

Summary of EIESC Activities in Detail, 2001-2005

**Compiled by Sarah Giersch
November 2005**

This document provides details of EIESC activities excerpted and highlighted from meeting notes and slides. It is arranged chronologically and within years by taskforce. Having the luxury of hindsight, the outcomes of some activities are placed within the chronological context of a taskforce in some cases before the outcome was known at the time. An accompanying document (*EIESC Documents List, 2001-2005*) provides supporting information, methodologies and tools for all of these activities.

Note from the compiler:

The activities below demonstrate how the EIESC has expended considerable effort (in volunteer hours and some supplemental funding) grappling with how to evaluate NSDL. Activities have been focused not on evaluating individual digital libraries but on identifying factors common across all the digital libraries that comprise the distributed NSDL. One of the primary challenges (even evidenced in this paragraph) is to define what NSDL is. Attendees at the 2003 Evaluation Workshop grappled with this (evaluate the actual and the intended NSDL), and the 2002 Pilot Study identified other instantiations of NSDL (evaluate NSDL organizational and governance structures, site usage and collections).

In some cases, initial EIESC activities resulted, in subsequent years, in highly detailed attempts to identify appropriate measures (e.g., the 2002-2005 Controlled Vocabulary taskforce, the 2004 DList taskforce to measure impact). What these activities demonstrate more than anything is that NSDL cannot be evaluated with off-the-shelf methodologies and tools. The metaphor of building an airplane while trying to fly it is quite appropriate. This doesn't mean efforts to conduct an NSDL-wide evaluation should not be undertaken. Rather, evaluation efforts should be approached as an opportunity to advance the field of evaluation in digital libraries as a whole.

Another result of EIESC activities is related to the NSDL Standing Committee structure, which provided an opportunity for collaboration between individuals, NSDL projects, Standing Committees (e.g., 2004 Web Metrics Workshop) and Core Integration (NSDL Annual Report). While several barriers to extensive project-level collaboration have been identified (i.e., not enough time, not part of project description, NSF's competitive funding structure), the Standing Committees have provided a place for distributed projects to come together around common needs and interests. This is potentially another factor to include in an evaluation of NSDL.

EIESC Organization

Chair, Jan 2005 – Dec 2006, Laura Bartolo - lbartolo@kent.edu

Vice-Chair, Jan 2005 – Dec 2006, Flora McMartin – mcmartin@merlot.org

Co-Chair, Jan 2005 – Dec 2006, Anne Diekema, diekemar@syr.edu

Policy Committee Liaison, Jan-2005 – Dec 2006, Lillian (Boots) Cassel - cassel@acm.org

Core Integration Liaison, Mick Khoo - mjkhoo@ucar.edu

Previous Officers

Anita Coleman – Chair, Jan 2004 – Dec 2005, asc@u.arizona.edu

Laura Bartolo - Vice-Chair, Jan 2004 – Dec 2005, lbartolo@kent.edu

[Tamara Sumner](#) - Chair, Jan 2002 - Dec 2003

[Sarah Giersch](#) - Co-Chair, Jan 2002 - Dec 2003

[Flora McMartin](#) - Chair, Jan 2000 - Dec 2001

Previous Policy Committee Liaisons

Howard Burrows, Jan 2002 – Dec 2004

Flora McMartin, Jan 2002 - Dec 2004

Previous Core Integration Liaison

Casey Jones, Jan 2002 – July 2005

Charter

Ensure that participatory and stakeholder evaluation principles are integrated into the design, development and implementation of the NSDL

- Engaging diverse community in evaluation (priority setting and doing)
- Accumulating baseline data on use and collections
- Promoting a culture of user-centered design
 - sharing instruments and expertise
 - capacity building
- Providing formative input to designers, policy makers
- Open to all interested participants
- Formerly the Evaluation Working Group (see EIESC Description < <http://eduimpact.comm.nsdl.org/events/?pager=119>>)

How to Join

- Subscribe to the EIESC listserv
- Attend EIESC meetings
- Send Mick Khoo, the CI Liaison, an email with your name and your project to be added to the EIESC Membership page. < <http://eduimpact.comm.nsdl.org/events/?pager=120>>

