Minutes 2014-02-27

Next call: March 13, 2014

Draft Minutes: ITANA call of 27-Feb-2014

Minutes are published on the Conference Call Details page.

Attending

Rich Stevenson, University of Maryland University College (host)
Glenn Donaldson, Ohio State
Chris Eagle, University of Michigan
Leo Fernig, University of British Columbia
Andrew Gianni, University at Buffalo
Michael Janke, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
Piet Niederhausen, University of Washington
Ashish Pandit, UC San Diego
Brenda Reeb, University of Rochester
Brian Savage, Boston College
Mojgan Amini, UC San Diego

If you were missed from the roll call and would like to be included in the minutes, please contact pietn at uw dot edu.

****
Links:
ITANA Website: http://itana.org/
ITANA Wiki: https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/itana/Home
****

UPDATES

Working Group: Reference Architecture for Teaching and Learning

Leo reported on the status of the working group. The work ended the year in 2013 with a high level capability map: https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/itana/Teaching+and+Learning+Capability+Map

Leo asked the group whether there is interest in reconvening the group and continuing the work in 2014, and what activities people are interested in. Potential activities are:

* Connect with IMS Global about their Caliper project; for example, a conference call on analytics in teaching and learning
* Similarly, connect with Internet2 on identity and access management in teaching and learning

Rich suggested that we continue to work on drilling down into the high level business capabilities, adapting materials collected in 2013 to flesh out a more complete reference architecture. Piet described some work he and Scott started at the end of 2013, identifying scenarios that would drive the design of the reference architecture. Ideas for scenarios appear here: https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/itana/Reference+Architecture+for+Teaching+and+Learning

Based on these scenarios, the reference architecture could be designed to help institutions work through the impact of these types of changes on capabilities, processes, data, systems, etc.

Brenda agreed that the scenarios are a good approach. The reference architecture would prompt the institution to consider issues related to a change, such as space, personnel, etc. Andrew suggested mapping the high level capabilities into solutions or at least IT capabilities. For example, what IT capabilities support a learning plan or the design of assessments. There's a "stack" ranging from business capabilities through IT capabilities to solutions. It would be useful to have a menu of IT capabilities mapped to business capabilities.

Rich made the distinction between a reference architecture and case studies, which go into local solutions. Andrew suggested that even lists of some commonly used tools would help illustrate the reference architecture and clarify what the capabilities represent. Leo discussed how IT capabilities can support many different business capabilities.

Leo asked whether there is enough interest to schedule some RATL meetings. The participants agreed that there is. Piet suggested that there may be ways to get more ITANA members involved in filling in a framework that the group creates, to generate more content for the reference architecture. Brenda suggested setting up a wiki or Google Doc that members can contribute to, with a deadline, in a "crowdsourced" way.

Leo will work on scheduling upcoming RATL sessions.

CSG Enterprise Architecture Survey

Mojgan reviewed the results of the survey, which many ITANA members participated in. 42 individuals from 27 institutions responded. Some observations from the survey results:

* A moderate level of maturity in IT governance
* Many business areas (not just central IT) are typically represented in IT governance
* The focus of IT governance tends to be strategic, and governance is mostly advisory or gate-keeping
* A majority of institutions have architecture review, and of those the majority have an architecture review board
* ARBs are mainly in an advisory or gate-keeping function
* ARBs tend to be more IT focused with less business focus and representation
* Slightly less than half of institutions have an enterprise architecture program
    * Those with EA programs reported a low level of maturity
    * Many institutions have an informal EA group rather than a formal EA role or office

- EAs mainly report to CIOs, and EA is usually funded by central IT
- Relatively few EA programs appear to be using formal EA tools
- Many programs use TOGAF or a comparable framework as a reference

Rich observed a potential correlation between how EA is funded (central IT) and its focus (IT governance), and asked whether we could learn from those institutions that are the exceptions to this.

Horizon Report

Brenda introduced the NMC Horizon Report and asked the group how they use these types of reports in their architecture practices.

Call attendees agreed that these types of reports are especially important for architects as they lead institutions through change. Rich suggested a future agenda around the roadmapping process and how these types of reports contribute to it for those who are working on enterprise architecture. There could also be an ITANA working group on EA roadmapping.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Registration for EDUCAUSE will open soon, so please start planning for the annual ITANA Face2Face meeting and other activities at EDUCAUSE!

Next call: March 13, 2014.