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 GOOD MORNING.

 >>'s back

The

Good morning. Welcome to the 8 AM session. This session is called Using Agile with Kuali OLE . I am Bruce Taggert. We are one of the founding partners it OLE. I am pleased to introduce our panel will talk about agile -- Agile. And OLE. [ Indiscernible -- low volume ]. At Indiana diversity. Bloomington. Tim McGarry is a library systems manager. And Christine Shannon. The Agile coach. And Mike Winkler, the director of information technology. Diversity of Pennsylvania. Robert. It is all yours.

Right. Thank you everyone for joining us so early this morning and thank you online for joining us. I know we are streaming it out and we are happy to have you. But the lights that make us look good for you online are pretty intense. [ Laughter ]. My name is Robert McDonnell . I be director for the library environment. I wanted to point out a couple of things do you.

I think it is better on the QR code which will take you directly to the slide and grab those as we are going along. Bass want to point out that is the only place to evaluate our session is online and it will take you straight to the page for that. When I ask you some questions, we are monitoring it up here so we can answer them as we move along.

Us want to point out that you can follow is on twitter and her new blog. -- and our new blog. [ Indiscernible -- low volume ]. To show the progression of our project.

A little bit about our talk today. The main function of today is really talk about the Agile development process that we modified and put in place and how our group works. I will talk about a little bit about quality OLE and a little bit about why we went with the Agile coach to set up this process to help us improve our overall software development. And then we will turn it over to Christine. I'm sorry, to Mike, to talk about the process. And Christine will talk a little bit more about the user story component of that.

And then we will talk about taking that user story into a functional specification using the Agile methodology . So, just a little bit about the Quality Foundation. How many have heard of that. Show of hands? Pretty good. The main reason that we joint the Quality Foundation is we were looking for the kind of foundational support that you would need for a long-term application, 10 year type of support. It was Enterprisewide support. For four it -- for higher Ed. By higher at. -- Ed.

Like a process for the founding process of each partner. And the governance board. We like the open-source component. And the educational community license that everyone uses at the foundation. We really like the fact that we can get the services we need from the 501(c)(3) entity that it provides and it is cost effective for us. Now this is what Quality is and what it is not. We will continue systems.

We wanted to see if Quality OLE would work for them. And they ask if they want to put in an RFP. We are not a vendor and we don't have a sales force. We don't solicit or compete for RFPs but we did talk to them when they are in the process and let them know what we are about. We do not have a sales force. We are creating great software to help them out if that is the way they are interested in going.

Just a little bit about the Quality Foundation current applications . Of course, the original one was the Agile system . The other one that is recently come on board is how we have taken the administration system and retooled it to make it work with the Quality framework. Quality student system which is now getting modules into place a key partner sites.

Of course, there is us, that Quality library environment. That Quality people management and apprised of ice is one of our newer applications. And Quality Mobility was launched this summer. And got lunch that IU. I like how that is going. The next thing is the library and how it is tied into that. And Quality Ready is one of our service applications.

We use it but that IU and with a highly trusted library. A few more goals about the Quality library open environment. We wanted to be community source. We wanted to build a framework that would replace the current labor management system and give us flexibility to be too next-generation type technologies. We wanted to re-examine operations. Especially as we are moving into the electronic model.

And part where from worthless that were based around those models. We could take a look at how libraries will offer the next generation content. And how we can integrate with different enterprise systems whether it is a learning management system for the information resource. Or whether it is a student system that provides context. And how we can direct them to better information.

A little bit about our founding partners. To give you an idea of who is there. Bruce is that Lehigh. The University of Maryland. Duke University. University of Florida. University of Pennsylvania. University of Chicago. We also got to seed funding from ever see Michigan but they were not interested in the model -- they were interested in the model we were to support so they provided the money to help us get going. And this would not of impossible without getting the matching funding.

That help us enable the process that we wanted to so we could hire a software development firm to do a lot of the development we needed to do in the first two years to put our core software pack which -- package together. This is our organization works. We have a OLE board. Our partner manager based out of IU, Scott, and his technical team. We were tricky for him. And we have a functional and technical Council. A functional Council, that is what drives this process.

