Draft content management maturity model

The report has used a content management maturity framework to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the content management infrastructure in CTR. Maturity frameworks are standard practice in industry to define how business processes, associated tools, and governance practices mature over time and often serve as roadmaps to determine priority areas of action. Examples of maturity models include the Organizational Project Management Maturity Model, the Information Process Maturity Model and the Capability Maturity Model published by the Software Engineering Institute.

Within content management itself, a maturity framework has been slow in evolving and no widely accepted industry standard models exist as yet. The report authors have thus formulated a maturity model based on comparable models like the Intranet Maturity model (developed by Avenue A!RazorFish) and domain understanding based on similar studies in the past. We believe that the model is generic enough to apply to a variety of business contexts and does take adequate cognizance of past industry practices and merging industry trends to be applicable to the CTR environment.

The content maturity model spans the following measures –

1. Strategy – what are the components of the unit's content strategy, and how comprehensively are they defined
2. Governance – what sort of team and organizational infrastructure is available to carry out the content management mandate
3. Processes – how well are content management processes defined in the unit
4. Tools and technology – what tools and technologies are available to the unit to carry out its content management mandate
5. Adoption – how widely are content management practices actually adopted by the unit's management and team
6. ROI (Return on investment) – what are the measurable results that can be attributed, directly or indirectly, to the unit's content management strategy

We have used the measures to define five levels of content management maturity in an organization. The following table describes the components of the five maturity levels –

	Level 1 (Proto)	Level 2 (Germinal)	Level 3 (Fledgling)	Level 4 (Mature)	Level 5 (Sophisticated)
Strategy	No awareness of content strategy. No definition of	Independent business units start to define content	Enterprise begins to formulate enterprise wide content	Enterprise level content strategy in place but not	Enterprise level content strategy drives unit level

	Level 1 (Proto)	Level 2 (Germinal)	Level 3 (Fledgling)	Level 4 (Mature)	Level 5 (Sophisticated)
	content types/templates – all content output dependent on author/business owner preferences. All content output viewed as an end in itself, with limited understanding beyond the immediate business/project context.	types/templates. Appreciation of the need to standardize content output. Limited understanding of metadata, as teams begin to experiment with content reuse and dissemination.	strategy; teams aware of need for integration. Draft enterprise metadata and taxonomy; adopted by pioneering units. Limited integration with user profiles. Content types identified but unevenly defined. Templates available, but often inflexible.	uniformly disseminated. Enterprise metadata/taxonomy begins to show up in several places (not yet validated completely against industry standards); integration with user profiles begins. Content types listed and well defined. Templates often still rigid.	practices. Well defined core metadata (validated against industry practices), and overall business and topical taxonomy in place. Metadata firmly integrated with user profiles. Well defined content types and templates.
Governance	No formal sponsorship. No content teams. Different parts of content responsibility sit with differing functions who handle tasks like storage, retrieval, and publishing in ad hoc fashion and as overhead responsibilities. No resources set aside to manage content.	Sponsorship at the discretion of managers. Content specialists begin to appear; mostly in editorial or publishing roles. The practice not yet completely understood in the enterprise. Authoring almost completely restricted to business experts.	Sponsorship largely from units. Formally defined content teams within several units. Enterprise level domain team not widely recognized (may sit within IT). Information architecture/content strategy mostly within IT. Within units skills focused on publishing, with little editing support (exceptions exist). Authoring divided between writers and business experts.	Sponsorship interest from the highest levels; most resources still come from unit groupings. Formally defined content management role at the enterprise level, with an undefined budget. Skills expand within teams, and the editorial role begins to grow prominent. Fitfully defined correlation between the central governance team and decentralized units.	Sponsorship from the highest level. Formally defined content teams with a defined budget. Skills in the team include managerial skills, information architecture/content strategy, authoring, editing, publishing, and records management. A central governance team works in conjunction with decentralized teams at unit level. Teams begin to share skills.
Tools	Desktop tools dominate, and are often tweaked to meet content needs. Network tools begin to appear. Paper is the most important content tool.	Network tools become fully entrenched as do local databases. Integration of local databases at the enterprise level begins. Few standard tools and business units adopt a variety of authoring, workflow, and storage tools without consulting with each other. Digital information replaces paper in part, but paper continues to dominate.	Enterprise level tools exist for independent functions (storage, publishing, etc.). Limited integration between these tools. Variable levels of adoption among business units. A proliferation of standard and non-standard tools. Digital information becomes the norm but paper continues to be important.	Integration of enterprise tools begins as does desktop integration of authoring/workflow tools. No end-to-end integration yet. Fewer non-standard tools as the enterprise embraces a greater variety of tools. Almost all critical information available digitally.	Enterprise level technology platform, customized if necessary to meet unit needs. Desk top integration of content management tools. All authoring through flexible templates. Single source authoring tools. Single document/data/records repository. Common, extensible workflow. Almost all critical information available digitally.
Processes	Most content activity centered	Apart from content capture,	Content capture, storage, and	Content dissemination and	Good integration between

