**Minutes of Meeting**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Date and Time** | 18 September 2025<br>09:00 PST | **Meeting type** | Zoom |
| **Organiser** | Mr. Rupesh | **Client** | Citywide |

| **Attendees (Internal)** |
|---|
| • Rupesh<br>• Kuldeep<br>• Jaspreet<br>• Vishesh<br>• Rahul<br>• Ajay<br>• Gurpreet<br>• Kapil<br>• Amit<br>• Pankaj |
| **Attendees (Client Side )** |
| • Tom, Teresa, Randy |

**Agenda**

- **Discussions on the following:**
    - Caller Details / Call Notes – UI Redesign
    - Demonstration of Notification Sound
    - Status Updates from the Priority Timeline Sheet
    - App User Experience (Login & UI/UX)
    - Feature Parity – Web & Mobile
    - Admin Panel Server Setup
    - Production Builds (Web & Mobile):
    - Resource Planning (Mobile Development)
    - ATS Module Deployment
    - Training Module – Current Status
    - Training Module Enhancements

**The following things are discussed:**

1. **Caller Details / Call Notes – UI Redesign**
    a. **Proposal by Jaspreet:**
        i. Introduced a **sidebar design** showing:
            1. Available units
            2. Call notes
            3. Caller details (appears only after adding a caller)
    b. **Feedback & Changes Requested:**
        i. **Positive:** Teresa preferred the sidebar over the previous pop-up.
        ii. **Concerns:**
            1. Tom: Dispatchers shouldn't need to **scroll excessively** to see available units.
            2. Recommendation: Expand the popup to **70–80% width**, covering up to the menu bar.
            3. Shrink unused space (e.g., remove "No Data Found" placeholders).
            4. Implement **collapsible sections** so rows expand only when needed.
            5. Ensure all available units are visible on a single screen ("before the fold") where possible.
    c. **Decision:**
        i. Proceed with revised design → **larger screen view, collapsibles, no empty placeholders**.
        ii. Remove duplicate "Add Caller" button; retain only one.
    d. **Action Item:** The Dev Team Update caller details UI per above changes.
2. **Demonstration of Notification Sound**
    a. **Observation:**
        i. Notification sound played but was **too soft/low** for most attendees.
        ii. Some participants could not hear it clearly due to microphone voice-activation filtering.
    b. **Feedback on Current Sound**
        i. Sound perceived as **minimal and not attention-grabbing**.
        ii. Teresa suggested a **loud "ding" sound** (like a text message alert).
        iii. Tom proposed **different tones** depending on notification type/priority:
            1. General → single ding
            2. Medium/low priority calls → double ding
            3. High priority calls → siren or stronger tone
    c. **Notification Types Requiring Sound**
        i. **Confirmed Initial Scope:**
            1. **Call Assignment** – when a call is assigned to an agent.
            2. **Report Rejection** – when a report is rejected.
        ii. **Future scope:** more notification types to be added with sound + pop-up alerts.
    d. **Customization Options:**
        i. **Proposal by Jaspreet/Kuldeep:**
            1. Allow companies to **upload their own sound files** (restricted

to **2–3 seconds** and MP3 format).

2. Provide **default sound options** within the system.
3. Uploaded sounds apply **only to that specific instance/client** (not shared across companies).

ii. **Feedback:**

1. Randy: Custom upload is useful (e.g., robot-triggered alerts needing unique tones).
2. Concern about inappropriate uploads; hence default tones must also be available.
3. Teresa: Similar to iPhone text tone selection; users should be able to **choose from a list**.

iii. **Decision:**

1. System will support **both default tones and custom upload option**.
2. Restriction: max 2–3 seconds, MP3 only, instance-specific.

**e. Mobile vs. System Sound Notification**

i. Question raised whether mobile app should use system-defined tones or device tones (from phone OS).

ii. Agreement: Use system sound notifications defined in company settings (not overridden by device default tones).

