NSDL ANNUAL MEETING 2005 – MEETING EVALUATION

This report supplies a preliminary summary and analysis of the online evaluation of the 2005 NSDL Annual Meeting.

People were very happy with the meeting overall. The survey suggests that the NSDL community has a growing practitioner base that values the sharing of 'hands-on' digital library experience. It therefore suggests that future meetings should continue to look for ways to support NSDL's practitioner communities in meeting structure and content.

Contents

1 Summary and analysis

2 Survey Responses

- Structured answers and ratings
- Unstructured comments. Note: As this is a public document some comments that reference specific individuals and/or workshops/activities have been removed.

Contact

Mick Khoo, Evaluation Co-ordinator, NSDL-CI

mjkhoo@ucar.edu

Summary and Analysis

The post-Annual Meeting survey received 99 responses between November 28 and December 12. This is a response rate of 45.0% (2004, 35.6%; 2003, 24.8%; 2002, 49.0%). The responses included approximately 275 unstructured comments.

The high response rate was supported by the use of an online survey hosted by surveymonkey.com. The survey could be accessed by clicking a URL embedded in an e-mail, and as the majority of survey responses were received in the hours following the survey e-mail and the subsequent reminder e-mail, this suggests that the 'one-click' access to the survey made it easy for people immediately to respond to the survey.

Out of the 99 responses, 42 people provided names and e-mail addresses for possible follow-up questions. These people will provide a good pool for exploring any questions arising out of the survey.

High Level Finding: People Liked the Meeting!

The overall meeting rating was 3.97/5.00 (2004, 3.99/5.00; 2003, 3.50/5.00; 2002 did not have an overall rating question).

The overall 'story' of the meeting is summarized very well by the responses to questions that ranked various aspects of the meeting from 5 (excellent) to 1 (poor):

1	Meeting support staff	4.60
=2	Information about travel and lodging	4.43
=2	Online registration	4.43
4	Poster session and reception	4.36
5	Share/find new ideas	4.29
6	Find new collaborators	4.16
7	Closing session	4.13
8	Information about the meeting on nsdl.org	4.08
9	Proposal submission, review and acceptance	4.06
10	Discuss NSDL commmunity issues	4.05
11	NSF and NSDL update	4.01
12	OVERALL AM EXPERIENCE	3.97
13	Interact with SC members	3.78
14	Interact with Core Integration	3.73
15	New people and projects orientation	3.64
16	Interact with NSF staff	3.61
17	Opening session/NSF and CI update	3.54
18	Interact with Policy Committee members	3.52
=19	Opening keynote	3.13
=19	Assembly meeting with Policy Committee	3.13

The positive feedback fell into several general categories.

People expressed their appreciation for the ease-of-use of the pre-meeting web site information and registration pages, and the meeting support staff.

People rated the poster session very highly, and the opportunity it provided for socializing. The poster session food was highly rated, perhaps because it let people postpone dinner for a while and enabled them to continue to mingle. A couple of people mentioned being restricted by the poster size format, but the pay-off in terms of additional socializing space made up for this. Somebody else mentioned having a 'Minute Madness' session, and this may be worth considering for next year.

From the point of view of 'relevance,' Julie Evans' 'NetDay' closing keynote was very well received, while the opening keynote was not well-received. Several people mentioned that had the NetDay case studies been presented on the first day of the meeting, these would have provided an interesting framework within which to carry on conversations about NSDL throughout the rest of the meeting.

Finally, people were appreciative of the venue and downtown location of the meeting, and they particularly liked being within easy walking distance of a large number and range of restaurants.

Cross-Cutting Theme: Supporting Discussion Amongst Practitioners and the User Base

An analysis of the open-ended questions concerned with the 'highs' and 'lows' of the meeting suggests that attendees generally appreciated meeting content that focused on implemented and functioning projects, and that facilitated discussion on the practical issues raised by these projects. Conversely, they tended to dislike meeting content that was too hypothetical and abstract.

One respondent expressed it this way: "Presentations, like the poster session, that actually showed the work being done, or planned were by far the most valuable. I think many more reports from projects would liven up the meeting and could create more sharing opportunities."

This cross-cutting theme may be summed up as follows:

Likes
Interactivity, talking, socializing, informal interaction, putting names to faces, real projects, real examples, real users, real statistics, concrete relevance

Dislikes
Irrelevance, too many concurrent sessions, sales pitches, slideware, hypotheticals, lack of relevance, lack of testing, lack of case studies, lack of focus, lack of implementation, lack of user focus, lack of vision, lack of confidence

Preliminary Conclusion

This survey suggests that the NSDL community has a growing practitioner base that values the sharing of 'hands-on' digital library experience. It therefore suggests that future meetings should continue to look for ways to support NSDL's practitioner communities in meeting structure and content.

