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Executive Summary Report

Usability & Assessment and Sociocultural Working Groups
All Hands Meeting, September 2012, Albuquerque, NM

Work Completed and Planned as Follow Up

Attendance
SCWG: Kimberly Douglass, Lynn Baird, Geoff Bilder, Ahrash Bissell, Miriam Blake, Kevin Crowston, Maribeth Manoff, Miriam Davis
UAWG: Carol Tenopir, Mike Frame, Denise Davis, Bruce Grant, Carol Hoover, Rachel Hu, H.K. (Rama) Ramapriyan, Ellie Read, Alison Specht, Lisa Zolly

Documentation

Main AHM documentation site within plone

UA/SC WGs documentation site within plone (contains all UAWG and SCWG subgroup materials)
https://docs.dataone.org/member-area/working-groups/usability-and-assessment/meetings-usability-and-assessments-working-group/2012-ahm (notes below from these documents)

Sub-groups and meetings:
1. Data Services Ecosystem (Miriam Davis, Lynn Baird, Miriam Blake, Maribeth Manoff)
2. Assessment Subgroup (Ben Birch, Carol Tenopir, Ellie Read, Geoff)
3. Usability Subgroup (Marybeth West, Mike Frame, Denise Davis, Rachel Hu)
4. Metrics and Statistics Subgroup (Bruce Grant,)
5. FAQs Subgroup (Miriam Davis, Kimberly Douglass, Ahrash Bissell)
6. UI Future Interface Subgroup
7. WG Model/Member Survey (Allison Specht, Kevin Crowston, Carol Hoover)
8. SCWG Communication Discussion with R. Koskela and A. Budden

SCWG Work Completed

Meeting Goals (Work Planned/Talking Points)
1. FAQs - process
2. FAQs – technical
3. Distillation and indexing of help functions from the FAQs

Work Completed
1. Data Services Ecosystem
   • Developed structure of research project to identify the administrative actors who support and influence research data services in academia and federal institutions (e.g. Office of Research, Office of Information Technology, Sponsored Programs, etc.)

2. FAQs
   • Developed Master List of Questions
   • Developed Keywords for beginning of Index

3. Working Group Structure/Function Survey
   • Developed two surveys re WG structure/function and member’s experience of it
   • Deployed surveys
   • Conducted first draft analysis
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- Presented first draft analysis

Summary of Communication Meeting
- If SCWG develops something we think will be useful to DataONE, but was not specifically requested by the LT, then, when it is submitted to the LT we need to include some context with it (our motivation for developing it), explain our intention for it, and include a specific request for feedback and/or action on the LT part.
- If LT requests a product from us, after delivery we should expect continued feedback from LT without prodding. Communication from the LT to SCWG will go through the SCWG leader on the LT team.
- In terms of the balance between work SCWG members do in support of DataONE and work members do that follows their own interests – LT will not tell SCWG what it has to do, but will make requests based on needs of DataONE. The role of scholarly output is highly valued by NSF, as well as synergistic efforts, mentoring of students etc.
- In terms of expectations of SCWG members at AHMs, those should be established and communicated through WG leads, not LT.
- There has been a hold up getting some things we’ve created onto Dataone.org due to licensing issues and requirements. Bigger issue than anyone envisioned.
- Several specific products we have submitted over time were discussed. The specific response on each item is in the attached notes.

UAWG Work Completed

1. Assessments
   - Completed draft of Scientists/Educators follow-up instrument
   - Prioritized stakeholders, strategies for assessment
   - Developed plan to study early adopters of open data sharing
   - Scheduled reporting of data already collected
   - Scheduled remaining baseline assessments

2. Usability
   - Reviewed usability test results from ESIP/DUG summer 2012
   - Performed eye tracking tests
   - Summarized recommendations for ONEMercury and DataONE.org
   - Discussed ONEDrive as the next UA
   - Planning focus groups

3. UI Future Interface
   - Performed initial brainstorming on future UI (potential features/capabilities, reference sites/applications)

4. Metrics and Statistics
   - Reviewed Metrics from PMP
   - Reviewed what is being collected now by infrastructure


Work Planned As Follow Up

- Discussed Statistical portal/ dashboard: Object Level Statistics (PMP), User Level Statistics (Persona), MN level Statistics, Macro level Statistics, Emerging interdisciplinary, DataONE.org statistics linkage (PMP)
- 2013 Summer student/project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Services Ecosystem</td>
<td>Draft questions for inclusion in scientists/educators follow up survey</td>
<td>M. Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Services Ecosystem</td>
<td>Review existing literature/efforts</td>
<td>M. Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>On hold pending research meeting in December with Tenopir and Allard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Services Ecosystem</td>
<td>Consider appropriate next steps</td>
<td>M. Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>On hold pending results of survey and research meeting above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAQs</td>
<td>Identify answers for first 10 FAQs</td>
<td>K. Douglass</td>
<td>Y4Q1</td>
<td>Submitted. Feedback received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAQs</td>
<td>Identify answers for 15 additional FAQs</td>
<td>K. Douglass</td>
<td>Y4Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG Surveys</td>
<td>Complete analysis</td>
<td>A. Specht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments (timeline)</td>
<td>Detailed timeline of expected activities for all assessments available at the following link. Includes people responsible for each step.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://docs.google.com/a/uic.edu/spreadsheets/ccc?key=0Am8rDNhFX-BkdE1OaGl4M2phSXZjLU1ENUpySjZLN2c#gid=0">https://docs.google.com/a/uic.edu/spreadsheets/ccc?key=0Am8rDNhFX-BkdE1OaGl4M2phSXZjLU1ENUpySjZLN2c#gid=0</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrics and Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI Future Interface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>