End-to-End Event Management (E2EEM)
Meeting Minutes

October 30, 2011

Attendees:
Lisa Baumann, Metropolitan
Lynn Hazlewood, Open Water Committee Chair
Richard Hess, Colorado
Anna Lea Matysek, National Office
Jim Matysek, National Office, IT
Steve Peterson, Pacific Northwest
Jeanne Seidler, Wisconsin
Luke Shaheen, National Office, IT
Ed Tsuzuki (Chair), New Jersey
Mary Beth Windrath, Adirondack

The need to preserve a hard copy (with signatures) of the application form as well as the sanction form was reviewed with both Sean Fitzgerald (Legislation Committee chair) and Patty Miller (Legal Counsel). It was confirmed that as long as the new on-line process captures what was submitted, what was approved, by whom and when, that the forms could be eliminated. This information would have to be retrievable (e.g. in a report).

The task force has been testing the application and provided feedback via e-mails directly to Luke and Ed since the last meeting. Additional feedback was reported as follows. It is organized by process step.

- Events
    - The reference to "Host Organization" (in the pop-up text bubble) could be clearer since some events are hosted by individuals as well. Wording such as "Please enter the organization or individual that is hosting this event" was suggested
    - Clarification of what an event "Sanction" would allow could be improved to point out that the "results would count as official times"
    - "Participants" was misspelled
    - There may be some AOL browser related issues with the calendar right arrow to select the next month as well as the display when clicking on the event end date. Luke and Jim will set up a separate GoToMeeting with Lisa to investigate.
    - The task force will have to look at additional open water event types (e.g. solo and non-competitive) and develop an approach (fields to use to identify them, tabulation requirements, and impact on any existing fields/data).

- Contents
    - It was agreed to require contact information (at least e-mail or phone number) of the meet director
- Venue
    - The difference between "Search Existing Venues" and "Search for Another Venue" could be clearer.
- Entry
    - The process for editing a sanction request, once submitted will have to be explained. A link to the application would be provided in a confirmation e-mail. This would allow the submitter to edit an application prior to approval as well as upload a revised event entry form. This will still need to be tested.
- Approval Process
    - In the listing of pending sanction requests, it was requested to say "There is 1 pending request…" if only one, but "There are N pending requests..." when there is more than 1.
    - Rather than say "Edit Sanction Request" it should probably say "Review Sanction Request"
    - It was noted that an event was submitted with the "display event publicly" option selected, yet on the review process, the box was not checked.
    - The "No changes saved until you select 'submit changes and exit' or 'Approve sanction' are in opposite order from the display of the buttons.

Next steps (this includes open items from the last meeting as well):
1) Luke and Jim to work with Lisa Baumann and investigate AOL browser observations.
2) Luke to allow for end-to-end testing of the application submission through receipt of notification e-mails and approval process.
3) Lynn and Jeanne to propose the "turnaround" document (acknowledgement/thank you), which should include instructions on submitting the sanction fee, at the end of the application request process. Also the sanction confirmation page at the time of approval.
4) Anna Lea will prepare training documentation, similar to what she has created for the meet results and top ten process.
5) Task force to establish a training and implementation approach and timeline. (see notes from 14-Sep meeting below)
6) Next meeting to be held on Sunday, November 13 from 8pm to 9pm EST.
    a) Review "forms"
    b) Discuss approach to training

From 14-Sep Meeting Notes:

Suggestions were made with respect to training and adoption:

- Provide the tool with a catchy name, perhaps reflecting its ease of use
- Should provide training documentation and training "webinars" for
  - Meet directors
  - Sanctions chairs (sanction chairs should be able to train their meet directors as well as learn how to review requests)
  - LMSC chairs (notification and awareness – may not need training on how to use the tool)
- Provide access to test site to allow new users to create test requests before using the production tool
- It has been recommended to establish a firm cutover date after which all events will be required to be submitted via the on-line tool
- It was also suggested that a(n additional) sanction fee be charged, that would be waived or reduced if the on-line tool was used. This suggestion was strongly opposed.