



University of Tennessee, Knoxville  
**Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative  
Exchange**

---

DataONE Sociocultural and Usability &  
Assessment Working Groups

Communication and Information

---

5-16-2016

## 2016 UAWG Meeting: Subgroup Summaries

UAWG

Follow this and additional works at: [https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_dataone](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_dataone)



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

UAWG, "2016 UAWG Meeting: Subgroup Summaries" (2016). *DataONE Sociocultural and Usability & Assessment Working Groups*.

[https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_dataone/181](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_dataone/181)

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Communication and Information at Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in DataONE Sociocultural and Usability & Assessment Working Groups by an authorized administrator of Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact [trace@utk.edu](mailto:trace@utk.edu).

## UX Summary:

### Tuesday-Wednesday

During the U&A WG meeting, the UX group (Rachel V, Racheal H, Mike F, Rob O, and Laura M) created two UX tests. The first UX test focuses on the DataONE website. The test will be completed in May/June at UT with new or potential DataONE Users (e.g., biologist students and faculty and IS students and faculty). The questions target questions new users may have (how to join, how to find/contribute data, find research/learning material). The second UX test will be conducted at DUG in July. DUG attendees will be asked to complete tasks on the search.dataone.org tool. The tasks include questions on geographical searching, signing into the search and using the profile functions, and using provenance features. During the planning we were also able to identify current UX issues and create Redmine tickets to address those issues.

## MN summary

### Tuesday-Wednesday

Tuesday afternoon-The Member Node breakout group (Rebecca, Rachel V, Rob O, Laura) drafted a Memorandum of Understanding between DataONE and prospective MNs, outlining expectations and responsibilities for both parties. The draft MOU will be reviewed by the Leadership Team, but at our report-out it was suggested that S&G take a look at it from that perspective first. Afterwards we'll run it by an up-and-coming MN we know to see if it makes sense from the prospective MN perspective.

We also looked at ask.dataone.org as a tool for answering people's questions about DataONE in general and MN onboarding in particular. We noted that ask hasn't been used since October 2015. Dave said that he has been considering using a different tool (stackexchange, for example) as a question/answer solution.

During the UX session on Wednesday, we looked at the MN dashboard and had difficulties accessing it (Rachel V, Rob O, Mike F, Rachael H, Laura M with different browsers, inconsistent results). Rebecca pointed us to a test version of some updates to the dashboard which we reviewed. Everyone liked the use of the MN profile information as the MN detail pages. We (UX) don't plan to investigate the dashboard further until the changes are in production.

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1eF1-e71mOOPzifjA42zmCJLI4jYDMew8kPdnrfYvMT0/edit>

## 2<sup>nd</sup> Scientists Follow-Up Survey

### Tuesday

Tuesday afternoon- A revised copy of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Sci. FU survey instrument was reviewed by Mike, Lynn, Lisa, and Dane. The survey was color-coded to highlight what questions maintained an undecided status, versus those which were suggested as additions to the survey. Many questions were cut from the survey and some of the new suggested questions were added and moved from one section of the survey to mesh better with the transitions of the survey.

In the second half of the block, Mike, Kevin, Lisa, and Dane discussed a range of organizations/groups who could participate in the survey. After discussion, approx. 54 groups/populations of scientists were identified to reach out to. An excel file was created for these groups and who would be responsible for contacting them, or who could get in contact with someone who could contact those groups. The excel file was created to allow a “check list” way of those involved in contacting to let the rest of the WG know that person/group has been contacted, and when they were contacted.

### LIBER Summary

#### Tuesday-Wednesday:

Carol, Lynn, Bob, Danielle, and Dane worked on the draft of the article/report to be sent to LIBER for LIBER Quarterly. With the lit review and analysis prepared before the meeting, the subgroup was able to form a draft around those components. By the end of Tuesday, an introduction, methodology, and edited lit review were complete. On Wednesday, the analysis was added into the official draft document in a way that fit with the narrative of the article. In addition, new crosstabs were suggested to add into the draft, and will be added in the coming weeks. Additional content results in the form of charts was discussed, but was decided to be added into the upcoming presentation regarding the LIBER findings.

### Connecting Scientists Summary

#### Tuesday-Wednesday

Suzie, Alison, Lisa, Mark, and Kevin discussed reasons why scientists may be avoiding journals that require data deposition. After discussion, some research questions to consider emerged, such as how to get data management practices to become habitual for scientists. From further discussion, this led into topics like cultural change through educating students, outreach that includes data management as part of STEM requirements, etc. To help with the structure of the survey, the group looked at scientist surveys from previous years. Some of the question types under consideration are: type of data, availability, organizational process, data sharing, metadata standards, and access/approval

## New/Emerging Communities

Wednesday

Suzie, Alison, Mark, and An built off of the ideas formed from the 2015 AHM. For an emerging community decision, the group favors environmental health. When looking at who to interview, the group went into detail about what may be the best candidates for the interview. These included synthesis centers, individual scientists/researchers, research project members, and organic networks. Once the groups were established, they started developing questions to ask these target groups, such as who they reach out to/how do they find each other, how do they develop a team, how do they trust each other with data and it's interpretation across disciplines, what is the role of semantics/provenance, etc. The initial plan is to find someone from a group to interview, and then develop more interview questions as a standard going forward.