AM 2005 – Online Survey results

1 Which days of the 2005 Annual Meeting did you attend?	
Tuesday	**40**
Wednesday	**97**
Thursday	**94**
Friday	**63**
Total Respondents	**99**
(skipped this question)	**0**

2 Are you or were you a project PI or project co-PI?	
Yes	**41**
No	**58**
Total Respondents	**99**
(skipped this question)	**0**

3 Are you a member of	
A current NSDL project	**56**
A past NSDL project	**3**
Both a current and past NSDL project	**30**
I have never been a member of an NSDL project	**10**
Total Respondents	**99**
(skipped this question)	**0**

4 How is/was your project funded?	
NSDL Collections Track	**22**
NSDL Core Integration Track	**11**
NSDL Pathways Track	**23**
NSDL Services Track	**20**
NSDL Targeted Research Track	**5**
Project is/was part of NSDL but not funded through NSDL program	**4**
I don't know	**9**
Total Respondents	**94**
(skipped this question)	**5**

5 If funded by NSDL what year did your project start?	
FY 2000	**8**
FY 2001	**5**
FY 2002	**9**
FY 2003	**17**
FY 2004	**19**
FY 2005	**19**
Don't know	**10**
Total Respondents	**87**
(skipped this question)	**12**

AM 2005 – Online Survey results

6 Pre-Meeting and Meeting organizational support	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Average
Information about the meeting on nsdl.org	1	3	16	39	32	3	**4.08**
Information about travel and lodging	0	1	8	29	46	10	**4.43**
Proposal Submission review and acceptance	1	2	10	29	21	29	**4.06**
Online registration	1	1	9	27	54	2	**4.43**
Meeting support staff	1	1	4	19	61	8	**4.60**
Total Respondents							**94**
(skipped this question)							**5**

7 Usefulness and interest of the General Sessions	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Average
New People and Projects Orientation	1	2	6	8	5	67	**3.64**
Opening Keynote speaker Larry Johnston	10	9	29	25	7	12	**3.13**
Opening session: NSF and CI update	1	14	17	35	12	11	**3.54**
Poster session and reception	0	1	5	47	41	0	**4.36**
NSF and NSDL update	1	1	12	39	18	17	**4.01**
Assembly Meeting with Policy Committee	3	9	19	13	4	42	**3.13**
Closing Session	2	0	7	12	18	51	**4.13**
Total Respondents							**94**
(skipped this question)							**5**

8 Opportunities to engage in the following activities	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Average
Discuss NSDL community issues	3	4	13	32	34	6	**4.05**
Find new collaborators	0	6	13	30	39	4	**4.16**
Share/find new ideas	0	2	12	35	43	1	**4.29**
Interact with NSF staff	3	9	23	26	19	13	**3.61**
Interact with Core Integration	0	8	27	27	21	9	**3.73**
Interact with Standing Committees members	1	8	16	30	19	18	**3.78**
Interact with Policy Committee members	2	9	22	26	12	21	**3.52**
Total Respondents							**93**
(skipped this question)							**6**

AM 2005 – Online Survey results

Questions 9-12 are individual Steering Committee questions.

13 What sessions/activities/presentations were the most valuable to you and why? (Responses below)	
Total Respondents	**66**
(skipped this question)	**33**

14 What sessions/activities/presentations were least valuable to you and why? (Responses below)	
Total Respondents	**46**
(skipped this question)	**53**

15 What thing(s) did you like most about the Annual Meeting? (Responses below)	
Total Respondents	**62**
(skipped this question)	**37**

16 What thing(s) did you like least about the Annual Meeting? (Responses below)	
Total Respondents	**56**
(skipped this question)	**43**

17 Please rate your overall experience of the NSDL 2005 meeting						
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Average**
	0	5	17	41	24	**3.97**
Total Respondents						**87**
(skipped this question)						**12**

18 Use the box below if you have any further comments about the Annual Meeting (Responses below)	
Total Respondents	**27**
(skipped this question)	**72**

19 If necessary would you be willing to talk to us about your responses to this survey?	
Yes	**42**
No	**38**
Total Respondents	**80**
(skipped this question)	**19**

20 If yes please supply a contact name and an e-mail address where we may reach you. These will be kept confidential and will be seen only by the researchers.	
Total Respondents	**42**
(skipped this question)	**57**

13 What Sessions/Activities/Presentations Were Most Valuable To You, And Why?

closing session had lots of valuable statistics. Users and Uses of NSDL offered lots of valuable insight and ideas on getting University faculty to use a DL.

SIG's on Education, Outreach were very useful and very informative

I found all the sessions I attended this year valuable. People seemed to be ready for collaboration and thinking in that way. The poster session is always such a good overview of what is going on.

I liked the interactive panels the best, including 'Using content from several digital libraries'. Good to hear comments from people up to their eyeballs in a topic.

posters   SIGs   informal meeting time

The Poster session and the crit labs were fantastic... direct contact and hands-on... but good things.

Poster sessions - they gave a great opportunity to interact with peers

Liked SIGS

Being able to get the standing committees together face to face was valuable - we could set the agenda for the rest of the year and assign tasks to actual people. The poster/reception was incredibly helpful because you had the opportunity to put a project with a person. All the sessions that I attended (it didn't matter what type) provided a substantial time at the end to interact/ask questions of the presenters - very valuable.

