

2017-06-07 EAMM-Edu WG Meeting Notes

Date

07 Jun 2017

Attendees

- Ayodele Carter-Davis, The George Washington University
- Bob Dein, Miami University (Ohio)
- Dan Kiskis, University of Michigan
- Greg Charest, Harvard University
- J.J. du Chateau, University of Wisconsin
- Jose Cedeno, Oregon State University
- Louis King, Yale University (facilitator)
- Maher Shinouda, University of Waterloo
- Piet Niederhausen, University of Washington (scribe)

Goals

- Review initial draft of [Brainstorming EA Maturity Levels and Characteristics v0.2](#)
- Develop consensus on framework
- Discuss working on elements that fall under the maturity attributes

Discussion items

| Time | Item | Who | Notes |
|------|---------------------------------------|-----|-------|
| 5m | Roll Call & Request For Scribe | LEK | |
| 5m | Review of prior meeting and agenda | LEK | |
| 25m | Discuss framework and reach consensus | All | |
| 20m | Discuss elements under attributes | All | |
| 5m | Next steps | All | |

Documents

- [Maturity Levels and Characteristics](#)
- [Attribute Brainstorming](#)

Discussion

We reviewed the first page intro to the model.

- General agreement that this is fine just now
- Jose suggested there could be a clarifying illustration of where EA fits in the enterprise
- There could be more on the high level goals and value proposition of EA as a function
- There could be definitions of terms in a glossary or part of the introduction

We discussed the levels of the model.

- Agreed on five levels
- Revised some headings from "ing" to "ed", to reflect that in the middle levels, the cells will contain criteria for what constitutes maturity at that level -- whereas at level 0, initiation is in progress, and at level 5, continuous improvement is in progress

We discussed the scope of EA.

- The maturity levels don't map to scope; scope is a "row"; a high maturity practice could choose to not expand into business domains
- In general scope of coverage should not be a measure of maturity

We discussed the Coverage section.

- We probably need to blow out the items here in more detail to make sure we agree on the categories.

We discussed what goes in a cell. Is it:

- What you are able to do at this level
- A capability you need to have to be at this level

- An activity you typically do at this level
- An activity you need to do to achieve a capability
- An outcome achieved at this level

Action items

- ALL - Proceed to add color-coded attributes on the [Attribute Brainstorming](#) grid prior to the next meeting.