Overview of EIESC Activities

2001

During the second NSDL Annual (All-Projects) Meeting (December 3-4, 2001), a group comprised of people funded under NSDL, DLI-2 and other NSF programs met to discuss evaluation issues that concern the National Science Digital Library. At the suggestion of the NSDL Policy Committee, the Evaluation Working Group (EWG) changed its name to the Educational Impact and Evaluation Standing Committee in late 2002. The primary charter of the EWG was to develop evaluation expertise, share instruments, and work with the Core Integration team to conduct library evaluations useful for guiding the early stages of the design process. The full charter of the EIESC is found above.

Outcomes of the December 2001 meeting included:

- Flora McMartin elected to NSDL Policy Committee.
- Tammy Sumner elected to Chair NSDL Evaluation Working Group.
- Meeting attendees established a goal for the working group for 2002: t
To complete a pilot evaluation of the distributed NSDL. Four questions articulated by the working group were to be addressed in the pilot study:
 1. How are people using the libraries?
 2. How are the collections growing?
 3. How is the distributed library building and community governance processes working?
 4. What are the issues in conducting distributed evaluation activities and what could best be done centrally?

2002

In February 2002, 17 representatives from NSDL projects, the Core Integration team and NSF program officers convened to develop plans and a timeline to answer the four questions articulated by the Evaluation Working Group in 2001. The pilot study participants included DLESE, iLumina, NSDL Communications Portal, Math Forum, SMETE.ORG and the ESIP Federation. Members of the pilot sites developed methodologies and instruments and conducted a pilot test during spring and summer of 2002. The data was analyzed in early fall and presented to the newly-named Education Impact and Evaluation Standing Committee at the 2002 NSDL Annual Meeting. Table 1 details the questions, related instruments, results and recommendations from the pilot study.

Table 1: 2002 NSDL Evaluation Pilot Study Summary

Question	Instrument	Results	Recommendations
How are people using the libraries?	Users & Usage Worksheet	1. Considerable use of library sites already exists (millions of sessions per month) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Simply measuring NSDL Core Portal traffic will severely undercount overall usage of NSDL 2. <i>Monthly</i> reporting of <i>reliable</i> usage metrics is problematic <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Monthly is too frequent even though time required to report is not long (about an hour 	Consider a sampling methodology with analysis performed centrally – focus initially on “are people using the libraries” to test method

Summary of EIESC Activities in Detail 2001-2005

		<p>or two)</p> <p>b. Treatment of crawlers and internal visitors inconsistent</p> <p>3. Incentives:</p> <p>a. Return information on how site is doing relative to (anonymous) others</p> <p>b. Build reporting costs into project budget</p>	
How are the collections growing?	Collections Worksheet	<p>1. Library collections measured in millions of objects, grew steadily during pilot</p> <p>2. Some metrics could best be collected by CI over union catalog</p> <p>a. Requires collections to map to standard controlled vocabularies for evaluation purposes only</p> <p>i. Promising: Learning Context and Resource Type</p> <p>ii. Not promising: Subject – extreme diversity</p> <p>3. Large amounts of non-traditional resources with no metadata (Pages, Events, Jobs, Discussions, etc)</p> <p>a. Recommend distributed efforts focus on measuring the growth and use of these types of community collections</p>	Create (simple) evaluation vocabularies for learning context, resource type, and subject. Work with volunteer collections and CI to test method.
How is the distributed library building and community governance processes working?	Library Building & Governance Survey (aka Annual Survey, PI Survey, or Annual PI Survey)	<p>1. 26 respondents ranging from PIs, technical staff, grad students, etc.</p> <p>2. Enthusiastic about building an NSDL</p> <p>3. Effective collaboration perceived to be critical, but frustrated with</p> <p>a. Current NSDL communication mechanisms</p> <p>b. Travel and meeting budgets getting cut by NSF</p> <p>4. All Projects Meeting valuable – place to meet collaborators</p> <p>5. Report knowing what components of NSDL governance for, but conversely, not what they are doing</p>	Revise and administer annually.
What are the issues in conducting distributed evaluation activities and what could best be done centrally?	Proposed Rationale and Research Questions to Assess Effectiveness of NSDL Pilot Evaluation	Could not find results at the time of compilation	