Sustainability (for showing that no one who doesn't have an underlying organization has yet figured out how to survive) and Selecting and Evaluation Digital Materials

CWIS Demonstration NSDL Search Service Presentation NSDL Fedora Presenation

Poster session Informal conversations

The sessions about the research how teachers use digital resources were very useful to me

CI to see what they are working on. Wrapup session on Friday with the high level overview on NSDL/NSF. Poster session was good to meet people and talk about ideas.

the time between activities, spent meeting with folks, was most valuable

The poster sessions were a wonderful chance to meet people whose names were familiar, and talk with them in depth about their experiences. The informal atmosphere, with food and beverages, made this a fun event.

Updates with NSF, CI and SCs. Most session topics seemed interesting too, though I wasnt able to attend many (see Q. 16)

Poster session was great. I think perhaps the main reason was the lower attendence: the number of people to talk to was not overwhelming; it wasn't too crowded. The posters were a little small, but we all managed.

Sessions on K-12 education, particularly on standards

a private meeting with some CI people. Tuesday technical meeting Web-metrics sessions

I thought the EIESC Standing Committee meeting was interesting from the standpoint that it substantiated my contention that NSDL projects (including CI) have little interest in evaluation or measuring impact. There is a noticeable difference between the importance of evaluation expressed by most members of the NSDL community, and the allocation of funds to support evaluation. This gap is present within NSDL projects, CI, and NSF/NSDL program.

Informal activities tended to be most valuable to me.

Presentations, like the poster session, that actually showed the work being done, or planned were by far the most valuable. I think many more reports from projects would liven up the meeting and could create more sharing opportunities.

Pathways technical working group CWIS workshop Workshop on NSDL Search (only the search part; the Fedora part had been recycled several times, and was largely inaccessible and not useful to the audience)

CI update and poster sessions were most valuable

Although I have been working on our NSDL project for 18 months, this is my first NSDL annual meeting attendance. Here are the things I liked, and why.
     a) New Projects/New People--good for me to begin seeing the big picture and connect email names to faces. This was generally well organized and helpful.

b) The food was good to very good, but there was never enough. I know how it goes though; this is a big sink for money, and you have to keep a lid on it.

c) It is good that you never called for or used meeting volunteers (at least, not me); this is a credit to the team's good planning and execution. Well done.

d) The Wed morning sesssion on evaluating NSDL impact via web metrics was superb. Bob Donahue, Sean Fox and Mic Khoo did a smashing job of explaining the ins and outs of web metrics and how they might be applied to evaluating NSDL impact. Bob Donahue is a very engaging speaker; get this guy back and in front of people again. Sean Fox made it so clear that he really understands this stuff and although not as entertaining as Bob, he makes up for it in the power of the things he says and his depth of understanding.

e) Jim Dorward did a great job in his Wed afternoon session on building evaluative capacity to examine impact. This session got as close as anything I saw to actually examining NSDL impact. He's a very good public speaker and very informed on his subject; use him again.

f) Joe Tront, Brandon Muramatsu and Martha Cyr presented an excellent tutorial workshop Thursday morning on how to select and evaluate digital learning materials, although they assumed that everyone in the audience knew about and were familiar with MERLOT (I was not, and told them so). Their presentation was superbly informative, especially with respect to establishing an excellent editorial structure and process for a digital library.

g) Julie Evans of NetDay and her closeout session on Friday was truly outstanding. Talk about actionable information; boy do they have their finger on the pulse of the HS/MS education culture. This is what you needed for your opening keynote address on Wed morning.

h) Meeting materials were very nicely done; very high quality and sufficiently detailed. I also thougt the meeting was very well organized. Meeting rooms, refreshements and computer support was very, very good. Changes to the schedule were announced and well coordinated and were kept to a minimum. Great job here. Hooray!

i) The poster session were very good. Everyone was friendly and informative. It was a fun atmosphere and I learned a lot talking to all the folks.

breakout sessions, but thee were too many and poorly attended

Poster session - best way to see what is happening in the community as a whole and talk to relevant folks when you see something interesting.

I really liked the crit lab for our standards assignment tool. 18 people showed up and tested the system so we received valuable feedback and made new contacts and publicized the existance of this tool.

1. Presentation of the Core Integration team about the data repository and search services was useful. It helped me, as an engineer, to better understand integration with core services.

2. Standards session on various tools and services that provide standards assignment and alignment was useful. It helped us identify potential partners and collaboration opportunities.

3. Evaluation committee meeting was useful for me to understand some potential pitfalls and various evaluation options for our project. It also helped throw some light on the measuring the impact of NSDL on various aspects of education.

Closing session.   Sustainability interactive panel session.   Poster session.   Standing Committee meeting

CWIS overview

i enjoyed the netday presentation quite well

The closing was excellent! I also enjoyed other panels in which results from studies were revealed. This will help to modify our project to fit the needs of users (now that we have a better idea of what those needs are)

Crit Labs and panels

I got something out of everything I attended

Web Services-->Realize that our group is not alone in our questions/struggles. Beth Carlson - EDC on NSDL Goes to School-->GREAT Report & stats + I have been able to show the results to other educators. Late Thursday night session- Diane Hillman/Stuart (U_WA) on the NSDL Registry Services-Supporting Interoperable Metadata Distribution-->WOW this is the future and non-trivial-->Expanded our group's thinking of what & how for transforming services.

