

## **NSDL ANNUAL MEETING 2005 – SESSION EVALUATIONS**

This report supplies a summary of the card-based session evaluations from the 2005 NSDL Annual Meeting.

Almost all participants were very satisfied with their session experiences. There was some concern however with ambiguity in session formats (e.g. panels vs. crit labs vs. workshops), and related frustration with a lack of support materials and take-homes, and limited time for discussions.

Based on the data and analysis in this report, I recommend that the 2006 Planning Committee consider:

- Adopting a smaller number of session formats, with the expectations for each format being clearly described in the CFP, in the submission guidelines, and in the AM schedule in the registration packs. Presenters should know what to present, and audiences should know what to expect, with respect to the amount of structure and interactivity that a session will provide.
- Encouraging presenters of tutorials (and also of workshops) to structure their presentations, to prepare support/take-home materials for distribution before the Annual Meeting, and to provide Web support for their presentations.
- Avoiding scheduling hour-long sessions, as these seemed to be too short for any of the session formats.

### **Contents**

1 Summary

Data:

2 CI Update Sessions

3 Crit Lab Sessions

4 Panel Sessions

5 SIG Sessions

6 Workshop Sessions

## **1 SUMMARY**

247 post-session evaluation cards were collected from 24 sessions during the 2005 NSDL Annual Meeting. The sessions included CI-Updates (2 sessions), Crit Labs (7 sessions), Panels (11 sessions), SIGs (4 sessions), and Workshops (4 sessions). An average of 9 cards were collected per session, with a low of two cards and a high of 24 cards per session.

The responses on the evaluation cards were almost always very positive for all sessions. Many sessions averaged 4.0+ for each of the first three evaluation questions.

**Questions 1-3** Average for all AM sessions, 1.00 = Poor and 5 = Excellent:

Q1: How useful was the session format?	4.32/5.00
Q2: How would you rate the interactivity?	4.26/5.00
Q3: How beneficial were topic and content to your needs?	4.25/5.00

**Question 4** “Should [this particular activity] be offered at next year’s meeting?”

Yes	193 responses	82.5%
Yes, with changes	34 responses	14.5%
No	7 responses	3.0%

**Question 5** Responses to the ‘free-form’ question were also largely positive. However, several concerns did emerge across the different sessions, including:

- Requests for more structured session materials (hand outs, take-homes, powerpoint files posted to Web, etc.).
- Requests for more time, especially for the shorter sessions, and the more discussion oriented sessions.
- Some dissatisfaction with session formats, and explanations of session formats.

### **Session Formats**

Attendees sometimes expected either less or more conversation, less or more interaction, less or more structure, etc., with their expectation apparently being geared to their interpretation of what the *type* of session (panel, workshop, SIG, Crit Lab, etc.) should offer.

- “Critics should have and present particular questions for feedback.”
- “The booklet describing each session should be more specific about what you'll be doing in the crit lab.”
- “There was way too much time spent on our own on the computers. It was ~80% browsing alone, and 20% discussion, which seems a waste of time (we're here to talk with each other, right?). Would've been more interesting to browse on our own for a while, talk about it together, do another short activity on our own, talk about it. I felt like a lab rat and didn't feel like I got anything out of this session.”
- “It's a panel presentation so as far as that goes it was good but there was a Q+A.”
- “More panel, less lecture - maybe pre-register for background info.”
- “Lots of open discussion - difficult to address within time - narrow the discussion topic?”
- “Make sure there are guiding questions.”
- “Not everything has to be interactive.”
- “Seed more questions, have scenarios, brief cases, "What is" to examine.”
- “Need take-aways.”
- “What makes something interactive? This was a standard panel.”
- “Really wanted practical takeaway info.”
- “Don't see a lot of difference with a traditional conference presentation session.”
- “Interactivity for a session is not easy in planning; might be helpful to provide speakers with some potential formats that lend themselves to more interactivity.”
- “Wasn't a panel - just a bunch of talking heads.”

## **NSDL Annual Meeting 2005 – Session Evaluations**

---

- “Survey us \*before\* the session - It did not make sense to ask our opinions when the time was limited.”
- “Discussion was ‘hub and spoke,’ not ‘network.’”
- “It was less informational than I thought. It basically tried to capture needs of communities and projects. I thought it would provide answers about existing services, not just take feedback.”
- “Too much time spent conferring with the group and not enough time explaining/demonstrating web services.”
- “What is a SIG format? How is it different from a traditional presentation with follow-up questions?”
- “Time too short - this was a presentation panel - over 45 minutes of presentation - would like more chance for discussion.”
- “This session could have been very useful on an interactive level if it had been allotted 90 minutes.”
- “It seemed very disjoint and off the cuff.”

