

CTG conducted an environmental scan from May 2008 through December 2008. The first phase reviewed academic literature, research reports, issue briefs, and white papers from public and private organizations. Web searches identified organizations, in the United States and internationally, with IT governance expertise (e.g., research centers, government agencies, consulting firms, etc.). This phase relied heavily on the use of Internet search engines and keywords commonly used to describe IT governance. The search scanned academic journal articles and the proceedings of relevant conferences in information science, management information systems, public administration, and organizational studies, again employing a set of commonly used keywords.

The second phase involved Web site reviews of publicly available documents from thirteen states that were selected based on the following three criteria: (1) states with publicly available information about IT governance efforts posted on their Web Site; (2) states ranging in the total size of government (i.e., size of IT budget and IT workforce); and (3) states at various stages of IT governance implementation. The selected states included California, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Virginia. The amount of information collected about each state and its accuracy depended heavily on information provided on their Web site; further, the information provided in this document is tied to the time period when the data gathering occurred, making it a snapshot in time, rather than an up-to-the-minute update on governance in any particular state.

Our analysis focused on examining state IT governance structures in each state, as well as the description of authority, roles, and responsibilities assigned to those structures. However, the overall analysis is limited by our ability to fully understand how state actors actually behave within their respective governance roles. Thus we are unable to provide an assessment of the relative effectiveness of any one IT governance arrangement versus another. While we conducted interviews with state chief information officers or IT directors from eleven states (California, Kansas, Kentucky, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New York, Oregon, South Dakota, and Tennessee) the purpose of these interviews was to gain a more in-depth understanding of their respective IT governance arrangements. A robust comparative evaluation of the states would require interviews with multiple actors within each state, which was prohibitive both in terms of cost and time available.