The Pathway sessions provide ideas for implementation for our new Pathways effort.   The Users and Uses session and the evaluation subcomitee meeting provided useful ideans for evaluation of digital library efforts

Poster session provided an opportunity to meet and have smaller discussions with other projects and possible collaborations. Also, provided a good place to iron out some specifics of interaction with CI projects.   Pathways technical meeting and sessions CI services also very useful.

AM 2005 – Online Survey results

The increase in user-oriented sessions was great.

- poster sessions; interactive, free exchange among NDSL peers and potential collaborators - hands-on workshop to learn about new tool (CAT standards) - NSDL update session

Standing committee meetings for opportunities to gauge interest around various issues.

poster session was a very valuable networking

Opening keynote

The sessions on CWIS, Standards, and peer review were most valuable to me. CWIS in particular was useful as it provided the ability to see a working product that is ready to be used.

I felt the session on standards was very useful given the large number of short, but focused presentations.   I enjoyed the session on middle school applications.   The session on web metrics was helpful too.

standing committees were good - when they had plans for action   SIGs were useful

The sessions from the FunWorks because they explained the process they went through and because of their sound pedagogy and extreme responsiveness to teachers real needs.

CI Update, Fedora, NSDL Search

NSDL goes to school sessions.

CI technology introduction sessions were great. We could chat with CI and get a better feel for how our project could be more integrated with the NSDL community. The cross-library usage session was fantastic.

I found the NSF/CI Update very helpful as well as the sessions I participated in. There was useful and timely information covered as well as good discussions.

The poster sessions were excellent -- although attendance was down, the diversity and energy displayed by the posters and their presenters more than made up for it.

Poster session, for loosely structured interactive time.

NSDL Pathways. They provided a good idea for the breadth of these efforts, in particular partnerships and scope of funded efforts

Discussions about standards, the workshop about the Syracuse tool.

Interactive sessions and posters, and panels where controversial issues were addressed and where contexts of use were explored/considered in a real sense. This type of discussion is stimulating and allows new thinking (by developers) to take place, while providing an anchor in the user's reality.

I benefited most from the two plenary speakers (both opening and closing) because I came away with fresh ideas. Also of benefit was the standing committee on Education Impact & Evaluation (the overall vision is sound and seems do-able). The session on Research in Digital Libraries and K-12 Schools was also highly informative and useful. The workshop on Content Alignment was extremely well-planned & presented (possibly the most interactive & engaging of all the sessions I attended).

The breakout session on impact was really helpful.

The most valuable thing to me is to be able to network with others. The poster session is a great venue for this. I also appreciate other networking opportunities

Poster Session. With the ASN, we provide a service to the other project. The Poster Session was a great time to meet everyone.

Short presentations of others' work.

CWIS Workshop

Youth Centered Design   Alignment of DL resources to standards   poster session

Research on Digital LIbrarie in K-12 Schools SIG Why Content Standards are Important NSDL Goes to School First-hand accounts of how teachers are responding to NSDL projects

Research on D Libraries and K-12 Schools CI, Building on Fedora-Based NSDL Repository Tutorial Workshop, CWIS Tech Standing Committee Interactive Panel - NSDL Service Integration   Expanded technology awareness

14 What Sessions/Activities/Presentations Were Least Valuable To You, And Why?

The opening session was fun but didn't provide much useful information.

Opening session speaker was amusing but I wish Julie's presentation had come first. I think we would have seen it refrred to throughout the meeting.

Nothing really struck me a 'least' valuable. A good meeting overall.

opening keynote - no new ideas   CI update - no real content

The plenaries are OK.. glad they are now short.

Everything I attended was valuable, but not always for the reasons intended

Panels often did not seem to have brought together the range of expertise that should have been included - need to seek out the range of possibilities rather than just those who already know each other

All of Tuesday was a waste since K-12 isn't central to our project.

Opening session

Committee meetings since I am a developer my time is best spent discussing implementation tidbits and high level project ideas.

The 'crit lab' sessions were just not long enough to really get going. Several times I found myself part-way through the activity, but unable to finish and provide enough feedback. Also, I would suggest calling this 'Evaluation Lab' or something more positive, to encourage more people to come.

Keynotes. I would rather see that time used for session tracks and more indepth updates with CI and NSF.

policy committee session. Their actual role and sphere of influence needs to be clarified. It mostly seems like they're irrelevant.

Too many sessions were held concurrently. Therefore, having to skip sessions that might have been otherwise beneficial rendered them less valuable.

I didn't attend sessions that were not useful

Much of the beginning sessions were not useful to me, but I recognize that I may be in the minority on that issue.

Opening session, while interesting, really didn't add to the NSDL information base, and I found it not too valuable. Even the CI report didn't give me the information I wanted to gain.