There seems therefore to be some mismatch in presenters’ and audiences’ expectations of how a particular *type* of session ought to be structured, and what it ought to deliver. These misunderstandings generated in turn frustrations with time-keeping and interactivity, especially if participants felt that they had not had enough opportunity to participate.

### **PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION FOR THE 2006 MEETING**

It may be that the current session typology is too subtle and ambiguous, and further, that the current categories are not taken seriously enough by presenters. Some presenters may be putting together generic AM ‘sessions’ and only as an afterthought classifying them according to the existing session typology.

To address this issue, one option for AM 06 would be to comprehensively brief presenters and audience as to what is to be expected in each session format. This could be supported by – for instance – reducing the number of session formats, and categorizing sessions along a ‘continuum of structure and interactivity.’ For example:

- Tutorials (where you are taught something supported by materials) (high structure, low interactivity)
- Panels (where you listen to presentations, with Q+A and perhaps panel discussion, and perhaps receive handouts) (medium structure, medium interactivity)
- Workshops (where you can talk a lot with other people, but do not necessarily receive structured session materials) (low structure, high interactivity)

Based on this approach, the 2006 Planning Committee should consider the following:

- Adopting a smaller number of session formats, with the expectations for each format being clearly described in the CFP, in the submission guidelines, and in the AM schedule in the registration packs. Presenters should know what to present, and audiences should know what to expect, with respect to the amount of structure and interactivity that a session will provide.
- Encouraging presenters of tutorials (and also of workshops) to structure their presentations, and to prepare support/take-home materials for distribution before the Annual Meeting, and to provide Web support for their presentations.
- Avoiding scheduling hour-long sessions, as these seemed to be too short for any of the session formats.

## NSDL Annual Meeting 2005 – Session Evaluations

---

### 2 CI UPDATES

#### Weblogs

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
3	5	4.7	5	1	0	0

Yes, but ...

#### Comments

Read the blog.

Blogs are fun. It's nice to see people being humorous on them. Excellent presentation, fun, engaging.

Good mix of info and live demos.

#### On Ramp

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
3	5	4	4	1	0	0

Yes, but ...

#### Comments

Excellent presentation! Fun! Engaging!

Read the blog.

I got very little out of this presentation. I came looking for information about On Ramp, but instead spent my time filling out a questionnaire. If any info was presented, I missed it while I was on the feedback site.

**3 CRIT LABS**

**Assigning Educational Standards to Educational Resources**

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
13	4.8	4.8	4.5	12	0	1

**Yes, but ...**

More time to explore

**Comments**

Exciting to hear about - disappointing that it won't work for us.

**DLESE Teaching Boxes**

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
6	4.3	4.7	3.6	6	0	0

**Yes, but ...**

**Comments**

Explanations were confusing, but I'm a newbie. I needed more time and a chance to walk through the builder.

There were some technical difficulties. More time should be allowed for hands-on activities such as this.

More time needed.

**The Funworks, A Student and Educators' Resources for STEM Career Exploration**

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
2	4	4	4.5	1	0	1

**Yes, but ...**

Development process with students interesting topic

**Comments**

This session was very helpful in allowing one to think about how their project design could inform other endeavours.

**The Ockham Testbed Servides Toolkit**

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
8	4.1	4.1	4.4	8	0	0

**Yes, but ...**

**Comments**

In general: The 'around the table' more intimate room settings facilitate the Crit Lab experience.

This tool is probably too advanced for some projects.

## **NSDL Annual Meeting 2005 – Session Evaluations**

---

### **Personal Digital Librarian**

---

<b>N=</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Interactivity</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Next Year?</b>		
				<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes, but</b>
<b>9</b>	4.1	4.3	4.4	5	0	4

#### **Yes, but ...**

More exploration of apps, less background on dev. and architecture.  
Critics should have and present particular questions for feedback.  
Provide guidelines for Critlab developers (short/simple)  
Use a more stable server!

#### **Comments**

They should be longer  
Good example and good instructions.  
Great software demo! Could be very useful.  
The technical description of the code basis did not add to the crit lab interactivity - crit labs typically target infor from end users.

### **Superimposed Tools for Active Arrangement of Educational Resources**

---

<b>N=</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Interactivity</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Next Year?</b>		
				<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes, but</b>
<b>9</b>	3.9	4.4	4	7	1	1

#### **Yes, but ...**

Less background about projects - more explanation.

#### **Comments**

No Mac support.  
The tool was neat, but it is unclear what the Crit lab format accomplishes to me. The participants were not really equipped to provide feedback.

### **One Out of Many: Facilitating Navigation Across Multiple Digital Libraries**

---

<b>N=</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Interactivity</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Next Year?</b>		
				<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes, but</b>
<b>8</b>	4.3	4.5	3.9	7	0	1

#### **Yes, but ...**

The booklet describing each session should be more specific about what you'll be doing in the crit lab.

