

# 3-11-2009 Conference Call

[< Previous Meeting](#) [Next Meeting >](#)

**Participants:** Christian (Rutgers), Brian (Marist), Mathieu (Delaware), Josh (Marist), Robin (Wyoming), Emily (JHU), John Hayes (Berkeley), Kate (Indiana), Janet (Delaware)

## 0. Welcome to new members!

- Christian (Rutgers)
- Brian (Marist)

## 1. TWSIA Judging

- There was an orientation session for the committee last week, only 4 of 11 participated.
- Used Elluminate, worked OK, but not the best for conversation.
- Need to confirm time; will use Doodle to find a good time for the majority of people.
- Have a conference call available as a backup.
- Skype conference calls seem to work fine with Connect; Skype recorder available.
- Will use Elluminate; this is the system that will be used for final judging.
- Josh needs frequent reminders.

## 2. Sakai Boston Conference

- Need to make a realistic budget as the conference gets closer, and we know where the winners will be traveling from

### 2.1 Pre-Conference Workshop

- OSP will run a full day workshop.
  - A.M.: Intro.
  - P.M.: Technical stuff. Will let attendees come to our presentation.
- Send announcements again to get more people involved.
- Have people post outline and contact information online before the conference; update after the conference to reflect actual event.

### 2.2 Sessions

- Discussion of T&L conference proposal ideas and recruiting of faculty/students to present.

### 2.3 Feature Presentation of the Winners

- Paris: Had a 75, 90 minute slot. Worked fine.
- Ask speakers to limit their presentation to 30 minutes, leave time for Q&A.
- Need to be recorded.
- Ask our sponsors to help us with this. Has value for them.
- Keynote and featured speakers should also be recorded.

## 3. New Requirements Process

- Michael will release a concept document in the next weeks.
- We need a new process to share our requirements with developers.
- Kate: IU has a process. Here is a link to somewhat outdated information: <https://oncourse.iu.edu/portal/site/!\gateway/page/895a1a30-ac76-483c-8040-9ff3946d1c6c>
  - [Attachment](#) to this page of rough notes
  - Two committees that guide development
    - FRC: Staff from teaching centers, IT, prioritize suggestions for enhancements and makes recommendations to the OPC
    - OPC: Mostly faculty--decides what development work will go forward
  - Getting the new LMS at par with the old one was the first big task.
  - "Suggestions" / requests come from many places:
    - Summary by suggestions analysis team from input from web-based form
    - FRC members through their work with faculty and staff
    - Requests from departments & schools for substantial enhancements and new functionality

- List of known issues, not bugs but "unexpected behaviors".
  - Survey to users which generated list of top ten requests
  - analysis of previous suggestions
  - FRC does more work than prioritize and make recommendations.
  - Evaluates new tools, such as Mneme, Samigo, BlogWow
  - Interaction with FRC and developer team lead, functional analyst, and designer.
  - OPC reviews recommendations
  - Decide which tools need more design work.
  - Dev team makes time estimate for enhancement, sends it to OPC.
  - Strong leadership and committed resources are the is keys to success, IMHO. Also--flexible evolving process
  - User-driven, not dev-driven.
- Josh: How should we address long-term, strategic vs. short-term fixes?
  - Kate: This is much more the focus of UITS leadership. OPC is kept informed of stratigeic goals. David Goodrum could join us to discuss this.
  - Josh: Problem with smaller institutions pushing their requirements to institutions with developers (IU, Michigan, Cambridge, etc.).
  - Kate: Need to make tool development a multi-institutional endeavor
  - Robin: How would this new process fit with what's happening right now (Jira)?
  - Josh: Last effort has had limited results.
  - We have to start from what has been done last time. Refresh the list.
  - Robin: Top 5 list process has been done already too.