Most was fairly valuable.

I've thrown all of my critiques into this box . .
    a) The keynote opening session was mildly entertaining but generally worthless. I expected to hear a compelling, energizing talk that would frame the value of NSDL and its challenges, especially in view of its customer base, but ir really addressed any substantive issues of NSDL impact, and in fact the entire week never really got to the core of NSDL impact to its customers in any compelling way.
    b) The whole issue of meeting volunteers was disorganized; not well developed. I had signed up as a volunteer online before the meeting, and engaged with a few staffers when I arrived. In general, I was thanked for volunteering, and told that I would be called on when they needed me. I think it simply turned out that they didn't need meeting volunteers and they didn't realize that until they got into it. Anyway, the whole issue of meeting volunteers seemed muddled and confusing to most staffers I talked to.
    c) I thought it was very telling about the health of the NSDL program, that during the Wed morning NSF and CI updates, a question was asked about overall NSDL usage. There was an embarrasing prolonged silence, followed by 'does anybody know' followed by Susan J's gallant attempt to do damage control, which amounted to 'This is hard to do'. This was bad for a newcomer like me to see and hear. I sat there thinking, 'What have I gotten myself into'?
    d) On the down side of the evaluating impact/web metrics session, it became clear to me very quickly that NSDL has not done a good job in deploying actionable web metrics. I mean for a six year old program, I would have expected to see and hear what I heard during this session in year one. During year six, I would have expected to see the results of five years of superb web metrics used to evaluate the merits/demerits of NSDL sub-projects as well as the overall program. The people out in the dot.com world had this figured out a while back and are continuing to refine this whole issue of web metrics. Is there a problem here? I think so.
    …
    f) We had around 60 out of the nearly 200 NSDL projects represented at the poster sessions. I'm not sure the mode of self selecting is the best way to manage this. The best run and most productive efforts should be required to attend and submit a poster; this should be at least 10% of the 200. Then let the NSF Program Director pick another

10% that he wants to have present posters, and then open up the other slots to self selectors. I had to wonder if the posters really represented a healthy cross section of the overall program.

g) I was very surprised by the lack of commentary and interest in NSDL customers. In fact, I left with the distinct impression that some projects actually don't know who their customers are, or do know and aren't really concerned about them. The only posters I saw with information about customers, presented dismal statistics about how few of their customer base knows about or uses NSDL resources. This is serious problem, if my impressions are accurate.

h) I found a curious imbalance in where the NSDL resources are going. There's a lot of stuff going on with DLESE or spinoff projects to DLESE. I mean, how large is the customer base of earth science programs in high schools and colleges? On the other hand, I saw almost nothing to do with Chemistry all week. I would have thought that Chemistry would figure hugely in this effort. This IS all about SCIENCE and chemistry is huge in science education in America. Where is it in NSDL?

N/A

Opening keynote was fun but it did not really add to my nsdl experience per se.

Opening session.

Web services. Half of the mtg was spent with brief intros.

1st keynote

My only complaint is that I wanted to be in two or three or four places at once and I had to pick one.

All the sessions that I attended were useful

Keynotes.

- didn't need the zip-up note pad included in registration packet; very nice but excessive

Opening keynote. While entertaining, it lacked direct inspiration or hard-hitting information for the NSDL community.

The emphasis on the 'interactive panels' (such as Web Services) seemed designed to solicit information from the audience about their needs for some tool/technology.   However, most of the audience seemed to be looking for a basic informative overview of the technology in question, and were not in a good position to offer feedback.

opening keynote and CI presentations - little substance or value

Wished for more variety and staggered programming so not all k-16 ed sessions occurred at same time.

I didn't attend any sessions that weren't useful.

Sessions that did not approach their presentations from the perspective of what problem was solved, but rather was just a show and tell. (Sales-y)

They were all helpful to some extent -

The opening presentation. I couldn't really follow his points.

In dpeth sessions about other's work without a chance to integrate their lessons learned.

I attended most of the technical sessions, but there was little practical information. Most of it was theory.

n/a

Crit Lab where software was not yet available for review

15 What Thing(s) Did You Like Most About The Annual Meeting?

variety of sessions available

Meeting people from projects, having face to face time

Opportunity to talk to a lot of people and get filled in on the details of some very interesting projects.

The ability to talk to a lot of different people about many topics.

talking with people

The hotel worked great... the location was really good. The staff organized things SO WELL.

interaction with peers

talking with others

The most important thing about the annual meeting is that it provides a forum for collaboration to occur.

Much better location than Chicago. Found useful technical information at some posters and in some sessions.

I liked that the lodging and meeting rooms were in the same location and I liked that the hotel was convenient to local shops and restaurants.

Opportunity to talk to various people

I liked that everything was in one building. And that the meeting was in an area of a city with quick access to quality dining.

Opportunities to meet with lots of different project representatives; poster sessions.

food, drink, people

Good location, good food. Really great to meet people on other projects.

Location was a nice change from DC or Chicago, more room in the poster session, nice to have 2 poster display opps.