**3. Status Updates from the Priority Timeline Sheet**

a. **Scheduling Filters** – Developed, in testing; to be included in the next build.

b. **Forms Enhancements** – Completed and deployed to production.

c. **Analytics** – In progress; complex due to multiple linkages and data detail requirements. Targeted for completion within the current sprint.

d. **ERM Work History & Invite Link (Reset Password)** – Implemented and live on production.

e. **Permissions for Mobile Officer / Patrol Officer** – Handled via role-switching; separate permissions discarded.

f. **Vehicle Inspection** – Now based only on beats; prior permissions discarded.

g. **CHS Admin Phase 1** – Development completed; awaiting server setup. Delay caused by PSSP requirement changes in August.

h. **Supervising Mapping (Employee)** – Dropped, as it was primarily for internal support.

i. **Admin Site for Dispatch** – Marked as priority for current sprint.

j. **Help & Support** – Live on production.

k. **CHS Admin Phase 2** – To be taken up after PSSP priorities are delivered.

l. **Chat Module** – Still pending.

m. **Scheduling P2** – Developed, to be updated in the next build.

n. **Mobile Training Module** – Completed and updated in latest build (shared with Teresa).

**o. Action Items – Documentation Sharing**

i. Tom requested an updated **priority sheet** by email (not chat).

ii. Must CC Teresa on updates.

iii. Tom reiterated he should not receive **general/unrelated emails** (e.g., meeting notes, Fathom summaries).

iv. Only send **meeting invites** + **priority sheet updates**.

**p. Analytics Discussion:**

i. Analytics currently **pending**; expected to be completed within **2**

**weeks** (two sprints).

ii. Tom expressed strong dissatisfaction:
    1. Analytics have been delayed repeatedly.
    2. Analytics are critical for **operations management reports** and client retention.
    3. Requested analytics to be treated as **top priority**.

iii. **Decision:** Rupesh directed to **pause other lower-priority work** and **deliver analytics by next week**.

**q. Payroll & Invoicing**

i. Teresa confirmed CommandHub has **completely shifted payroll to CHS** (old system discarded).

ii. She will cross-check payroll reports closely to ensure all required information is present.

iii. If updates are needed, payroll will take **immediate priority**.

**r. KPI Development**

i. Tom requested **KPI tracking & reporting** to be prioritized next:
    1. KPI setup across **daily, weekly, bi-weekly, semi-monthly, monthly, quarterly, semi-annual, annual**.
    2. Ability to **set targets** and compare against **actual performance**.
    3. Should show variance (e.g., Target = 100, Actual = 90 → Missed by 10%).
    4. Must include **comparison with previous periods**.
    5. KPI to be configurable under **general company settings** with positive/negative point allocation.

ii. Clarifications:
    1. PTO/PSL vs KPI priorities discussed.
    2. Tom instructed: **do not drop mid-progress tasks**, but once current sprint priorities are completed, **next new priority = KPI**.
    3. If possible, **start KPI earlier** depending on resource capacity.

**s. Upcoming Priorities (Next Builds)**

i. KPI Integration (planned from October 1, but may be moved earlier depending on sprint completion)

ii. Quick Access Button

iii. CHS Admin Phase 2

**t. Key Decisions**

i. **Analytics** – Must be delivered by **next week** (highest urgency).

ii. **Payroll** – If Teresa identifies issues, payroll updates override all else.

iii. **KPI** – To start immediately after current sprint priorities; may move earlier if the team has bandwidth.

iv. **Email Communication** – Only send **priority sheet updates + invites**; remove Tom from all general notes/emails.

u. Tom emphasized the **critical importance of KPIs**:

i. In a recent meeting with a potential high-value client, **KPI discussion captured strong attention**.

ii. KPIs and Analytics will be a **major selling point** for large organizations.

iii. Need to demonstrate **KPI setup, tracking, and targets** in the **next**

**demo (approx. 1 month away)**.

iv. KPIs are also essential for **Citywide** internally, aside from client needs.

**v. Decision:**

i. **KPIs + Analytics** are **top development priorities** moving forward.

**4. App User Experience (Login & UI/UX)**

a. Tom reported **frustration with login process**:
   i. Strict org-name search was difficult (spacing, case-sensitivity).
   ii. While understood as a **security measure**, it makes the first-time user experience poor.
b. Once logged in, Tom noted the **app UI looked good** overall.
c. Organizer clarified: strict search is to **avoid app mislabeling**, but acknowledged usability pain.
d. Team confirmed **UI modifications and improvements** are planned in the **next build**.

**5. Feature Parity – Web & Mobile**

a. Concern raised by Tom: **app and web must remain aligned**.
b. Kuldeep explained:
   i. A **parallel sheet** will be maintained to track **features in web vs app**.
   ii. After the next production build, this mapping sheet will be shared with Teresa for visibility.
   iii. Some lag between web and mobile is expected, but the goal is to **minimize the gap**.
   iv. Any **new web feature** will come with an **estimation for mobile implementation**.
**c. Decision:**
   i. Maintain the same **priority sheet** for mobile and web.
   ii. Commit to keeping **functionality aligned** across platforms.