The specifications we need. To be developed in the software. The technical software represent all of the technical areas from the library and make sure it is going to work. And see how it will enter in Robert -- how it will interoperate. And we have tons of subject matter experts to help us with this presentation writing. And those can direct within the library. In fact, this give you a closer view of the core team and our project manager. We've had some great consulting help from felt -- from folks who have built out Quality finance .

You will see over here HTC global services won the contract to develop our core software. And we have onshore and offshore resources. These direct feedback to the project manager. When you take a look at this, this is, as a few months ago, all of the people of all, when you get down to the first ball -- first level, those are subject matter experts from the library schools and driving the specifications. For the product. I wanted to point out, how can I find a more? That I sent someone to find out more about quality application stack?

Our user conference is coming up November 14 two the 16th in an apple is -- in an apple us -- in Annapolis. And we will have a lot of good information about our software product and friends who are invented products with archive space which will be open source. And they will talk about some other stuff. And the rest of the Quality staff will be there. And we will have conferences. With that, I will turn it over to Mike to talk more about our actual process. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Robert and good morning to everyone here and online as well. Thank you for coming out. Just a little but about what are goals worth as we get started with our project -- were as we got started with our project. Using the Agile methodology for develop . -- for develop at. -- or development -- for development. Rather than waiting for months to seize over, we want a quick feedback on the specifications we were getting to be able to see things in code.

We really like the idea of collaboration between stakeholders, people who have a lot at stake in this project of being able to understand how the software is going to work. This is being driven by Quality is based around workflows. We understood right away that the workflows will be changing. We needed to have this optional people. -- functional people. Those who are really in the libraries and purchasing the materials and describing them in circulating them.

And loaning them out. And really understand what is going to happen as we began implementing Quality OLE. Getting them involved early was important but they also taught us lots of things that need to be give -- need to got -- need to be done that were difficult to figure out. First doing circulation and we will come to the desk in the present the book. And then they walk away. That is relatively easy to specify. When you talk to your circulation people and libraries, it they will take there is lots of education to be done with.

We need to get that collaboration done between stakeholders and developers. We like that idea a lot as been has -- as been expressed -- as has been expressed in Agile methodologies. We have been able to validate whether the specifications make sense or not. So we wanted to be able to get code back quickly. And tested against our assumptions of how the entire system was going to work.

And, finally, focus on the functional software itself other than technology. We wanted to focus on the workflows. And that methodology lends itself to it. But we had significant hurdles to that. As Robert pointed out in our slide, we have eight primary partners who were involved in this. And spread across the eastern US. And into the Midwest. We were fortunate in that all of the partners except for Chicago were in one time zone. Which makes scheduling a little easier. The core team and the functional Council and the Board, the technical Council and the developers and that being spread literally across the world.

Even into India. We had some real challenges with the geographic division. Being able to get together only occasionally and understand how to get together virtually is one of the issues that we had worked there. Because of that, we had proxy stakeholders. It was difficult to have a stakeholders be right with the developers. It is hard to imagine how the functional Council could be meeting briefly with the developers. So the core team ended up being a proxy for us.

We talk a lot to them so they can understand the processes that we were talking about and we work with them to discuss the functional capabilities. They are working with the offshore developers in a much more Agile integration. [ Indiscernible -- low volume ] We also have many stakeholders .

Having many partners is challenging. The processes that we are worried about, they're very similar. There are always differences and effect of like to joke that if you look up exception in which Apia, there is a pickup -- picture the University of Chicago in their. -- in there. They always seem to have the ones use case that is damage. To everyone else. And then we had architectural uncertainties. As we were building the system, we can want to building systems we have been building for years.

We wanted to look into some unique and somewhat exotic technologies are library automation systems. Including things like this course and management systems. There were some learning curves and that. And using the quality system that is embedded within Quality OLE . Because the challenge was the full financial system.

And then learning Quality as well . To handle workflow. So, too many get those hurdles and challenges that we have, we played around with organization several times now. Things that have become consistent about this is that we have weekly Web conferences and we've been good with technology. And have become comfortable working with each other remotely and virtually.

