

# 2017-07-05 EAMM-edu WG Meeting Notes

## Date

05 Jul 2017

## Attendees

- Dan Kiskis
- Louis King
- Jose Cedeno
- Greg Charest
- JJ DuChateau
- Maher Shinouda
- Piet Niederhausen
- Raoul Sevier

## Goals

- Harvard Presentation and continued work on attributes.

## Discussion items

| Time | Item  | Who                        | Notes  |
|------|---|----------------------------|--|
| 5m   | Roll Call   | LEK                        |  |
| 25m  | Harvard Presentation of prior work on EA Maturity Model                                 | Raoul Sevier, Greg Charest | <a href="#">Thoughts on EAMM for edu</a>         |
| 10m  | Review of prior work on Attributes Brainstorming Document and discussion moving forward | JJ DuChateau               | <a href="#">EEAM-edu Attribute Brainstorming</a> |
| 20m  | Discuss initial draft of maturity model document and call for volunteers                | All                        |  |

## Notes

- Reviewed Harvard's [Thoughts on EA MM for edu](#) presentation
  - Work based on prior work
  - Thoughts on aligning to existing models in industry
  - Clear definition of maturity model
  - Clear articulation of outcomes
  - Clear articulation of audience
  - Writing style and language to be accessible by intended audience
  - Focus on strategic audience
  - The model should incorporate a scale of maturity and a set of processes domains specific to the capability
  - Metrics are needed for each domain
  - Harvard chose ITIL service lifecycle to define process domains
  - Maturity levels are generic (1-5 or 1-3, etc.) and the processes are from ITIL therefore the actual cells must describe the actual characteristics of the service at various stages of maturity
    - Needs measures and assessment mechanisms
- Discussion items
  - The group has discussed definitions, outcomes and use of the model. These need to be documented in the initial draft
  - Mapping to ITIL may not be a good choice for all of higher ed as ITIL is a significant lift in its own right
  - Mapping to ITIL could be highly beneficial in that it is an understood and popular framework
  - ITIL might not encompass all of EA functions
  - Performance measures are very interesting
- EEAM-edu Attribute Brainstorming led to reasonable trajectories across each of the attributes
  - The model seems to be working and should move towards documenting
  - Documentation should not be viewed as fixed but still very fluid - a working document

- Writing team should start work
  - Make sure all prior work is incorporated as text or comments in initial draft
  - Include definitions, audience, use, etc.
  - Create a working draft that others will be able to contribute to and that can be restructured as needed
  - See action items for next steps

## Action items

- Louis to write up meeting notes and circulate to Working Group
- Louis to add call to action to message to working Group to add thoughts and attributes to brainstorming sheet by Wed., July 12
- Piet to draft initial structure for the EAMM-edu document
- Writing group of JJ, Piet, Louis, Jose and Maher to stake a claim to sections of contribution and to write initial drafts by Fri., July 14th
- Louis to set up a meeting for Fri., July 14th for writing team to discuss progress