

April 2005 Virtual, Planning

RTC BoF

Summary of Thursday, April 7, 2005

Note: A prior discussion has been going on concerning the transformation of this group from a Birds of a Feather Session at the Member Meetings to a Special Interest Group. This will be the third time that this group will meet at a Member Meeting and it has been having regular monthly meetings via the I2 Commons. The SIG status would reflect the continuing interest in and activities of the group.

A SIG would give us a formal presence on the I2 web site, mailing lists, etc.

and participation/oversight by I2 staff. Jon Tyman has been sitting in, contributing to the discussion, and facilitating our use of the Commons for our monthly meetings. One of the executive directors would oversee the SIG.

Finally, a name change would be necessary to avoid conflict with the Real Time Communications Advisory Group. This has led to the discussion of an appropriate new name and re-articulation of the group's mission. Meanwhile, I will be pursuing this status change with Jon. -gsk

Participants: Jon Tyman (I2), Ted Hanss (U. Mich), Jennifer Macdougall (MAGPI), Les Finken (U. Iowa), Gurcharan Khanna (Dartmouth College)

What's in a name?

*name should reflect core mission and philosophy and distinguish itself from other I2 groups

*advanced research technology still an important focus *user focus also very important *user focus might lead to research the literature, case studies, database on collaborations, analysis of barriers and catalysts *focus on collaboration projects not only sharing "war stories" but also calls for joint projects and examples of successful use of research technologies

some name suggestions that have been made (to the best of my recall):

ACT Advanced Collaboration Technologies

FCC Fostering Collaboration and Communication AACT Applications of Advanced Collaboration Technologies CuART or CART or CAT Collaboration using Advanced (Research) Technologies

monthly meetings: craig's presentation in march and the Eluminate demo in february were the most popular.

*what does that tell us? that people want case studies, analysis, as well as a technology focus?

*should we try harder to have regular presenters? a lot of work to make it successful

possible overlaps with other I2 groups need to be monitored *such as with the Teaching & Learning Working Group, ResearchChannel WG, maybe others

many I2 groups have a collaboration, advanced technology, and user issues component by the very nature of the I2 focus

Agenda for the May Member Meeting in D.C.:

*settle on a name

*case studies, analyses, presentations, demos: who has something appropriate?

*discuss future goals/activities (monthly meetings, joint projects, demos) *other?