The functional Council meets once a week on Thursday. The technical Council on Wednesdays. And we vet agendas and get our work done. We will be talking a little bit more about some innovations that we have done is we've gotten closer to our first of that release. That are really aimed at a mutable -- increasing the velocity. The core team as I said before does daily meetings with themselves and the primary stakeholders. So they meet every morning for about 15 minutes. And they review where they are.

And what burdens they are having in the development of the code for the specifications. Later in the day, they have a David -- daily meeting with the offshore developers. The people who have in fact changed their schedules so at the beginning of the day, they can come in and meet with our core team. Finally, product owner visits.

Once every 6 to 8 weeks, the product owner which is represented by the chair the social Council, which is myself right now, and Tim McGarry is coming on as a cochair, we will go out of Bloomington to visit the core team and work through architecture scope questions. Any problems we have. With the organization of the project. Priorities that might be shifting. Those sort of things. It has been very hopeful to have those face-to-face meetings. I really wanted to finish up my point -- my talk here talking about imports of face time and adapting Agile and what we are trying to do.

We have found that it is really critical to get together. As much as you can do virtually, the intent close time that you have face-to-face really make the difference. For managing how the direction of the project or the trajectory is developing. And dealing with problems that come up along the way. It is also important for this group bonding idea. You have to come together as a group and forms of trust. And really be able to rely on each other. And know that people are not working at cross purposes. With their agendas. They are open and no to all of us. Very important for the group to come together. And get a sense of that.

There's nothing like putting people in a room. But he intends. For 10 hours. They going out for drinks and dinner afterward. It is also really good for the special activities that are best done in person. It is difficult to emphasize enough how being able to do a little bit of horse trading what we are trying to develop our pool of subject matter experts or SMEs as we call them in developing our Tiger teams which are rapid response teams that are aimed at helping us maintain our velocity for greeting actual specifications and testing and excepting the software. And for the backlog.

Going to the user stories. Which I will ask Christine to speak about. >> Hello, thank you again for joining us. I am Christine Shannon. How many of you have experience with Agile ? Okay, great. How many are familiar with User Stories? Okay. I'm going to talk about the process of how the Quality OLE team got ready for development and created the backlog and everything came together and how we do that first grooming. They had a great team, a lot of people, the organizational chart that Robert should that had -- showed that had all of these people at different universities.

Some of the partners are presented a group of institutions. There were a lot of people that had a lot of experience. And they were coached really well in creating User Stories. 1244 user stories. They had a big spreadsheet last summer of user stories. And set okay, word we start am a which we do with this?

Some of the challenges, when they came to me and said they knew to figure this out, some of them are really granular some of them were brought concepts. A lot of duplicates, each submitted the user stories themselves. They had folks who do the same jobs at different universities. Saying we need to do this. There was different wording. They said the same thing that had different words. And they knew they were duplicates out there. And they can get their arms around it.

And then having a grouping. Everything was using -- the given at a user story level. Combining into a greater business process. This group or that group. They didn't start with the tip of the iceberg. They had the mass of pieces of chunks of ice everywhere. They had no priority among the whole 1200 less. And really no idea of the complexity of each of them.

And all to really, they didn't know where to start with that. So we look at that and decided -- looked at that and decided thinking of the iceberg, how do we figure out and where do we start? When you look at Agile, you want to be talking about the most near-term stuff. You know you will know more when you get to three months or six months down the road. You will know more than you know today. You want to spend a whole lot of time talking to what you will be six months from now. Because your were to know more than. As you are looking at the backlog, you want your type focus on your closest things that you were working on.

That is the idea of prioritizing. So we decided, we put these goals together. We had a user story committee and a chair for that committee. Kristin at North Carolina State University. We got together and said, what goals do we need to do? And Robert and Mike set us up with this. We wanted to organize the backlog and the spreadsheet of user stories.

Finding duplicates. Funny anything that is the same. Finding similarities. We also determined that they have done a lot of business process mapping. They had spent a lot of time with those SMEs doing the process as a process mapping. They had business processes. They were able to take those, that knowledge that they had and match it up to user stories very easy.

So they were able to do a lot of that. It gave us the high-level grouping. Then we wanted to prioritize and order that backlog. We wanted to know where to start. We wanted to create a roadmap of what would really be that iceberg. What is it they are going to be -- what is achievable? What is the order that is what to make the most sense as they gain knowledge through product of element -- product development?

