

**Date:** Sat, 08 Oct 2005 05:58:44 -0400 (EDT)  
**From:** John Norman <john@caret.cam.ac.uk>  
**Subject:** RE: One more thought on simplicity (only two levels of tools)  
**In-reply-to:** <29289888.1128706228897.JavaMail.tomcat5@sharkfin.ds.itd.umich.edu>  
**To:** sepp-req <sepp-req@collab.sakaiproject.org>

I saw the flurry of emails following this post, but I'd like to reply from this point in the thread:

I agree with much of Mara's post, but am reminded of the joke with a punch line of "If I were you, I wouldn't start from here" :). I am conscious that the current feature set has been determined by the core schools to the exclusion of other schools. We at Cambridge, for example, would have set a higher priority on ad-hoc groups rather than sections, but we were not involved in the decision. So, here we are at the Enterprise Bundle debate as feared. I find it interesting that we are drifting also towards the Apache Incubator model too.

I would argue for a progressive transition:

1. We should discuss where we would like to end up.

Here I favour framework and a modest set of functionality/tools as 'Sakai Core' or 'Enterprise Bundle' (but where the constituents of that Bundle are discussed and agreed with the wider community) together with an easy 'pick and choose' deployment tool for adding 'full' tools at installation/upgrade and an incubator process for becoming one of those 'full' tools.

BUT

2. Pending agreement on where we want to end up and how we get there:

We should have some pragmatic expansion of the current processes to allow for greater inclusion and more flexible options to be brought into the Sakai product as new users and others reviewing the product will analyse it (think of the EduTools matrix).

I see Chuck's criteria as addressing (2) and Mara's comments as addressing (1)

If we can agree that Chuck's criteria are part of a transition to a model as envisioned by Mara, then we may have squared the circle :)

John

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Mara Hancock [mailto:marah@media.berkeley.edu]  
> Sent: 07 October 2005 18:30  
> To: sepp-req  
> Subject: One more thought on simplicity (only two levels of tools)  
>  
> Sorry to beat a dead horse (if you all tell me I am on the wrong  
> track, I'll concede but Tom's question about the balance between  
> quality and priority got me thinking).  
>  
> I have to say that I keep coming back to the simplicity issue and

> having "at least three phases of tool migration" into the enterprise  
> still seems like overkill in terms of management and oversight. In  
> reality there will be hundreds of phases (as the products and  
> projects evolve), but what kind of centralized commitment can the  
> community trully make? I would like to foster a bit more of a  
> decentralized notion here (I can't believe I just said that!)

>

> Imagine:

>

> One stop shopping at a web interface that allows you to download the  
> latest enterprise bundle -- defined at a high level as: The Sakai CLE  
> release that includes the most current framework and a solid base  
> toolset that has been through a common QA, usability review, and product  
> release process.

>

> AND

>

> Search on optional Sakai tools by keyword, category, project status  
> (red/yellow/green), etc... With the highest ranked and most used  
> tools highlighted at the top page automatically. These modules areas  
> will indicate the status, and have a link to the last stable release  
> (highlighted in some way) as well as the latest patches, etc... It  
> will also have documentation, demo, description, etc... (Remember,  
> our use of the term tools is loose. In some cases we mean a simple  
> view switcher, on other cases we mean an entire testing and survey  
> application.)

>

> Then, at each requirements review phase the requirements group can  
> run a report to highlight the top tools that are either Yellow or  
> Green, AND highly used (an indication of priority) and ask the tool  
> owners whether they would like to have it included in the bundle. If  
> yes, it will be seen as a potential "quick win" and in the  
> requirements voting there is a section where the community can  
> basically ratify the inclusion of these tools. The only reason not to  
> include them might be if the community experience with them doesn't  
> match the project status as indicated. There may be some enterprise  
> releases where there are no new tools coming in via this method.

