



---

## CONTENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM EVALUATION TEAM

### Minutes

Minutes 01/2005 of the meeting of the Content Management System Evaluation Team held on Tuesday 22 March 2005, in Seminar Room 2, Library, commencing at 4pm.

---

#### 1. Attendees

Helen Mandl, Sharon Hughes, Sandra Wills, Ric Caladine, Christine Brown, Joe McIver, Michael Organ.

#### Apologies

No apologies.

---

#### 2. PROJECT OUTLINE

Helen provided an outline of the project, its background and projected outcomes.

#### 3. TERMS OF REFERENCE

There were a range of comments on the draft terms of reference. It was noted that much depended on the outcomes of the first point on assessing current needs and that the Terms of Reference may need to be reworked following that part of the project. The name of the group was also discussed as the term "content management system" can mean a range of different things to different people. Other suggestions included: electronic archive, institutional repository, and digital repository. Name to be discussed further.

**Action:** Helen to rework Terms of Reference and circulate before next meeting.

#### 4. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

In general it was felt that a small committee was required to keep the project moving. Nathan Asher in ARD had been contacted and asked to be kept informed.

#### 5. ACADEMIC INVOLVEMENT

Noted that involvement from a range of key stakeholders would be crucial to the outcomes of the project. Stakeholders could include academic staff but also those from all university units.

Stakeholders would be involved in the needs analysis part but also required in the evaluation of systems.

In order to increase general knowledge of this area, one suggestion was to have a group of 3 or 4 people attached to each committee member who could substitute for them and attend meetings where appropriate.

Another suggestion was to invite associated stakeholders such as those exploring the Graduate Attributes Portfolio to provide a brief presentation as part of team meetings.

## 6. ACTION PLAN and TIMELINE

A draft timeline was proposed and it was noted that there was a lot to deal with in this time. Prolonging the project and timeline to find the right system would need to be balanced with the desire to implement a solution. This issue noted as one to discuss with the eTeaching Steering Committee.

The first action would be to undertake the needs assessment. This would involve speaking with a range of university individuals or via forums. A series of questions would help gain an understanding of the type of digital objects already in existence.

Agreed that the team should continue with fortnightly meetings with after 3.30 on Tuesdays being a suitable time.

**Action:** Helen to organize next meeting.

**Action:** Helen to circulate possible questions for prompts as part of the needs analysis.

Meeting concluded at 5.00pm

HM 310305