A few things that we have learned right away is we wanted face-to-face time. And Mike talk about that, too. There is so much about. So much to should we did. Where is it at all possible to get face-to-face? I will talk about where we recap allies the time last fall to do this to make our ways through the user stories.

Really having a face-to-face time is key. We use index cards and we got out the spreadsheet. We have the spreadsheet that you can't get our arms around it. Let's go back to the user story basics. Let's get index cards. At the user stories. And we printed out 1200 -- 1244 user stories on index cards. And for prioritization, we used this method to do must have, should have, could have and would like to have. We learned right away, in the capture of user stories, some of these are stories were things that were maybe not something that would be released.

Or maybe something that would never get done. What they were doing in their current business process but now with the vision of OLE was meant to be. But we knew they were going to be some of those out there, too. We used distribution docs for prioritization. This was a comment. It worked really well. As a good Agile taking . And it worked really well -- technique. And it worked really well because everyone could have an equal voice. It wasn't -- it was a way to get everyone to be independent unique voice.

This is where you have -- every one has a you cool -- equals that of dots. And you put the dots on the card and you say this is where it is most support and to me. So you have 20 cards you are voting on. Each person gets maybe 10 kn. -- dots. We learned it was about half as many of dots per cart based on the vote. And everyone would dot up the most important user stories. And we use the number of dots to order that.

So we ended up it is surely an incrementally going through these workshops. And we said, here is an XM we can meet in here is what we need to do. We learn from each one. We started in October. And it is small workshop at NC State and Kristin was able to host it. And the user story committee did the business process mapping to the user stories. That at least gave us categories and user stories so the 1200 got broken into 547 groups. Business processes.

We had volunteer experts. This is where folks on the user committee, they were not part of the functional committee -- council. There were little more the day-to-day business little. And they knew what needed to be done. They came in and they were awesome. And this 1200 cart. We lay them out on the table. Similar to the size, the table was. We were able to put them up on boards where we could. Then we went through card by card. And the team, working with this. And this was similar. Every card had a number. And they sorted them. Is that these are not needed. Get rid of these.

And ordered and sorted everything. And we did a daily scrub because everyone had budget constraints and timing challenges. Because it was a quick turnaround to make the trip. So the folks who could not make it, we did every half day. Every four hours. What are we going to do? What have we done? What is in our way?

Folks could call it to get an update on what it was going on at in the state -- NC State. That worked pretty well to keep everyone in the loop and involved as we started through this process. We ended up with 77% reduction in the prior backlog. We got rid of 23% of user stories. And got down to a set that was a lot more manageable. We were not done. We didn't finish everything. And we still needed to prioritize and we need more information about the backlog.

So we turned around and went to Kuali. Someone on Chris's team updated the spreadsheet. And we all headed to the other coast, San Diego, for the quality data. We took those stories and Lights on the functional councilmembers being together and used that time to go through and make bigger, make more decisions, make deeper decisions of what was important. To get a lot of must have, should have work there.

The federal council level, the director level groups came together and were able to make those decisions. At the end of that workshop, we were down to 270 one user stories. -- 271 user stories. And we have started prioritizing. We start working for the priorities and doing the dots. The NCU workshop, we had a small group of folks. Was easy to get the social Council group which was larger. The lessons learned in that was try to keep everyone involved and everyone engaged in the activities was a little bit more challenging.

And we also didn't give everyone a lot of heads-up on what you would be doing for a day and a half. There are some challenges with that. Or learn from that. And we went to DC and decided, we did the same thing but we give everyone a heads up about what we were going to do. There is a conference that most of the folks were going to in DC from the functional Council. So we piggybacked on that conference and take this Sunday. And headed to DC.

I have to give kudos to Robert on the most amazing meeting. So, anywhere in this country, I believe Robert can find you a room. [ Laughter ]. Or a restaurant. Or anything you need. The man is amazing. We had this awesome room in DC. Whiteboards, Windows, rolling tables and everything. We went in on a Sunday and had anyone who is able to make it could come. And we did the final work. We did more dots. And by that time, everything was starting to percolate.