The hotel was really nice; it was in a convenient location; and it was convenient to have the Meeting in the hotel where we were staying. The food was great too.

great hotel - great timing in the renovation cycle. Nice deep government discount, too.   The double poster sessions worked well for me. Of course the second one was not so well attended, but it allowed for some discussions of greater depth.

The interchange of ideas greatly aided the generation of new concepts and possible sub-projects within my own project.

chance to collaborate and network

Annual update. Meeting the various committees and reports on the projects. Good way to gauge overall progress.

The hotel was very nice, and seemed responsive when problems developed. I also enjoy talking to people about their projects--the poster sessions are good for that.

Opportunity to interact face-to-face with other meeting attendees. Opportunity to feel the pulse of NSDL from its project members.

The meeting was well managed (good food, good schedule, workable formats, walkable environment). The time frame (number of days) could be tightened up a bit. I liked the poster session a lot - here's where the real information about projects was found. I'd like to see these expanded on the second night to actual presentations.

Informal meetings with CI and other project staff that we share interest/projects with.

opportunity to talk to other project leaders

Getting togteher with people and forming new collaborations

Meeting people whose work is related and meeting people who we are already working with. We got a lot of work done face-to-face which normally is done by email or phone. It is important to meet people for real once in a while.

- The whole meeting was very well organized.   - Meetings stuck to their schedule(atleast the ones   I was in).

Realistic discussions about current status of the NSDL in view of evolving technological arena (e.g., Google scholar). Practical insights were shared about how to move forward with the NSDL.   Less focus on what isn't working than in

past meetings.

Better location

opportunity to meet with collaborators face to face, expand interest in my projects

many opportunities for discussion

Networking, closing speaker, opportunity to learn about other projects and ways in which we might work together, ideas about outreach, location! much better than last year - food galore!!!

Talking with other projects to whom we can either provide something or from whom we can request something.

Location in Denver - Much better than the Chicago hotel last year.

Opportunity to meet face 2 face with other nsdl folks

The poster session was an excellent.   In general the meeting was excellent. It was more of a working meeting.

Opportunity to work out points of collaboration face-to-face and forge relationships that can be carried out by teleconference and email more smoothly.

- good central location (Denver - mid-US) - well organized - superb staff - cool clear organizer in registration packet - enthusiasm exhibited by so many people involved - great opportunitiy to have in-person work sessions with our NSDL team (brings

Informal networking.

Opeing keynote -- thought provoking, funny, provokative

The ability to interact with other projects. I'd like to see an extended technical program in the future, with more opportunities to share technical details, preferably tutorials for Fedora, OnRamp, and NSDL's web services in the style of the CWIS session where people can log in and be guided through the process of implementing the tools that have been developed.

networking poster session & reception Larry Johnson's videos at keynote

time to talk with people

The two poster sessions.

Opportunity to meet with others, coordinate and discuss collaborative projects

Being able to get a feel of our project's scope and place in the NSDL. Meeing the CI and discussing integration and other things with them.   We found that the service that we provide is useful to many libraries and we are looking into ways to make a true service available.

It is very helpful to have the opportunity to talk one-on-one with other projects, CI, and NSF.

Networking... Great food at the Poster Session

Being able to talk face to face with other projects to share ideas and common cause.

Networking with people

The opportunity to network with dedicated people and to see first-hand what the other projects are doing.

I liked the format of the meetings, and that they varied the breakfact, it was substantial and they left it out long enough.

The small discussion groups.

Getting with all the other project folks.

people

The opportunity to interact with other developers and NSDL gurus. It provided a sense of community and provided valuable resources.

The quality of the presentations.   The excellent organization.

Opportunity to talk with people from other projects, learn about broader efforts and future plans for NSDL, identify opportunities for collaboration

Opportunity to find out what other projects are doing, learn about NSDL's future direction, and identify possible collaborators.

16 What Thing(s) Did You Like Least About The Annual Meeting?

How no fault to find with this one.

Too many concurrent sessions of interest.

no real vision for NSDL   need more effort to bring Pathways together to work together on common issues   timing during year   lack of broad diversity in membership

There is no opportunity (or incentive) to generate NEW work and new collaborations.   Everyone who is funded is.... well funded. And there is no funding in the NSDL for 'mingrants' or anything that could extract really interesting short-term inter-project collaborations.   If there were, say, three $5k minigrants going to the BEST three mini proposals that included MORE than ONE project, and a session where projects could figure out their ideas... some REALLY interesting things might result.

I understand the importance of K-12 , but the refocus seemed to come at the expense of the needs of those of use who work with higher ed.

no specific complaints

As with all US science, funding moves on glacier time when ideas and collaborations move on internet time. What good does it do to see a niche if one knows that it'll be 6 months before one can write a proposal and another 6 months before it can be evaluated? It was noted that there's a missing focus group on Chemistry. There were 3 chemistry NSDL projects with representatives in attendance. Why couldn't a 1 paragraph proposal have been written in real time and funded right then if that's an obvious need?

Perhaps the closing session could end earlier to allow for earlier flights home. Not a critical issue, though.