#### **Comments**

Very valuable for developers  
A very useful opportunity to explain an excellent resource in more detail. Thanks.  
There was way too much time spent on our own on the computers. It was ~80% browsing alone, and 20% discussion, which seems a waste of time (we're here to talk with each other, right?).  
Would've been more interesting to browse on our own for a while, talk about it together, do another short activity on our own, talk about it. I felt like a lab rat and didn't feel like I got anything out of this session.

## NSDL Annual Meeting 2005 – Session Evaluations

---

### 4 PANELS

#### NSDL Goes to School

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
10	4.5	4.3	4.6	9	0	1

#### Yes, but ...

If the idea is as good as Bethany's and the team.

#### Comments

Put PowerPoint slides on Web.

Loved the topic - excellent survey and helpful findings.

Awesome data and presenters.

The presenter (Bethany) was very good at answering questions directly and informatively

Excellent content and presentation.

#### Youth Centered Design - The Development of an NSDL Collection

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
6	5	4.8	4.7	6	0	0

#### Yes, but ...

#### Comments

Great presentation.

Excellent - Small attendance unfortunate.

The presenters spoke very well and the interactivity was good.

It's a panel presentation so as far as that goes it was good but there was a Q+A.

Great idea!

#### Users and Uses of NSDL

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
8	4.3	3.5	3.9	5	0	3

#### Yes, but ...

I'd like more info on usage within the classroom.

I have a suggested speaker - Nancy Gough -Signal Transduction Knowledge Environment (STKE).

Have more time.

#### Comments

Presentation panels are useful as long as they present info that is useful to people as a whole - this session did that well.

???

## NSDL Annual Meeting 2005 – Session Evaluations

---

### Building Teaching and Learning Activities Around Digital Collections

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
2	4	3.5	4.5	1	0	1

#### Yes, but ...

They don't have an opportunity to demonstrate collaboration.

#### Comments

### Facilitating Interdisciplinary Interactions

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
9	4.2	4.2	3.7	8	1	0

#### Yes, but ...

Informal conversations outside panels were most important.

#### Comments

Dedicated participants; experienced, knowledgeable. But too few in numbers.  
Need to share examples.

### What Makes a Good K-12 Resource?

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
3	5	5	5	3	0	0

#### Yes, but ...

#### Comments

Great discussion!

### Using Content From Several Digital Libraries

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
7	4.4	4.4	4.4	6	0	1

#### Yes, but ...

Fewer presenters whose work (and approaches) are radically different.

#### Comments

Stimulating - however quite broadly focused in the end - maybe this is why it was stimulating?  
Excellent session.

Low attendances limited extent of interactivity.

This topic needs more discussion!

## NSDL Annual Meeting 2005 – Session Evaluations

---

### Educational Content Standards in Digital Libraries (I+II)

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
11	4.2	4.1	4	10	0	1

#### Yes, but ...

More panel, less lecture - maybe pre-register for background info.

#### Comments

Excellent topic - would love more time for this discussion.

Need more time for more discussion.

I expected 'standards' to deal with computer/IT tech. specs. For encoding and expressing content, i.e. metadata, XML, SOAP, etc. Instead it was on setting K-12 learning standards. Great.

Lots of open discussion - difficult to address within time - narrow the discussion topic?

### NSDL Service Integration

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
8	4.6	4.6	4.8	6	2	0

#### Yes, but ...

But also like straight panels.

Make sure there are guiding questions.

#### Comments

Not everything has to be interactive.

See the blog :)

Have projects do good, bad, ugly.

Very useful.

Great ideas; directions set excitement generated.

Very clear at integration.

### Sustaining the NSDL Through Its Projects

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
7	4.7	4.4	4.7	6	0	1

#### Yes, but ...

Seed more questions, have scenarios, brief cases, "What is" to examine.

#### Comments

This panel was excellent!

Very useful hearing about different types of sustainability model.

## NSDL Annual Meeting 2005 – Session Evaluations

### Observing the Impact of NSDL Through Web Metrics

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
24	4	3.6	4.2	18	0	4

#### **Yes, but ...**

Need take-aways.

Sean Fox should be reinvited.

What makes something interactive? This was a standard panel.

The Omniture talk presumed that I actually knew what Omniture was; I'm new and I missed the big idea about this.

#### **Comments**

Really wanted practical takeaway info.

Very useful - case studies always useful.

Do more on site evaluation at future NSDL meetings. This wa a great session.

Format and content have met the expectations.

Don't see a lot of difference with a traditional conference presentation session.

Useful, but other activities might be better.

This panel depended on presenters (as do most). The three here were excellent, good results - they were experts.

Bob Donahue session was especially interesting and useful.

Interactivity for a session is not easy in planning; might be helpful to provide speakers with some potential formats that lend themselves to more interactivity.