It is starting to make sense. What is the product roadmap and what he so be done? From all the conversation and that this time, we were able to then say, here is how it needs to happen. We know there is a dependency of finance. We know all of these different things. But this is what would make sense. This is important. And we were able to say, now we are ready for that next that. -- step. And we are ready to dive deep into the certain area. And start doing optional specs so we are ready for the developers. And that is where Tim is going to tell you more about that area.

 Thanks, Christine. Once we had user stories in place, we try or type them in the me action need to write optional specification so the programmers could get to work. Unlike this humorous comic strip, it does take a lot of documentation and planning. But there is still room for complaining about what we are doing. That is never going to be the case. We built the early specification teams around the functional councilmembers that have been focused on the prioritization of user stories.

Not only do they have the knowledge of priorities but they also had the functional readership to focus on the areas that they are focusing on in the internal libraries. So, we asked one or two functional councilmembers to lead a group of subject matter experts in the library, people who were doing day-to-day work. To come together and think outside of the box will do it. Talk about what you were supposed we doing in your libraries, what you are curtly doing, what you wish you could do. As well as what you think is going to happen in the future.

And kinda planing out 3 to 5 years. We may be doing this for the next six months. What we are expecting a change. And we need to do the workflow. But, as expected, subject matter experts are necessary the right people with the right documents for developers. They are doing than the gritty day-to-day. But it is typical, what you want us to accomplish. Tell us what the software will do. I need to know what you want. Bush so I can -- a compost so we -- accomplish so we can develop is over. -- so we can develop the software.

They are necessary wanted to communicate that to the developers. On my team, what I focus on tried to do, try to allow the subject matter experts to tell their story. Do a narrative of what you do that would meet this user story that we are working on. A very specific user stories that have a noun and a person and inaction. What these narratives, I would build a pseudocode outline like this or a bullet outline.

So I can go back and ask them if it represents step-by-step what you just told me? And we could go through the process to be sure it is right. With allies, we would build -- outline, we would build this. To see if it would discuss and cover what we discovered in the narrative. And they could get to the developer and wrap their mind around it is a they have this decision point an action point and what to consider.

I have data storage elements. And, so, the subject matter expert could look at this diagram say okay, I am that actor right there. I do that step. Make that decision. I click on save and edit and it has to be approved by someone else. And that I click send. We were able to retell the process fairly well so that we can get these documents.

Unfortunately, we still had [ Indiscernible -- low volume ] . As was described you see, where the functional Council working on user stories and regrouping and prioritizing them. We had developers waiting for documents to write code with. And we accord team that we hired full-time to begin or media or he for the functional -- intermediary for the functional Council. Unfortunately, as you can see from this document, the core team and anything that go to a middleman for everyone. It in developers and spec teams in developers and the functional Council.

And, so, we were under resourced for this task. While they have the skill set to work through this process, we were just hitting them with too many things at one time. So we decided that because we had to focus on scope and focus on the roadmap and prioritization, we needed to organize our human teams. Resource teams. To work around scope little bit more easily.

We get a recalibration of our scope. And we focus on how we could make it were agile. More individual. For the user story. And how we can break it down. The core team wasn't the only team that was responsible for delivering documents to the programmers. The SMEs were not the answer to that. We added a few elements to our structure. First, as the functional Council, we decided we needed to add a vice chair for the functional Council. Essentially, relieving Mike of being the sole but his owner in the Agile model .

And giving him a backup. And another voice. Is what those responsibilities. We were trying to remove as much bottleneck as much as possible. And then we created a scope integrity -- tiger team. For individuals. Myself and Mike into other functional councilmembers. Who could work in the roadmap. And make the decisions about scope that we need to make an atypical manner.

We could present a decision back to the function Council for confirmation. If there is dispute or discussion or disagreement, we could go back as the Tiger team and make a quicker decision. And iron out some of the wrinkles. And we created a template about what the Tiger team will look like for all of the subject areas. That to be the intermediary for the core team. And make the decisions on the spot. A short turnaround. That the core team really kept going back to the subject matter experts. You want the sword you want that? Is workflow A better for you? Does that maybe 80% rule? Or does workflow B work better because you will note to changes in the future. We wanted to make those decisions for you fully.