Travel and some of plenary sessions

Having two rooms on the lower level, tucked away in a corner without a good map, was not good. Also, it would have been nice if the session titles were on a plackard next to the doors

Breakfast food.

early mornings

Too much brainstorming re NSDL itself. I know NSDL needs to continually evaluate in order to make changes to sustain itself, but my impression was that the organization needs more confidence.

There werent enough session tracks. With only one track in the am and pm, if you had a presentation to give during both tracks (as I did) you basically missed an entire day of the event and couldnt attend any sessions. It would have been better to break out the 90 min tracks into two 45 min tracks so there were more threads and more opps for presenters to attend sessions.   Also, it is always disappointing to me how few NSF program officers attend, even when the event is in DC. For many projects it's the only opportunity to connect with the POs, and it would be great to see others there (Lee and Dave's attendance is always appreciated). I am not sure what can be done to encourage their attendance, but just offering the comment.

I didn't like the fact that, when I reserved rooms for my group, we wanted to share rooms (2 ppl/room, w/ double beds), but the hotel said that no double rooms were available, and we had to sign up for king beds; but when we actually arrived, everyone in my group was given their own room with double beds and told that no king rooms were available. So we ended up paying twice as much for rooms as we should have (since we were forced to reserve 1 room per person).

Denver, while a lovely city and fun to visit, seems like a poor location. We need to make it easy for the NSF to attend. We need to make it easy for any money source to attend.   I'm also questioning whether it was a good use of money and time for me (a CI techie) to attend.

Too many concurrent sessions.   In some areas it seems that almost no progress has been made since last year's meeting. I get the impression that many people are waiting for someone else to come up with workable solutions to overall issues.

not enough time to go into detail on some sessions

A day too long.

Overall, the meeting lacked a sense of vitality.   Controversial or stimulating discussions were lacking in the sessions I attended.

Politics.

AM 2005 – Online Survey results

Some sessions running over time.

The usefulness of the entire meeting was about 50% or less. I think everyone is just too busy to attend a meeting with a less than 50% usefullness quotient. But since everyone might have a different definition of usefulness, you may be hitting the majority of attendees.

Opening session was a bit restrained...something about the room perhaps.

the lack of diversity. I was appalled at the sparcity of attendance by underrepresented minorities. Is criterion 2 being ignored by NSDL?

Program information provided is too sparse. having just the schedule with titles of sessions does not provide enough information to make an intelligent choice about which breakout session will be most useful.

Only one breakfast out of three with oatmeal :-).

Assembly meeting didn't involve the membership in governance discussions.   Opening session speaker provided amusing video clips (e.g., herding cats, building planes in the air). The speaker, however, failed to share vision about where we can go with the NSDL and how to get there.

Lack of meaningful content for collection developers. So much of it seems asbtract and fuzzy. I see a need for a stronger technical track in the future.

too many concurrent sessions to choose from (meaning one had to be too selective, missed too many things) and too much time without any sessions (committee meetings)

Too many sessions scheduled at the same time - perhaps have either fewer sessions or have shorter times for some presentations in order to allow time to participate in more.   For example, the fedora and nsdl search service are of interest to almost everyone - so our presentation that was scheduled at the same time had no one attend - yet we needed to hang around in case some one attended so we missed most of the fedora presentation.

Too hectic. Too many concurrent sessions. Most sessions had few people attending. Not much traffic at the poster session. I think some of this was because fewer people were attending this year than previous years.

The nsdl web site needs to have the conference more prominantly displayed (linked). It was very difficult to find the program etc.

Couldn't attend all the sessions that we wanted to attend

Scheduling of committee meetings. Had to make choices between a couple of commitees since they were concurrent.

- our Friday event was not well attended; everyone had gone by then

Redundancy.

I found the rampant laptop use at sessions to be extremely obnoxious. In any given session, it seemed like half of the audience was not paying attention. This in turn seemed to reduce the burden on the speakers to give clear, well-organized presentations.

The opening speech. (The closing speech, however, was fabulous. I was sad to see that it was scheduled after many had already left.)

The report backs on the policy and standing commitees were a bit dry and i wonder if there is a way to do this more quickly.

no users - poor diversity among the people   lack of real attention to the theme - broadening impact - we should have left with a clear action plan to broaden the impact

Still think some actual sessions on collaborating and 'how to' for basic NSDL stuff (like meta-data for NSDL) etc would be very beneficial

Interacting with related projects.

It was difficult to attend sessions other than the ones I was involved with. Perhaps fewer sessions, next year?

The meeting dates was problematic, both in terms of personal scheduling and because having it the week before Thanksgiving made making travel arrangements difficult.

Poor organization of notification of accepted proposals. We were accepted for a panel presentation, but never notified. I found out when it showed up on the web site. In addition, panel sessions were shortened from 90 minutes to 45. This required me to substantially reorganize and replan my session, including which speakers I could still fit

into the presentation, or reasonably ask to come given the short presentation time.

It was not made clear that we had to arrange specifically for PC/Windows machines and not Macs for our crit lab session. We had to move the session to a different room and lost significant time (and possible participants) as a result.