>

> The way we were heading with the provisional idea today makes me feel  
> like essentially what we are saying is that enterprise quality is  
> unachievable (if so, we should revisit what enterprise quality is)  
> and so therefore, we are going to find a way to have non-enterprise  
> tool become part of the release without calling it that. This  
> approach seems to dilute our definition and expectations of the  
> bundle. Now, don't get me wrong -- I want options and I want as many  
> tools at as high a quality as possible. In some cases I may not care  
> about the tool meeting all the enterprise requirements, but I want it  
> to be very clear what I am choosing and why and I want the enterprise  
> to be solidly QA'd. No easter eggs.

>

> I didn't really want the presentation tool in our Fall release, but I  
> was not explicit enough and it ended up in there (I forgot it was  
> there!). Imagine if I had to review all 20/30/100 optional tools with  
> every release. With the above approach I can review the tools when my  
> team has time and when my campus community lets me know they have a  
> need.

>

> Mara  
>  
> =====  
> Mara Hancock  
> ETS Associate Director of Learning Systems  
>  
> <http://ets.berkeley.edu>  
> University of California, Berkeley  
> Educational Technology Services  
> 117 Dwinelle Hall, #2535  
> Berkeley, CA 94720  
>  
> Desk: 510-643-2214  
> Mobile: 510-407-0543  
>  
> [see attachment: "message0.html", size: 5563 bytes]  
>  
>  
> Attachments:  
>  
> message0.html  
> <http://collab.sakaiproject.org/access/content/attachment/c9dca4ed-04ce-4376-805c-dd16363c8ca8/message0.html>  
>  
> -----  
> This automatic notification message was sent by Sakai  
> (<http://collab.sakaiproject.org>) from the SEPP Requirements site.  
> You can modify how you receive notifications at MyWorkspace > Preferences.

-----  
This automatic notification message was sent by Sakai  
(<http://collab.sakaiproject.org>) from the SEPP Requirements site.  
You can modify how you receive notifications at MyWorkspace > Preferences.

---

X-Account-Key: account2  
X-UIDL: 27953-1116672769  
X-Mozilla-Status: 0011  
X-Mozilla-Status2: 00000000  
Received: from mahimahi.ds.itd.umich.edu ([141.211.253.162])  
by vms053.mailsrvcs.net  
(Sun Java System Messaging Server 6.2-2.05 (built Apr 28 2005))  
with ESMTTP id <0IO100I8WD1WYJK0@vms053.mailsrvcs.net> for jxf@immagic.com;  
Sat, 08 Oct 2005 04:58:44 -0500 (CDT)  
Received: from mahimahi.ds.itd.umich.edu  
(mahimahi.ds.itd.umich.edu [127.0.0.1]) by mahimahi.ds.itd.umich.edu (Postfix)  
with ESMTTP id 18BCD14061 for <jxf@immagic.com>; Sat,  
08 Oct 2005 05:58:44 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from mahimahi.ds.itd.umich.edu ([127.0.0.1])  
by mahimahi.ds.itd.umich.edu (JAMES SMTP Server 2.1.3)  
with SMTP ID 473 for <sepp-req@collab.sakaiproject.org>; Sat,  
08 Oct 2005 05:58:33 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from caret.cam.ac.uk (ns-map.ds.itd.umich.edu [141.211.253.192])  
by mahimahi.ds.itd.umich.edu (Postfix) with ESMTTP id B30E314039 for  
<sepp-req@collab.sakaiproject.org>; Sat, 08 Oct 2005 05:58:32 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from [192.168.101.10] (helo=linarite) by caret.cam.ac.uk with esmtp  
(Exim 4.54) id 1EOBTG-0000c2-TJ for sepp-req@collab.sakaiproject.org;  
Sat,  
08 Oct 2005 10:58:32 +0100

Message-id: <23319010.1128765524099.JavaMail.tomcat5@mahimahi.ds.itd.umich.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2900.2180  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Office Outlook 11  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Thread-index: AcXLZNMstCKKneUTTtwqQACpRzVFk2AAiN/YA  
X-Content-Type-Outer-Envelope: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
X-CARET-Spam-Score: -1.4 (-)  
X-CARET-Scan-Signature: 0470830c83a6596391839684af271bac  
X-Content-Type-Message-Body: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"