In a report to the NSDL National Visiting Committee, EIESC Chair Tamara Sumner identified three “meta” lessons learned from 2002 Evaluation Pilot Study:

- Collection of reliable usage metrics across distributed sites still requires considerable thought
- Consider including in subsequent evaluation activities a questionnaire on current evaluation practices and needs as a variable component of Annual Survey. These results could inform the development of workshops by CI and others.

- Consider conducting a landscape analysis of funded projects, and those that did not receive follow-on funding. The purpose of the landscape analysis is to concisely characterize the state of the program to determine areas that are underrepresented or missing pieces of critical functionality.

Policy changes discussed during the EIESC meeting in December included:

- Setting term limits for EIESC Committee Chair and Vice-Chair positions at two years. Elections for new officers will be held at the end of 2003;
- Establishing a regular meeting schedule: two face-to-face meetings held at the NSDL Annual Meeting and around the Joint Conference on Digital Libraries, with other f2f and teleconferences as necessary;
- Nominating and electing Sarah Giersch (formerly acting Secretary) to be EIESC Vice-Chair.

The EIESC meeting also served to set the agenda for EIESC activities in the coming year, summarized in Table 2.

Summary of EIESC Activities in Detail 2001-2005

Table 2: EIESC To-Do List for 2003			
Question	Taskforce	To Do	People
How are people using the libraries?	Users & Usage	1. Explore a sampling approach to collecting usage data that focuses getting a better estimate on the overall volume of library use	1. Sampling: Tammy Sumner will assemble a team in the new year
How are the collections growing?	Collections Assessment	1. Follow up with the CI on the process and mechanics of gathering collections data, consider defining controlled vocabularies for evaluation purposes only. 2. Discuss ways of characterizing services	1. Vocabulary: Judy Ridgway (lead), Boots Cassell, Mimi Recker, Barb DeFelice 2. Services: [no name assigned]
How is the distributed library building and community governance processes working?	Annual PI Survey	1. Revise the survey and methodology 2. Follow up with a contact about creating a valid survey instrument 3. Create a 2 pg. list of survey results and action items	1. Survey: Mary Marlino (lead), Sarah Giersch, Flora McMartin, Bruce Grant, Mick Khoo 2. Validation: Jim Dorward 3. Survey action items: [no name assigned; this was not completed]
What are the issues in conducting distributed evaluation activities and what could best be done centrally?	Evaluation Workshop	1. Conduct an Evaluation Practices Survey 2. Convene a workshop based on survey results, in part to explore education impact	1. Survey: Mary Marlino (lead) 2. Workshop: Mary Marlino (lead), Casey Jones, Ellen Iverson, Flora McMartin, Howard Burrows, Jim Dorward, Laura Bartolo, Liz Liddy, Lillian Cassel, Mimi Recker, Bob Downs, Tammy Sumner

2003

Work on the EIESC Taskforces continued during spring 2003. Additionally, two more activities were added, one to the Annual PI Survey taskforce, and one to the Collections taskforce. Also, an EIESC member represented the committee on the Annual Meeting Planning Committee (Sarah Giersch, 2003, 2004, Chris Walker, 2004, 2005).

Recognizing that the wealth of data gathered through the Annual PI Survey and other EIESC surveys could do more than inform policy decisions and committee activities, an idea was put forward to create an Annual Report for NSDL. The report would contain data-driven content from EIESC surveys but would also contain features about NSDL and project accomplishments and could be used for outreach and publicity efforts. The inaugural issue was deemed a Progress Report, but subsequent reports have been issued annually. Work on the report was undertaken jointly by EIESC members and Core Integration Communications Director, Carol Minton Morris.