This is a very interesting topic given our need to measure impact. Would be good to discuss reliability of data collected.

These folks know their stuff! Real experts!

Wasn't a panel - just a bunch of talking heads.

Content extremely useful for projects and NSDL.

Excellent sessions, great info, very good presenters.

Useful and enjoyable.

**5 SIGS**

**Web Services for Digital Libraries**

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
12	3.6	4.3	3.3	8	0	2

**Yes, but ...**

Survey us \*before\* the session - It did not make sense to ask our opinions when the time was limited. Suggestion: Survey Monkey - List of possible 'burning topics' and create a histogram for discussion.

Specific topics.

**Comments**

Discussion was "hub and spoke," not "network."

Drifted off-topic towards the end.

Was overall a good session.

It was less informational than I thought. It basically tried to capture needs of communities and projects. I thought it would provide answers about existing services, not just take feedback.

Too much time spent conferring with the group and not enough time explaining/demonstrating web services.

**Controlled Vocabularies**

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
6	4	3.2	3.8	5	1	0

**Yes, but ...**

**Comments**

The structure should be moderated (less free-for-all).

Helpful collection of folks.

No technical content!

**Giving Good Workshops: Challenges, Successes, and Impacts**

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
7	4.9	5	4.9	6	0	1

**Yes, but ...**

There is need of these discussion for higher ed. outreach/workshops as well.

**Comments**

Well facilitated, thank you!

Good discussion - look forward to follow-up.

Look forward to e-mail list - great resource for my personal development - thanks!

A good amount of time for Q+A - Thanks!

## **NSDL Annual Meeting 2005 – Session Evaluations**

---

### **Research on Digital Libraries and K-12 Schools**

---

<b>N=</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Interactivity</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Next Year?</b>		
				<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes, but</b>
<b>17</b>	3.9	3.9	4.5	12	0	3

#### **Yes, but ...**

Involve other projects doing K-12 research on digital lessons [?]

What is a SIG format? How is it different from a traditional presentation with follow-up questions?

Longer time for interactivity.

#### **Comments**

Well-presented and good info, but best part was open discussion. For next year could consider a session that's even more about 1) how classroom functions and 2) how teachers prepare, and another on media specialists.

Useful sharing of research.

Discussion during presentation would be useful.

Presenters were excellent - liked the way the data connected to the "average teacher," not the alpha group.

Access to slides is needed.

Looking forward to additional research results.

Would like handouts/ppts so could share research with colleagues.

Time too short - this was a presentation panel - over 45 minutes of presentation - would like more chance for discussion.

Not enough time.

Time too short - discussion could have gone on.

This session could have been very useful on an interactive level if it had been allotted 90 minutes.

Great content, prep - just wish there had been more time for discussion.

How do I get copies of the presenters' PowerPoint?

**6 WORKSHOPS**

**Building NSDL Projects' Evaluation Capacity to Examine Impact**

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
15	4.1	4.3	3.9	7	1	5

**Yes, but ...**

A bit longer.  
More time for small group interactions.  
More interactive and discussion.  
Good format but need perhaps more time.  
Maybe a little more structural - small group don't always talk.

**Comments**

If more examples should be better.  
Evaluation is always a useful area for projects.  
Good outcome ideas at this session - Evaluation and reporting evaluation is essential and needs much more attention.  
I'd like to have the Powerpoint slides  
It seemed very disjoint and off the cuff.

**Are Your Resources Aligned to Standards?**

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
6	4.5	4.5	4	4	1	1

**Yes, but ...**

Set-up with machines, sites.

**Comments**

This was very well organized, and relevant. One suggestion might be to explain to larger group more emphatically why this is critical.  
Very useful info - huge project, good start.

**Selecting and Evaluating Digital Learning Materials for Higher Education**

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
9	4.8	4.7	4.7	8	0	1

**Yes, but ...**

Give the 4-hour version that includes the review process and materials.

**Comments**

Very well done/informative.  
Most useful session I've attended.  
Excellent. Thanks for the materials.  
Thanks! Loved it!  
This was the most useful session of the entire meeting because they provided a broad ??? of content.

## NSDL Annual Meeting 2005 – Session Evaluations

---

### CWIS

---

N=	Format	Interactivity	Content	Next Year?		
				Yes	No	Yes, but
18	4.6	4.6	4.5	17	0	1

#### Yes, but ...

More time for hands-on to explore features.

#### Comments

Good mix of interests and it addressed basic and advanced issues for the time allotted.

Awesome.

This was great! Real interactivity and products you can use today instead of betas that we get to use "in a few months."

Good to do something hands-on and see how it really works.

Great workshop!

Nice blend of guided tour of CWIS and examples of other sites.

Consider a Crit Lab format to improve the product.

It moved a little fast but, I'm not too technologically savvy.

Well presented; good material.