9-16-09 Conference Call

Conference Call Agenda

You may want to review the newly added [Instructional Visioning page](#) which contains additional resources and will act as a space for idea generation/documentation.

1. Introductions - who are you and what is your motivation/interest
2. Brief Background on New Initiative - What's taken place in the community that lead to this call?
   a. "requirements gathering" vs. "tool-centric visioning" vs. "instructional visioning"
   b. There is a lack of clarity
3. Discussion: What should our strategy be and how do we implement it?
   a. Developing/defining a clear set of objectives
      i. Establish a common vocabulary within the Sakai community
      ii. Document a standardized process that include all three initiatives (or more) and communicate it out to the larger community
   b. Some existing models to leverage
      i. OSP "Action Verb" model
      ii. "Talking to users" - model for collecting local input and feeding it up into the community
4. Next Steps
   a. Face-to-face meeting? - What would we need to have in place to make this productive?

Participants: Josh Baron (facilitator), Nate Angell, Keli Amann, Eli Cochran, Stephanie Conley, Brian Dashew, Janet DeVry, Kate Ellis, Steve Foehr, David Goodrum, Robin Hill, Jon Hays, Ann Jensen, Steve Lonn, John Norman, Nancy O'Laughlin, Daphne Ogle, Rita Pavolka, Jacques Reynauld, Janice Smith, Teggin Summers, Lynn Ward.

Meeting Minutes

- After a round of introductions, Josh gave a brief overview of the different discussions and ideas that lead up to this call
- Josh described three basic processes that have been discussed and for which there appears to be a need:
  - **Requirements Gathering** - this is a process for gathering incremental improvements/tweaks needed for specific tools. It has been going on formally and informally for some time. This type of effort attempts to answer questions like: what needs to be improved as we work to develop the Assignment tool between the 2.5 and 2.6 release?
  - **Tool-centric Visioning** - This is a process for creating a vision of the type of teaching, learning and assessment that should be supported and facilitated by a new tool or a tool that is undergoing significant or complete re-design. This type of effort attempts to answer questions like: what new types of teaching, learning and assessment should be facilitated by Gradebook 2 or Test & Quizzes 2 (these being complete redesigns of existing tools).
  - **Instructional Visioning** - This is a process for creating strategic tool-agnostic visions of the type of teaching, learning and assessment that future versions of Sakai should facilitate and support. This type of effort attempts to answer questions like: what innovative teaching, learning and assessment strategies are instructors interested in leveraging and how could Sakai facilitate and support them?
- There was a comment that these three processes could be categorized into operational (requirements gathering), tactical (tool-centric visioning) and strategic (instructional visioning) with regards to their role without the communities work.
- Janice Smith described the "action verb" or portfolio-specific vignettes that the OSP community has been engaged in. She noted that there is interest within OSP in broadening this work out and merging it with efforts by the T&L group. There are some issues that my be very OSP specific that need to remain with that group but much of what they have been discussing fits under the broader teaching and learning umbrella.
- David Goodrum noted that Micheal Korcuska had suggested that we attempt to get 20 institutions to each interview 5 instructors as means to gather a "library" of user-based scenarios. This seems similar to the work that Stanford is doing but on a broader level.
- Janice Smith noted that there have been challenges in the past with functional group coming up with visions and requirements which are either not possible to implement from a technical perspective or due to resource constraints. This may point to the need for regular interactions with developers as means to keep expectations realistic. It would also help ensure developer buy-in once a final vision is created.
- Eli Cochran noted that developers often do not have the time or experience needed to "convert" an instructional vision into a final product. This points to the need for UX expertise to help bridge this gap.
- There was discussion of what the right next steps might be...we considered either continuing broad open-ended discussions that would lead to a more concrete plan and set of ideas or possibly moving to get involved in a specific tangible activity that would help mature our thinking.
- We talked about engaging as a group with Stanford on their redesign of Test and Quizzes
- Janice Smith noted that although there was merit to doing something practical and specific, it ran the risk of distracting us from the larger broader issues. Attempting to engage in both something specific while continuing the broader discussions seemed like a good approach.
- There was a suggestion that we consider creating three committees, possibly focused on operational, tactical and strategic, visioning. This might help us divide up the work.