	Level 1 (Proto)	Level 2 (Germinal)	Level 3 (Fledgling)	Level 4 (Mature)	Level 5 (Sophisticated)
	on content capture. No understanding of content management processes. All content management tasks performed as ad hoc events.	content storage becomes important. Content specialists begin to create repeatable processes and establish preliminary guidelines and standards. Content processes often conflated with generic Internet/Intranet processes.	workflow are important. No clear linkages yet with dissemination and preservation. Some units begin to document content processes. Style guides begin to appear; there may also be an enterprise style guide though its influence may be limited. Most content management processes continue to be distinct from business processes with almost no integration (though 'portals' may make an appearance). Large scale duplication of business content for content management needs, resulting in increased version mismanagement. Content management processes begin to grown distinct from generic Internet/Intranet processes.	preservation become better integrated with capture, storage, and workflow. Integration between content management and business processes begins. Enterprise wide style guides gain greater prominence; they also begin to acknowledge business functions. Duplication of business content decreases as integration between content management and business processes begins. Content management processes now recognized as a stand-alone domain.	capture, storage, workflow, preservation, and dissemination. Integration between business and content management processes; no duplication and/or content management overhead on top of business effort. All content management processes documented as part of business process documentation. Enterprise wide style guides in force that cover business as well as traditional content/editorial practices.
ROI	No ROI metrics in place as the content domain is little understood and investments are rather tiny.	Dissemination starts to become an important factor in the ROI. The cost/benefit of paper vs. digital publishing, and the value of storage begin to grow prominent. The ROI measure is often in conjunction with those of associate Internet/Intranet initiatives.	Dissemination, storage, and retrieval become the key elements of the ROI (though they are not very effective). The need to measure ROI against regulatory/compliance needs is recognized. The ROI begins to separate from that of Internet/Intranet projects and content management ROI starts to become a separate category.	Dissemination, storage, and retrieval improve across the enterprise. Regulatory/compliance based projects begin to show results. Content reuse, rather than duplication, begins improving operational efficiency. Content management is now formally understood as a separate ROI category.	Content management protocols play a part in meeting regulatory/compliance needs. Discernible impact on efficiency/effectiveness of operations. Reduced cost of dissemination, storage, workflow; content reuse becomes the norm.
Adoption	Ad hoc user needs, mostly centered on creating digital	User content needs become more defined and storage plus	Adoption becomes a significant issue as users	Adoption initiatives come from the very top. Content	User needs addressed include timely, effective

	Level 1 (Proto)	Level 2 (Germinal)	Level 3 (Fledgling)	Level 4 (Mature)	Level 5 (Sophisticated)
	versions of paper based content. Early dissemination needs as websites begin to appear. Adoption not a significant issue as most information is 'local' in nature and available via alternative channels.	web dissemination become standard practices.	begin to demand user-friendly and high productivity content management tools. The focus of information shifts to embrace enterprise wide information needs, and reader dissatisfaction becomes an issue.	management processes gradually start becoming part of business processes.	dissemination, the ability to pull content, and the development of new content products not dependent on the single document paradigm. Content management practices part of organizational orientation, and also built into all business processes. Rules based dissemination of all content output.

Please note that level 5 need not be the apogee of the content management domain. We expect further levels of sophistication to develop soon; the levels may however be adequate to measure the maturity of the domain within most enterprises as things stand today.