Board Minutes 2005 June 23

This document contains minutes from the conference call of the Sakai Board held on June 23, 2005. Corrections, suggestions should be sent to Joseph Hardin and Mary Miles.
Present in the call: Lois, Vivie, Joseph, Mary, Carl, Mara

The most pressing agenda item at this time is the July 6-7 meeting. Everyone has received an agenda. Mary was asked to send a note to Mary Curtin at MIT suggesting that the entire group get together on the morning of the first day to map out the plan for the next couple of days.

The main topics for the Board at the July meeting will be the software that will be developed going forward, reviewing what comes back from the different groups, and getting a clear idea of the possibilities. A major issue of discussion will be hierarchy. This needs to be clarified for the working groups.

Mike reported that the product release process for 2.1 began this week. He has put together a listing of all the things that needs to be done and has sent it to Chuck for comment. Once that is received back, he will put it in confluence and get a good head start for 2.1. This will result in less discussion about what we would like to see and more discussion about what is possible.

A listing of possible items includes:
¿ Push on with framework and get authorization and hierarchy figured out
¿ Course management services available
¿ Having an OSP based resource tool
¿ Getting some improvements with regard to accessibility
¿ refactor legacy tools (making remaining tools comply with the style guide).
¿ With Daphne taking responsibility for section tools, how much time would be available for development?

Joseph asked Mike to send the document to the board as soon as it was received from Chuck. He also asked to see the "hell or high water" and "black-eye issues" lists with respect to 2.0 and 2.1. The Board needs to know what will be done in 2.1 and what will not.

In a discussion on hierarchy and super-structure a question of definition arose. Joseph suggested that several of the board members write a "use case" at the front of the guidelines which will direct the work in 2.1. Joseph asked whether the work in 2.1 would facilitate a professor or teacher to create a sub-group for his class and what tools would then be available to their sub-groups. Joseph suggested that a synoptic use case like that at the front would make everyone on the board very aware of what they are getting or not getting.

There will not be an opportunity to do a lot of reconfiguring of user groups and it was unclear what board members have to have. Lois mentioned that she was struggling with the terminology. She will send something back in writing to clarify her position. Other board members were encouraged to prepare a similar use statement and needs section in the form of a 3-sentence executive summary. Mike will make sure these use cases are at the top of the presentation. The solution should not simply direct someone to another source, but rather provide something specific so there is no question as to what is meant by what sectioning, or sub-grouping, or hierarchy would give me this, etc. If necessary, Mike was urged to contact people by phone to clarify their concerns.

Lance has constructed a set of tools for implementing hierarchy and infrastructure. Now, he and Glenn need to sit down and determine what will be included in 2.1. Mike noted that a part of this work is determining what is in 2.1 in terms of hierarchy and superstructure. Joseph responded that at this point, he just wants to be sure that it's clear to the Board what the choices are.

Joseph reported that he has made a request to determine exactly what the ECL currently covers, specifically with respect to documentation, and the copyright people are looking into this. Apache license is different from ours (ECL) and was written for these concerns so we don't have any similar language in the ECL. The ECL was written only for the software.

All discussion on the December Conference will be saved for the 6th and 7th. Concentra and other potential PCOs have been asked to bid, and that is due back prior to the face-to-face meeting. The board agreed that if it seems reasonable, Joseph should just go from there. A program chair is still needed for this conference.

The incorporation process is moving forward, with conversations taking place that include initial definition of the process of moving the IP over to a foundation. If the articles of incorporation are simple enough, there is no need for a round-robin review. The board suggested that Joseph continue with the work and unless there are big problems, set up the corporation. This will then be taken directly to the universities with the request to transfer the IP. This could all be done while the by-laws are being worked out.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:26 p.m.