

# 2008-04-28 Conference Call

Meeting minutes for April 28, 2008

## Sakai/OSP 2.4 Status

- SAK-9732 Fixed.
- SAK-12842 fixed
- SAK-13337 fixed by Brian
- SAK-13271 Creating new form item when adding evidence in a matrix causes 404. Assigned to Beth.

## Sakai/OSP 2.5 Status

- SAK-13114 SAK-12119 12119 renamed. Associated with proprietary version of taggable. Only occurs if GMT is configured. Who is supporting GMT? IU is probably not, given their move away from it. Syracuse probably is not, but we should get the official word from them. We may need to put out a call to get someone to support it. It would take several weeks to get an answer about whether rSmart will be doing anything. Problem may only be on HSQL
- SAK-13304 fixed by Brian.

## 2.6 and Beyond

**Multiple Evaluator Workflow looking for development resources.**

### Form data extraction and Summary Data

Michigan wants to extract data from forms and make it available for reporting. We need realtime, with an interface in front of the actual user. UM doesn't run the data warehouse, and it wouldn't do what we need anyway. Is data warehouse a good solution? Two views, instructor and student. Lynn: hard to imagine anyone who wouldn't love this. This wouldn't be a turnkey solution; anyone using it would have to customize things for their own data. UM looking at BIRT or Pentaho for reporting. For real analysis of the data, export it. Jan: why not go all the way and have it give report on all the data in the matrix. Noah: some interactivity would be possible farther down the road, but we need to do the base case first, showing only a partial slice of the data. Navigating to cells or forms would allow you to see the whole thing in context.

Are we adding too much complexity? Answer: This has to be an option, not a requirement. Steve: when you define a form, indicate you need realtime extraction of this data. John Ellis thought a solution like that wouldn't be too hard. Is there a way to generalize this so it easier to implement? Perhaps have some standard forms that would work out of the box with the reports. LOI: if you view it as an extension of the matrix tool, where it is simply a different view of the matrix data, does that make it easier to generalize?

**Matrix defaults. This is part of a larger set of requirements, but it is an easy place to start. Add functionality into the matrix properties so that you set defaults. Backwards compatibility? 2nd requirement: anyone with evaluator role could see anything. Wanted more granular control so, e.g., peers only see what they are supposed to.**

Useful feature, but adds complexity.

Saving changes as the user works would be valuable, in case user hits back button. Does this take multiple evaluator functionality into account? Answer: no, but may not be incompatible.