In candor, I believe we need more focus on promotion, publicity, and exposure of our wonderful sets of resources. This, to me, is THE top priority now that we have already established so many fine collections, yet I felt that my voice was a distinct minority.

I thought it was really well-done - no complaints.

The large plenary sessions was in a room that was to large so it was hard to hear the speaker

Some of the committee meetings were just repeat sessions of past meetings.

Lack of 'we're all working toward the same goal' feeling. It still feels more like a collection of separate projects than a community.

The technical portions were not informative enough. It seemed as if the sessions were more aligned to collect feedback on where NSDL should go and do, but not helping new projects and developers to get there.   There should be more geared toward new projects in the sessions.

n/a

Overlap of sessions on topic related to K-12 so that I was unable to attend several sessions that were also of interest My resentation proposal was accepted but time for presentation was cut in half after I had obtained commitments from two other presenters which made it difficult to give enough time to each presenter.

Overlapping sessions made it very hard to 'track' along a path of interest.

18 Please Use The Box Below If You Have Any Further Comments About The Annual Meeting

engage user community

Congrats to the staff for a great meeting... everything worked (including this survey)

No meeting will be perfect in all cases for all needs. this seems to be pretty good mix. would help faculty to have fully reviewed sessions for tenure/promotion

I get the feeling that no one is in charge of the NSDL project: there seems to be no project management plan in place and there is a noticable lack of leadership. My understanding from talking with folks is that the technical projects promised have been promised for a long time with no progress. I attended one session and found no technical content. Other drop ins to other sessions yielded the same result.   My comment about the annual meeting is to get some (a lot!) of technical content. Computer techies should have a track as well as the librarian techies. It's good to have cross-fertilization and some of those sessions as keynote sessions. But the conference, for me to attend again, must have some technical reasons. Denver in November is not a good reason.

The question about one's NSDL projects doesn't quite fit me. I had worked on an NSDL project, but now I'm working on a non-NSDL but closely associated project.

the main thing was the chance to get out of town for a few days

The planning committee and CI always do a great job organizing this event, and it is certainly hard to please everyone. So many thanks for their hard work. These are just suggestions for future planning, not criticisms!

Maybe some BOF sessions for actual coders? (Say, at 2006 meeting, a techie NDR API session for actual coders ... or maybe even a room set aside for half a day for techies to learn about the NDR API, how to use it, and ask questions to their hearts content. A sort of workshop. A lot of the techies were skipping sessions and sitting in the 'programmers' lounge' near the registration desk anyway -- why not set up a venue to suit them in which they can exchange useful information?

One thing that bugs me (and I mentioned this last year): why don't the name tags have the participant's affiliation on them? In many cases, one learns of a project's efforts before knowing who the players are.   This would greatly aid in fostering participation, forming partnerships, etc. and would be extremely simple to do.   Please take care of this for next year's meeting.

Excellent venue!! Cheap flights; very affordable and good conference hotel; plenty of restaurants nearby. Denver go!

Much better location in Denver than at last year'sChicago meeting

I think the focus needs to be on the projects. There is not a lot of cohesiveness, but we can't get there without talking and sharing more. The NSDL is an amazing group of bright and talented people, but they all seem to be orbiting in their own galaxies.

Thanks to all the folks who put this thing together. It's a lot of work. I think most attendees were pretty darn happy with it.

I re-iterate what I said in 16 above. I cannot imagine why there was such poor diversity. Does that really reflect diversity of NSDL? Sure the room was half full of women, and that's great, but that's only a partial solution.

Generally I liked it, but I still think it might be better.

Meeting was not really worth the time and effort it took to attend. We had relatively few people stop by our poster and only 3 persons attended our Friday morning panel presentation. The main advantage was that of getting our team together for planning activities and assigning tasks for the comiing year. We thought the meeting was pretty flat and dull. Too many different projects going off in their own directions

I was a panel reviewer AND surprized that you put my name in the program - Thank you.

We started ot as a collections in 2000 and received a Pathways grant in 2005. This should explain previous answers.

Thanks for your hard work on this meeting!

Make sure that caffeine is always available throughout the day. I was falling asleep in the afternoon!

seems some standing committees do little until right before the meeting - perhaps new leadership is needed, or funding for the efforts   there should be more focus on getting pathways projects together to make the MOU real - with action plans for collaboration and impact   a full day track for addressing making the MOU real would be very useful to which each pathway must be represented

AM 2005 – Online Survey results

There were far too many concurrent sessions. Many sessions had very low audience attendance.

Note that at the beginning of the survey you acknowledge that people may be PI/co-PI on a current and past project but then in aswering the questions as to which tracks and when did funding started we could only select one. I chose to identify the information for my first project and not my current project which is a Services-Usage Workshops project and started in 2005).

The organizers did a great job!

The venue was excellent. The organization was superb.

Good job by planning committee!

All-in-all a great job by the organizers! I learned much and feel that our project will benefit from the experience. The closing presenter should have been the presenter for the opening session.