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Research Themes

• First outline of specific research topics produced during the research meeting held at Penn State University in Fall 2009.
• Contains a skeleton that will be continually refined and adjusted by the Research Group (you).

Handout: Research Themes Document, Fall 2009
Research Outcomes

• Pragmatic outcomes such as white papers, tools and guidelines useful to partners,
• Research outcomes such as journal and conference papers that are peer-reviewed,
• Visible outcomes such as presentations and panels in industry and research conferences.
Research Projects

• Expectations from each research project
  – Produce outcomes that are
    • relevant to the practice of EA
    • following well-accepted research methods
  – Subject the outcomes to
    • the rigors of EA practice
    • scrutiny in relevant academia disciplines
An Example

• Managing informal knowledge in an EA project
• Produce outcomes, for example:
  — Relevant to EA practice: best practices in context
  — Following accepted methods: comparative cases
• Subject the outcomes to, for example:
  — Rigors of practice: share results with members
  — Scrutiny in academia: present and publish
Normal Research Projects

• Duration: one year,
  – Support for:
  – Student work
  – Faculty time,
  – Travel and other incidental research expenses

• Does not preclude smaller or larger projects.
  – A project may be split with a checkpoint to assess progress and decide on continuation.
A Portfolio Approach

- The Research Projects Portfolio should contain
  - the potential for impact on industry practice, and
  - deeper insights and significant contribution to knowledge over time.
A Portfolio of Projects

- **Low risk**
  - **Low reward**
  - **Avoid**
- **High risk**
  - **High reward**
  - **Seek out**
Expectations Today

- “Significant discussion” about the feasibility and appropriateness of each project
- “Considering” each project as part of a portfolio of projects
- “Voting” to indicate desirability of pursuing the ideas contained in each project
- Providing clear indications of “working with faculty researchers” on projects
Voting Principles

• One vote for full research membership
  – Individuals attending to provide votes (preferably) today
  – Individuals dialing-in to provide votes via email (preferable quickly)
  – Individuals unable to dial-in to provide votes via email or snail-mail by deadline
Criteria

- Appropriate for themes and priorities of this group
- Potential to produce results for immediate benefit
- Potential to produce results with longer-term impact in EA
- Selection of appropriate technique/approach/method
- Feasibility based on need for/access to organizational data
- Potential for high-quality impact in academic discipline
Additional Criteria

• New criterion if the group decides to add
  
  ______________________________

• New criterion if the group decides to add
  
  ______________________________
Presentations

• S. Clark, PSU - Enterprise Transparency: A Modular Approach to Support Decision Making in Complex Organizations (Champion: Peter Greis, Ernst & Young)
• C. Woo, UBC, Canada - Conceptual Modeling for Evolving and Chaotic Business (Champion: Mike Rosen, Cutter)
• R. Ocker, PSU - Improving Collaboration in Distributed EA Teams (Champion: LuAnn Kollaja, CSC)
• M. Rossi, Aalto, Finland - A European Perspective on Business and Enterprise (Champion: Ulrich Kalex, Alfabet)
• B. Cameron, PSU - Value Measurement for Enterprise Architecture (Champion: Len Fehskens, Open Group)
• G. Cai, PSU - Overcoming Semantic Barriers in Integration of Heterogeneous Enterprises (Champion: Matt Peters, CAI)