Why Healthcare Financial Planning Fails – And What Leading Systems Do Instead

Eighty-four percent of administrative leaders cite financial pressures as their greatest strategic threat in 2026.[1] That number gets cited in every board deck and every consulting pitch. But the statistic obscures the real problem.

The issue is not that costs are rising. Every executive in the room already knows that. The issue is that planning and execution are structurally disconnected, and most organizations do not have the architecture to close that gap.

This is not a planning problem. It's not an analysis problem. It's an accountability problem. And until organizations treat it as one, the cycle will repeat: plan, budget, execute, miss, explain, repeat.

[1] *Healthcare finance trends for 2026: A dynamic mix of opportunity and risk,* Beckers Hospital Review, January 28, 2026

The Planning-Execution Gap

Traditional healthcare financial planning was designed for a more predictable operating environment. Annual budgets, quarterly variance reports, year-end reconciliation. That model assumed that the conditions present when the budget was built would hold for twelve months.

That assumption broke years ago.

Today, a 400-bed health system can see its payer mix shift, a key service line lose volume, and a labor market tighten, all in the same quarter. By the time the variance report surfaces, the damage is already embedded in the financials. Leadership is reacting to performance that departed from plan months earlier, with limited ability to course correct in real time.

But the deeper issue is not speed. It is structure.

In most health systems, FP&A owns the budget. Strategy owns the plan. Operations owns execution. Quality owns clinical outcomes. Each function does its job. But the connective tissue between them, the process that says we planned X, we spent Y, we got Z, now what we do, we do differently, lives in organizational no-man's land. Nobody owns it because it crosses every lane.

That gap between planning and execution is where performance improvement goes to die. Not because leaders do not care about measurement. They do. But because the organizational machinery to close the loop does not exist.

The Accountability Loop: A Framework for Continuous Performance Management

What separates organizations that sustain financial performance from those that cycle between improvement sprints and backsliding? In our experience, it comes down to one structural difference: whether the organization has built a closed loop between planning, execution, and adjustment.

We call this the Accountability Loop. It has five steps:

Most organizations are reasonably good at the first three. They identify opportunities, allocate budget and people and execute initiatives. Then they move on to the next thing.

Steps four and five – Measure and Adjust – are where the model breaks down. Not because measurement is absent, but because there is no standing process that connects what was planned to what actually happened to what needs to change. There is a kickoff, there is execution, and then there is a gap.

The gap has a cost. Organizations that invest in performance improvement without closing the loop are likely to see an erosion in their gains over time. The work was right. The sustainability architecture was missing.

Two Halves of a Complete System

The Accountability Loop has a natural seam in the middle. Steps 1 through 3 – Prioritize, Resource, Execute – are the domain of Performance Improvement. This is where clinical and operational teams identify savings, redesign workflows, and drive cost out of the system. Most health systems have invested heavily here.

Steps 4 and 5 – Measure and Adjust – are the domain of Enterprise Performance Management. This is where planning becomes continuous: rolling forecasts that reflect operational reality, variance analysis that connects clinical activity to financial outcomes, and scenario modeling that lets leadership test decisions before committing resources.

When both halves operate together, the loop closes. PI identifies and executes the improvement. EPM measures whether it held, models what comes next, and triggers adjustment before performance degrades. Without both, organizations oscillate between improvement sprints and drift.

What This Looks Like in Practice

Consider a regional health system facing a $40 million operating loss. The traditional approach: launch a cost reduction initiative, identify $50 million in opportunities, execute against the top priorities, report progress quarterly.

Under the Accountability Loop, the approach is structurally different. Each critical outcome has a single owner, not a committee, not a shared responsibility, one person. Decision rights are established before the first meeting: who can approve a staffing change, who can redirect capital, who escalates and to whom. A weekly structured conversation replaces the quarterly performance review – not a status update, but a decision meeting where every metric has a name attached to it.

On the EPM side, rolling forecasts replace the static annual budget. Driver-based models connects clinical volumes to financial projections in real time. When orthopedic length of stay increases by half a day, the financial impact surfaces within the week, not the end of the quarter. Leadership can see the variance, trace it to the driver, and make the adjustment while the problem is still small.

The result is not just better forecasting. It is a fundamentally different operating rhythm. One where planning, execution, and learning happen continuously rather than in disconnected annual cycles.

Technology as Enabler, Not Solution

EPM platforms, Workday Adaptive Planning, Oracle EPM, Anaplan, Strata, among others, provide critical infrastructure for closing the loop at scale. Integration with ERP and HRIS systems creates a single planning environment where workforce, supply chain, and financial data connect. Automated variance reporting replaces manual spreadsheet assembly. Scenario modeling moves from a quarterly exercise to an on-demand capability.

But the platform is the enabler, not the solution. Organizations that implement EPM technology without the underlying accountability architecture, individual ownership, clear decision rights, structured conversations, the right metrics, end up with a more expensive version of the same problem: better data, same disconnected decision-making.

The sequence matters. Build the accountability structure first. Define who owns each critical outcome. Establish the decision rights and the meeting cadence. Then implement the technology that makes the loop visible and actionable at enterprise scale.

The Path Forward

For organizations looking to make this shift, the path forward has three components: establish a shared ownership of planning across finance, operations and clinical leadership, not as a governance committee, but as an operating process. Embed continuous planning in to the drivers that most influence outcomes, including workforce, payer mix, reimbursement, and service line strategy. And invest in the enterprise integration and supporting platforms that allow leaders to operate from a single trusted source of truth.

In an environment where variability is no longer episodic but constant, the distinction between organizations that plan annually and those that plan continuously will only become more pronounced. The former will keep budgeting in the rearview mirror. The latter will build the architecture to see around the corner.

The question is not whether your financial planning needs to change. It is whether you have built the system, the accountability loop, that connects planning to execution to learning, continuously, across every function that touches performance.

Organizations that close the loop will outperform. The rest will keep explaining variances.

Contacts

James Case
Principal, Advisory
Health & Government Solutions,
KPMG US

Stephen Thompson
Principal, Advisory
Finance Transformation,
KPMG US

Some or all of the services described herein may not be permissible for KPMG audit clients and their affiliates or related entities.

Learn about us: | **kpmg.com**