coordination across all business units. A successful IG program should incorporate four lines of function within every organization: (1) organization and culture (addressing structure and change management). (2) Policy and management (3) Effect on business processes, and (4) technology optimization. IG models going forward will likely start with a C-suite position and undergo refinement based on organizational need. The risks and benefits of big data have been a prominent concern for executives. There is a recognized need for the effective organization, retrieval and destruction of information. IG programs must also

address data security, including breach prevention and response. Done correctly, IG will not only prevent immediate failure of existing programs, but set up new programs for success.

Silic, Mario, and Andrea Back. “Factors Impacting Information Governance in the Mobile Device Dual-Use Context.” *Records Management Journal* 23, no. 2 (July 19, 2013): 73–89. doi:10.1108/RMJ-11-2012-0033

The proliferation of mobile devices brings new challenges associated with less ability to control these new sources of data. Through a semi-structured interview process with records management professionals, this research paper looks at the implications of mobile devices and information security for information governance. It found that organization security culture, mobile strategy and security framework were important issues to be considered in information governance associated with mobile technology.

Soares, Sunil. “Selling Information Governance to the Business: Best Practices by Industry and Job press Function.” MC, 2011.

This book reviews the business cases and lays out best practices for IG in several different industries and points out what they can learn from each other. Industries covered include financial services; healthcare; manufacturing; retail; transportation; government; energy; and telecommunications. It lays out 14 steps to implement an information governance program regardless of industry as well as roles and responsibilities, metrics, software tools, and maturity assessment.

Stackpole, B. “Information Governance Strategy: Developing a Roadmap for Managing Corporate Information.” *Tech Target*, September 2012.

http://docs.media.bitpipe.com/io_25x/io_25448/item_394579/RSD_sContentManagement_SO%23033718_E-Book_053111.pdf.

Companies often develop information governance programs to mitigate compliance risks or as a means of leveraging unstructured data as a business asset. The article discusses the following basic information governance best practices for launching and sustaining an information governance program: (1) Set clear governance roles and responsibilities. (2) Create policies and procedures to support the program. (3) Appoint the proper leadership – an executive with the authority to make decisions. (4) Establish clear metrics and communicate the value of good governance. (5) Make information governance a continuous process. The biggest barrier to information governance success is the lack of rightful program “owner” – one with enough authority and enterprise support to focus a governance initiative and keep stakeholders engaged. To ensure that information governance programs don’t fail, executive leadership must hold team members accountable. This means factoring the IG role into job descriptions as well as performance measurements.

“2013 Data Governance Survey Results” *Rand Secure Data White Paper*. Accessed February 13, 2014.

<http://www.randsecuredata.com/getattachment/resources/whitepapers->

[reports/Survey-Results/RandSD_WP_DataGovSurveyResults_Final.pdf.aspx?ext=.pdf](#)

This recent survey describes the areas where organizations are succeeding with Data Governance efforts, and where they are lacking. 44% of survey respondents replied that their company does not have a formal data governance policy in place. Organizations in which C-level executives are very involved or extremely involved in data governance, are three times less likely to experience complete data loss or a data audit failure – indicating that there is a relationship between the involvement of C-level executives in implementing data governance solutions and the overall success of a data governance within an organization. Based on the results of this survey, Rand Secure Data recommends that all organizations develop a formal data governance policy or reevaluate your current policy; take a cross-functional approach to data governance; ensure that data governance policy complies with legal and regulatory requirements; consider implementing new technology solutions.

Weber, Kristin, Boris Otto, and Hubert Österle. “One Size Does Not Fit All—A Contingency Approach to Data Governance.” *J. Data and Information Quality* 1, no. 1 (June 2009): 4:1–4:27. doi:10.1145/1515693.1515696.

This paper offers a flexible approach for designing data governance models for organizations, referred to as a contingency approach, which focuses on the roles and decision rights of each actor in the data governance initiative. This approach is based on strategy adapted from IT governance and organizational theory and demonstrates the influence of performance strategy, diversification, organization structure, process harmonization, market regulation, and decision-making styles. This includes a corporate data strategy which links data management with major business drivers and outlines strategic goals. When applying the model in practice, companies can configure it to their specific needs.

Weill, Peter, and Jeanne Ross. “IT Governance: How Top Performers Manage IT Decision Rights for Superior Results.” Harvard Business Review Press, 2004.

This book focuses on IT governance and the value it provides to organizations. It is heavily cited as an early model for Information Governance.