-- more easily. We had a functional councilmembers give you the prioritization. And speaking to that, authoritatively, based on the discussions we had between special counsel in the scope team. We had a technical Council member who did technical research on the way. Deciding how we could integrate on our campuses. What technologies we should be using. And they could be answering that from a technology perspective.

Does this back meet the goal for the -- spec the different a technology perspective. And we added an analyst role. Sometimes it was someone on staff or at a partner institution that was essentially volunteered to be in that possession -- position. We have four analysts right now. And we have assigned them time to the OLE project .

And they contribute to that on the [ Indiscernible -- low volume ] equivalent . The resulting were for became more cyclical and repetitive. And became iterative. We got go through the process and we do with the decision had to be made and when the decision came up. So we had the functional Council of leadership which is Mike and I. Working with the core team to create a high-level roadmap. And made these decisions. Based on what the developers were telling us and their timeline. And the roadblocks they were seeing or had in front of the. As follows what do we expect to deliver and specifications over the next iteration.

The scope Tiger team refined and developed and said that to the Council for approval. The functional Council then, based on that roadmap commission that Tiger teams on an ad needed basis to do the work in the smaller functional areas. That Tiger team worked with the SMEs and they helped the SMEs tell their story, design their story, and the workflow. And work with the core team to build those specs so they could deliver. The court to was always in the process fairly daily.

But they didn't have all of the response ability -- responsibility of making the specifications. Was a back-and-forth process. The core team could develop that. And they could basically work with the developers. They could go back to the SMEs four specification discussion is needed. But they didn't have that hurdle all the time to know how to represent that technically.

Finally, the core team would come back to leadership. They would discuss what is happening with the active specs. And talk about what is in development. What is coming down the pike. And make decisions on what was needed for priorities if we had to make new prioritization so. Out of that office, we were able to create a quarterly develop and cycle. So Agile works best in 2 to 6 week in Kermit. We started out a recorder to make sure we had a release every quarter. Based on the events. So this is a map of what each team is doing in the quarterly cycle. We have the scope team that is constantly looking at the scope. And refining the Matt. Anything based on her blocks. And dependency that we may need looking in the future for how we plan for specs in the future. The Tiger teams are working on it as needed. But there is only room for one Tiger team, there will be three or four or five or six Tiger teams working simultaneously. Some will drop off because their priorities don't come back until nether quarter. There are constantly Tiger teams working.

We of this puzzle -- specification functional teams. Wonderful volunteers who have the rich knowledge of what the leverage is day-to-day. What they need to do. What is missing. And they are working on their early part of the quarter.

Starting at the team. Started been asked -- narratives. Discussing their stories. Throwing out exceptions that they see that are not handled. And then they come back after a break. After testing and acceptance. What the developers have been coding based on the stories. And the core team is working behind the scenes all the time, helping to start up these teams, doing technical review, preparation for coding and also helping the spec teams do the testing. And working through that.

And ultimately doing the integration coding for the system module. As you can see here, what the developers are doing, waiting for the reviews of the technical documents. Doing the coding on their own Agile cycle. And doing integration . As of November, we will be releasing 0.3 which is our first public release of Quality OLE . It will be focused on the futures of select and acquire. We are going to show how we can leverage the core modules of the quality financial system.

To do our library business workflow. Doing requisitions. Orderings. Invoicing. Essentially preparing for us to do the data for, a bidirectional data flow. So we don't have to have a full financial system. We can leverage what we are already using on the enterprise.

We are using Quality as a middleware and workflow engine for all of the back end processing. For the supply chain and omission. -- animated. [ Indiscernible -- low volume ]. That is another Quality project that is supporting our efforts. We are also going to be doing proof of concept of our describe module. Which will be used in the Apache jackrabbit repository. This allows us to do the formats for discussion records which lever systems haven't been able to do very easily.

We create these retrieval for the document. And relate them to different format where they are, -- common with common data elements. We will show an initial scale of 10 million records. [ Indiscernible -- low volume ]. And so, we will show what that will look like. [ Indiscernible -- low volume ] . And give the proof of concept for that area. Finally, we will be will to show some searching and retrieval functions. Of the metadata that we have as follows transaction to the metadata on the financial side. That concludes our presentation right now. We would like to take some questions.

