1. Whistleblowing is a topic of significant complexity that involves a range of competing interests and values. Employees who witness illegal or unethical behavior within their organization may feel obligated to report such activities in the public good's interest. However, organizations may view whistleblowers as disloyal or troublemakers who threaten their reputation, operations, and financial well-being. The case of Justen Deal, who blew the whistle on the HealthConnect project at Kaiser Foundation Health Plan/Hospitals, raises important questions about the role of whistleblowers in organizations and the ethical implications of their actions.

From a moral standpoint, whistleblowing can be viewed as an act of courage, where an employee is willing to endure personal and professional consequences to expose wrongdoing or prevent harm. In this context, Deal's actions can be interpreted as those of a concerned employee who believed that the issues with the HealthConnect project were severe enough to warrant public attention. Deal's memo offered a detailed account of the technical and financial challenges encountered by the project, including the effect on patient care, and his concerns were not limited to his immediate team or department. By sending the memo to all employees across the organization, Deal may have felt a responsibility to alert others and to hold the organization accountable for its actions.

However, whistleblowing can also result in negative consequences for both the individual and the organization. From an organizational perspective, whistleblowing can be seen as a threat to reputation and trust, as well as the financial and operational stability of the organization. In this light, Deal's actions may be viewed as those of a troublemaker who publicly criticized the project without proper authorization or consideration of the potential repercussions. Deal's memo may have caused unnecessary alarm, damaged employee morale, and hindered the organization's efforts to address the issues. From a legal standpoint, whistleblowers may also face retaliation, such as termination, demotion, harassment, or other forms of retribution, which can have a chilling effect on future whistleblowers.

In the end, whether Deal was a troublemaker or a concerned employee who acted ethically is a matter of viewpoint and values. Some may view him as a hero who spoke truth to power, while others may view him as a troublemaker who created unnecessary chaos. However, regardless of one's stance on the matter, it is apparent that the HealthConnect project at Kaiser Foundation Health Plan/Hospitals had significant issues that required attention, and it is probable that Deal's actions aided in those issues being addressed more quickly and effectively than they otherwise would have been.

2. The implementation of the HealthConnect system at Kaiser Foundation Health Plan/Hospitals has sparked different views from Justen Deal, Scott Herren, and Matthew Schiffgens. These views are influenced by their respective backgrounds and roles in the project. Each view brings a unique perspective to the challenges faced during the implementation of the HealthConnect system.

Justen Deal, as a Kaiser employee and publication project supervisor in the Health Education and Training Department, had direct experience with the technical problems and scalability issues encountered during the implementation of the HealthConnect system. He believed that the Citrix Application Delivery infrastructure used by Kaiser was ineffective, inefficient, and unreliable in handling the load of the Epic system. He blew the whistle on the project to raise awareness among his colleagues about the issues and the billions of dollars being wasted on an unscalable system.

On the other hand, Scott Herren, as a group vice president and general manager at Citrix Systems Inc., provided the infrastructure used by Kaiser and defended his company's product. He believed that the problem was not scalability but the overall architecture being used to support the large loads required by Kaiser. He argued that Citrix has had many successful Epic deployments worldwide, and the implementation must be architected accordingly to support large deployments.

Matthew Schiffgens, as a spokesperson for Kaiser, had a more general perspective on the issue and was responsible for managing the company's reputation and public image. He acknowledged the challenges faced during the implementation of the HealthConnect system but stated that Kaiser had a process to systematically address these challenges as they arose. He believed that identifying and addressing issues as they go along is a fundamental practice of running a good business.

3. The HealthConnect project is currently facing a critical decision: whether to continue with its implementation or terminate the project due to technical problems. The decision is complex and involves evaluating a range of factors such as the impact on patient care, financial and organizational costs, and potential benefits.

On one hand, if the technical problems are severe and negatively affect patient care, terminating the project may be necessary to prevent further harm. Furthermore, if the costs of continuing the project outweigh the potential benefits, ending it may be the most prudent decision. However, terminating the project would lead to significant financial losses for Kaiser, as it has already invested $4 billion in the project.

On the other hand, if the technical problems can be resolved, continuing with the implementation may be a viable option. The project could provide Kaiser's employees with immediate access to millions of patient medical records, streamline various healthcare operations, and enhance patient care and experience. However, continuing with the project may result in ongoing technical problems, delays, and further financial costs.

Regardless of the decision, both options would have significant ramifications for Kaiser, its employees, and its patients. Terminating the project could lead to a loss of investment, damage to Kaiser's reputation, and disruptions in patient care and operational efficiency. Continuing with the implementation may result in additional costs, delays, and potential technical problems.

Furthermore, if the project is terminated, it could lead to financial and legal consequences, including breach of contract and potential lawsuits. Additionally, it may negatively impact employee morale and confidence in the organization's decision-making abilities. If the project continues, Kaiser needs to address concerns raised by stakeholders and take appropriate actions to rectify any issues.

Therefore, the decision needs to be based on a thorough analysis of the costs, benefits, and risks associated with both options. Kaiser must prioritize the well-being of its patients and employees while also considering its financial and legal obligations. The decision will have long-term effects on the organization and must be made carefully after considering all the factors involved.