

# Yale University EA Maturity Review - 2019

## Background

### What is your name and title?

Louis King, Enterprise Architect, [Louis E King \(yale.edu\)](mailto:louis.king@yale.edu)

Completed by the [Technology Architecture Committee](#)

2019-02-08

## Quick References

- [Maturity Model on a Page](#)
- [EA Practice Maturity Levels](#)
- [EA Practice Maturity Attributes](#)
  - [Scope Definition](#)
  - [Engagement](#)
  - [Impact Assessment](#)
  - [Delivery](#)
  - [Management](#)

### How is Enterprise Architecture defined at your institution, and what is the mission of the EA practice?

Enterprise Architecture is not widely understood at Yale. The capability is orchestrated and primarily delivered through the Infrastructure Design Services group in the central Information Technology Services department. It leverages architects in other IT groups in ITS and in the professional schools in a federated approach. The Enterprise Architecture and Design Services capability focuses primarily on application, data, and technology architecture of enterprise services, architectural governance of solution architectures and technology standards, and digital transformation in a few areas where the team has deep expertise of the business functions of the University.

## Review by Maturity Attribute

X indicates where Yale currently evaluates itself to be. X indicates where Yale expects/aims to be by next evaluation in one year.

	1. Initiating	2. Formed	3. Defined	4. Managed	5. Improving
A. Scope Definition		X	X		
B. Engagement		X	X		
C. Impact Assessment	X	X			
D. Delivery			XX		
E. Management		X			

## Scope Definition

***Our current level is about 2 and we are aiming for 3.***

Examples that illustrate our current state:

- The team and federated architects work closely together to provide architectural design services and guidance on all core services and all major portfolio projects.
- Architectural reviews for new and revised architectures are regularly performed by the Technology Architecture Committee.
- Digital transformation services are provided to select functions of the University.
- The team engages in understanding emerging technologies and assessing them.

Things we want to work on:

- Make sure there are language references/glossary of EA related terms.
- Build a stronger web presence for EA and describe the performed capabilities.
- Publish the EA approach and scope.
- Specify the availability of architects to projects currently lacking them within IT.
- Specify an architect to be the point of contact for each functional domain of the University.

## Engagement

***Our current level is about 2 and we are aiming for 2.***

Examples that illustrate our current state:

- Senior leadership stakeholders generally recognize value in EA capabilities but those valuations are ambiguous in regard to specific value propositions delivered by the capability.
- Infrastructure Design Services works closely, respectfully, and in harmony with federated architects across ITS and with select IT Partners in other departments of the University.
- Some developers and solution designers are not aware of the EA capability or perceive it as not a good fit for their needs.

Things we want to work on:

- Develop further documentation and tools to properly engage technical teams.
- Proliferate a design thinking mindset.
- Publish success stories about engaging EA capabilities.
- Provide information about EA through IT Partners venue.

## Impact Assessment

***Our current level is about 1 and we are aiming for 2.***

Examples that illustrate our current state:

- The number, type, and depth of architectural engagements are tracked.
- Architectures are generally proven to be effective when implemented.
- Stakeholders are expressing satisfaction with the value provided.

Things we want to work on:

- Create qualitative assessment of engagement with the Technology Architecture Committee (TAC) and Technology Architecture Standards Team (TAST).
- Create qualitative assessment for follow-up on architectural engagement of projects.
- Create qualitative assessment of the federated model.

## Delivery

***Our current level is about 3 and we are aiming for 3.***

Examples that illustrate our current state:

- Design Services engages with a broad number of stakeholders using a variety of methodologies to advise on and to deliver architectures that are recognized as functionally strong, technically sound, risk appropriate, and business-viable.
- The Technology Architecture Committee is widely valued among practitioners and has a repeatable engagement process in place.
- EA is engaged with and embedded in the broader work processes of the organization.

Things we want to work on:

- Build a library of recommended best practices.
- Further define our architectural capability.
- Consider discussing which capacities will be applied to specific projects.
- Develop press relations function and self advocacy.

## Management

***Our current level is about 2 and we are aiming for Y.***

Examples that illustrate our current state:

- Currently ambiguity about what EA's value proposition is.
- EA staff and financial resources are clearly defined.
- EA effort is tracked by department but not aggregated across departments.
- EA capabilities are embedded in the core processes of Information Technology Services.
- EA capabilities are requested by select domains of the university and are working towards being part of those stakeholders business processes

Things we want to work on:

- Clarify what is being managed.
- Provide total number of engagements by EA across organization.

## Summary

**Overall, what are the major challenges and/or opportunities for EA at your institution?**

The CIO established a Technology Architecture Standards Team this year. This team, which has appropriate representation across ITS departments, will focus on standards. The TAST may also be the organizational structure that can appropriately frame the EA capability within the organization. The EA capability, the Technology Architecture Committee (architectural review board), the Technology Architecture Standards Group, and Infrastructure Design Services will need to rationalize and optimize their specific charges in the context of the broader EA capability and the ITS organization.

Continuing to add value through EA activities to core services and major portfolio projects is a clear opportunity.

Sharpening the value proposition and strengthening engagement with key stakeholders will be essential to garnering continued support.

Engaging in digital transformation activities in select domains will continue to be a new capability. That will need to be nurtured and matured over time.