

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	Thoughts on EAMM for edu
10m	Review of prior work on Attributes Brainstorming Document and discussion moving forward	JJ DuChateau	EEAM-edu Attribute Brainstorming
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