Because we have an online audience, if you have questions, please come to the microphone to the folks online can hear what you are asking, as well. Thank you.

So, there was a question from someone online. Or they were tweeting it. They were wonder if the presenters are using conditional project management development terms in order to better convey the topics into the groups that they were working with. And then there was a follow on to that, it was kind of a comment. Is that it felt like the functional Council members serve as product owners pulling in the required SME's and that is how we viewed it.

Sure. I think the functional Council ended up being the proxy product owners. With the chair were presenting kinda the more persistent [ Indiscernible -- low volume ] with the core team . So when Tim talks about relieving some of these responsibility, it became pretty intense because according have lots of questions. As the Agile proxies with the developers and product owner . So the demands on my time became a little too great. At one point, we had scheduled every Friday all day long to be with them.

That Justin work with my day job. So bringing Tim on has been really helpful that way. The innovation of the Tiger teams also allow us to spread out that product owner response abilities to whether members of the functional Council. And as a council, we come together and discuss what is happening within the Tiger teams and really aligned our priorities and projects are not going off into different directions.

I think also, the relationship that the functional Council has with the Tiger teams is helpful. There is a trust relationship there of the functional Council members who are leading the Tiger teams knowing with the ultimate goal is. Essentially bringing back any sort of questions or possible disagreements of the partners may have about what functionality needs to be prioritized.

That way it actually limits the decisions of the higher Council has to make because they have already laid the groundwork for that. Any other questions?

There is another tweeted question. Is there once in the audience, the -- though? I will ask you this one. Can you talk a little more about next steps and the timeline over the next year or project and partners? The thing to talk about their if we did have a session yesterday that talked a lot about that. [ Laughter ] But I'm sure Mike to talk about that for just a second .

Sure. We are heading to Quality days next month where we will do

 the 0.3 release. But also the release of the roadmap and that will be a public document. It allows you to drill in from the high level of sort of understanding -- if we could go back one -- sort of the high level of these kinds of the points -- bullet points into intermediate levels that describe what we mean by these kinds of things. And why these are important to this release.

All the way down into the stories themselves. That we're using to organizer product and work with developers directly. You would be able to see how the user stories are lining up with pieces of functionality that are being developed. And how those lineup with the high-level deliverables that we are looking for in each release.

Going forward, we hope to have this release in November and then we will have a release next March. And then we will have our 1.0 release in June or July of 2012. Going further beyond that, the partnership will continue to work on the software and develop it and hopefully stick to those quarterly releases.

That one question in the audience. That is probably all we have time for.

Okay. I was just wondering with the decisions of Agile, or any of your developers already skilled in using that methodology? Or was a pretty new to most of them? And to define with such a large team that you had to create a hybrid approach? Because you're still wanted to project the larger timelines for executives and folks who see?

Yes, the global services that was awarded the contract for development did have experience with Agile. I was a natural progression for them to be able to do their work in development cycles. I would say that it is safe to say from the functional Council that we do not have much experience. I happen to use it at Lehigh. But it is not to say that most of the partners, most of the partners do not use Agile on the campuses. It was fairly new to them . We wanted a hybrid approach indeed. Emacs especially in the beginning as we were trying to go through the user stories and duplicate them to organize them. Now that we are moving forward, we have that settled, we are able to focus on that.

I would say, just as a follow on to that, we bent Agile but I don't think we broke it . Agile . The challenges that we faced, communication and distance and the functional Council, I would say this is made up of business people. And sticking to a weekly Council meeting. And all of the work that has to happen in the consultations. It is quite challenging for everyone. So we needed to find ways to deal with that.

Today people who have very busy schedules and help them help the project move forward. I think that Tiger teams were a great intervention -- innovation for us. In terms of things that we've learned, going into this, one of them is you need to constantly be looking for where those bottlenecks are. And leave your ego at the door, really, and be prepared to say, this is about me. And what I know and what I need out of this project. But what is good for the project. And be ready to change out in the Agile way and redeployed resources.

And really focus on philosophy. That is important thing. To get the specifications into the coders hands of they can develop code. So you can get the code back and understand whether your product is the report or not.

All right, thanks so much everyone. Have a great Educause.

[ Applause ]. >> [ Event concluded ]