

2008-11-10 Conference Call

Meeting minutes for November 10, 2008

Sakai/OSP 2.6 and beyond Development Status

- We sent Marist an email about QA on OSP that they volunteered to do. We don't know when they will start.
- There was an e-mail thread about forms being broken in upgrade from 2.4 to 2.5. There may be some connection with Resources, so Chris forwarded the issue to Jim Eng.
- [SAK-14769: Forms in a Matrix cell are unordered](#) Noah fixed this so that, when you have multiple forms in a matrix cell, the forms will always show up in alphabetical order. Should this go into 2.5x. Sean suggested having them listed in chronological order. We decided it should be considered a bug and be merged into 2.5x in alphabetical order, but revisit the order question if a use case come up for it.

2.7 and Beyond

- A question raised by the fix for [SAK-13437](#): If we have an email with a link to a portfolio in it, what should the behavior be when the user logs in to avoid a security issue? User won't necessarily be aware that they have an open Sakai session, so they probably won't be aware they need to log out. There are several options. Local institutions could add a logout button to the portfolio itself. Or we could have the user land in My Workspace and go to the portfolio from there. A third option would be to have a custom dashboard. We will think about this more next week to see if anyone has any suggestions.
- Remove Matrix owner name from list of matrices in Matrices tool. It was decided to remove the matrix owner name unless you have Create or Edit properties. That way students don't go to the tool and think that the matrix belongs to someone else. In a related issue, if there is only one matrix in a site, users should just land in that matrix. Isn't that the same as exposing the matrix tool? A mechanism should be found to make it possible to go directly to a matrix, even if there are multiple matrices.
- Evaluation-Centric Workflows: [Hugo's page on confluence](#) Hugo has described phases that a work goes through. How do we validate that these are the correct steps? Hugo feels they are 90% accurate, but it would be good to know that each institution's work flows are met by the steps. LOI will put up a form so that people can confirm that their use cases are covered. Lynn: concern about isolating evaluation workflow from other workflows. Would this prevent us from coming up with a system like LAMS, which has all kinds of things managed in their workflows. Response: Problem is there are so many workflows. If the code is too broad, it will take too long to develop and be too hard to configure when it's done. The goal is to create an infrastructure that supports multiple workflows, but initially fine-tune it for Evaluation. Later the Evaluation engine could be hooked into, for example, a learning workflow. Authoring also has its own workflow characteristics. Also, configuration should be straight-forward. If you are configuring a workflow, it should be like structured English, not like configuring IT. Right now OSP is very configuration heavy. Maybe it would be better if you could pick an archetype. So for evaluations, present "here are some common things people do." Allow institutions to start with one. Hugo will put up a form and example of how his use cases work with the steps outlined.