**6. Admin Panel Server Setup**

a. Discussion on **CHS Admin Panel hosting**:
   i. Organizer shared pricing: **$64/month** server option.
   ii. Tom approved proceeding with this setup immediately.
   iii. Agreement: If upgrades are required in future:
      1. Up to **$500/month** → the team can proceed without delay, but must **inform Tom**.
      2. Above $500 → requires Tom's explicit approval.
   iv. Clarification: Do **not add costs to Nidhi's bill**; these are development-related expenses.

**7. Production Builds (Web & Mobile):**

**a. Web:**
   i. Team to share a **detailed email listing tickets** for next week's production build.
   ii. Teresa to review & approve final scope.
**b. Mobile:**
   i. A **production build is planned** → to be submitted to the Play **Store**.
   ii. Expected approval timeline: **2–3 days**.
   iii. Mobile build to incorporate Teresa's feedback.

**8. Resource Planning (Mobile Development)**

a. Rupesh raised concern: only **one resource** on mobile app → slows down parallel development.

b. Suggested exploring options to **speed up mobile updates**.
c. Tom's response:
    i. **Do not add new resources or costs to the bill.**
    ii. Team must deliver improvements **within current budget and resources**.

**9. ATS Module Deployment**

**a. Discussion:**
    i. Jaspreet asked if **ATS can be added to other instances**.
    ii. Tom agreed ATS should be rolled out.
    iii. Teresa suggested **checking with Mike** first to ensure ATS is stable and meeting requirements before deployment.
    iv. Randy will coordinate with Mike and provide feedback.

**b. Decision:**
    i. Hold rollout until feedback is received from Mike.
    ii. ATS to be planned for deployment once confirmed stable.

**10. Training Module – Current Status**

a. **Training Module** already **pushed to another instance** as per Teresa's confirmation last week.
b. Randy reported training module testing is good so far, with no major issues.
c. Teresa flagged difficulty in viewing **failed vs passed attempts**:
    i. The current workflow requires manually clicking through each attempt.
    ii. Sorting/filtering for **failed assessments** is missing.

**11. Training Module Enhancements**

**a. Assessment Status Handling(Training Module)**
    **i. Current Process (Issues):**
        1. All attempts go to the "Attempted" column.
        2. Instructors (e.g., Randy) must manually review, scroll, and save results as Pass/Fail.
        3. Certificates are only generated **after manual save**.
        4. This adds extra steps, especially for passed assessments.
    **ii. Requested Improvements:**
        1. **Auto-approval & certificate generation** for **objective-type questions** (MCQs, True/False) when passed.
        2. Manual review only required for **subjective/write-in questions**.
        3. If automation is not feasible:
            a. Add a **Save button on the listing page** (so instructors don't need to open each record).
    **iii. Decision:**
        1. Implement **auto-pass and auto-certificate generation** for objective-type tests.
        2. Keep **manual save/review** only for subjective-type assessments.
        3. Add **Save button** to assessment listing for efficiency.

**b. Multiple Choice Question (MCQ) Behavior**
    **i. Issue:**
        1. Current setup allows learners to select multiple options even

when the question is meant for a single correct answer.
      2. Leads to confusion and unnecessary errors.
   ii. **Requested Change:**
      1. Add option in question setup to define:
         a. **Single-select MCQ** (only one correct answer allowed).
         b. **Multi-select MCQ** (multiple answers can be correct).
   iii. **Decision:**
      1. Update question setup interface with **single vs multiple answer selection option**.
      2. Default for MCQ will be **single-select**, unless explicitly configured otherwise.

c. **Assessment Dashboard Metrics**
   i. **Issue:**
      1. Dashboard currently shows **total assessments submitted** (e.g., 250+) instead of **pending actions**.
      2. Not useful for instructors who need to focus only on what requires review.
      3. Different instructors see different totals, leading to confusion.
   ii. **Requested Change:**
      1. Dashboard should display **pending assessments requiring action** (grading, confirmation).
      2. Provide separate counters for:
         a. Pending
         b. Completed
         c. Failed
         d. Total historical (if needed, in reports).
   iii. **Decision:**
      1. Revise dashboard to highlight pending actionable items instead of cumulative totals.