In addition to the Collections taskforce Controlled Vocabulary project (Judy Ridgway, lead; defining controlled vocabularies for “format,” “learning resource type,” “audience,” and “discipline”), a new activity was proposed to provide another angle on evaluating NSDL: crosswalking collections metadata for “audience,” “type,” and “subject” (gathered during the 2002 Pilot Study) to be used to analyze the depth and breadth of the resources within the NSDL distributed collections. This was lead by Anita Coleman of the GROW Project.

During spring, other standing committees and the Core Integration undertook survey efforts, which EIESC members were involved with developing and analyzing, including a survey from the Sustainability Standing Committee on NSDL projects’ sustainability plans and needs (lead by Sarah Giersch) and an NSDL Project Exit Survey from Core Integration (lead by Casey Jones) given to projects whose funding cycle was ending.

By the time of the June EIESC meeting at JCDL 2003 (Houston, Texas), there was much to discuss about in-progress activities, which are summarized in the presentation slides (http://eduimpact.comm.nsd.org/doc_tracker/docs_download.php?id=429) and meeting notes (http://eduimpact.comm.nsd.org/doc_tracker/docs_download.php?id=428). In early October, the Evaluation Workshop was held in Washington, DC (<http://eduimpact.comm.nsd.org/evalworkshop/index2.php>). Full reports about the workshop and other EIESC activities were made at the 2003 NSDL Annual Meeting (Washington, DC), summarized in Table 3 below.

During the EIESC meeting, nominations were taken for positions of Chair and Vice-Chair. Anita Coleman and Laura Bartolo (respectively) were put forward to be elected later via email.

Summary of EIESC Activities in Detail 2001-2005

Table 3: Summary of 2003 NSDL EIESC Activities

Question	Taskforce	Activities / Results	Recommendations
How are people using the libraries?	Users & Usage	1. Usage study: Designed to examine scalable, centralized, sampling approaches to web metrics collection and analyses. Key issues to consider are algorithmic approaches for automatic data preparation, sampling methodologies, and reporting formats.	1. The EIESC is working to determine the best means for accomplishing this goal; nothing to report
How are the collections growing?	Collections Assessment	1. Controlled Vocabulary (Judy Ridgway, lead): examining new approaches towards collection assessment, in particular with respect to automatic or semi-automatic analyses of the NSDL metadata repository. The goal is to be able to track the growth of the repository across subject, audience, and resource type dimensions. A key difficulty is that all libraries are using different controlled vocabularies in important collection and item-level metadata fields (including resource type, subject, audience). 2. Crosswalk Analysis (Anita Coleman): interim documents posted on the EIESC website	1. <i>Working Group recommendation</i> : Once the assessment/ reporting tool is in place, (1) reports should be generated at regular intervals, (2) the terms that do not fit into any of the cross-walks should be monitored so that additional mappings can be developed as needed, and (3) a mechanism should be developed so that changes in collections' vocabularies can be supported automatically. <i>EIESC recommendation</i> : Judy and team should press forward 2. There were not conclusions to report
How is the distributed library building and community governance processes working?	Annual PI Survey	1. PI Survey (Sarah Giersch, lead): Survey revised and tested for validity and usability, delivered to every NSDL project; results are summarized in a report; the pilot sparked the idea of creating an "Evaluation" category for the Collaboration Finder and for creating the NSDL Progress Report; the final survey provided data for the NSDL Progress Report 2. Annual Report (EIESC, Carol Minton Morris, lead): Representatives of the EIESC and NSDL Core Integration convened to design, gather data, and produce an Annual Report summarizing the current 'state-of-the-union' for NSDL. The report pulled together primary accomplishments to date and the evaluation data collected from the pilot study and workshops conducted by the EIESC. This report was envisioned to be produced yearly as a joint EIESC and CI effort. The first NSDL Progress Report covered NSDL from Fall 2000 to Summer 2003. It was delivered during the Annual Meeting where the committee discussed EIESC's continuing involvement 3. Exit Survey (Casey Jones, lead): given to all NSDL projects ending their funding cycle; using some survey questions to populate the Collaboration Finder	1. Consider the following for re-use: design so the same basic instrument can be used regularly – cost and time savings; Clarify the purposes and timing of the Annual PI Survey relative to other data-gathering activities occurring across NSDL 2. EIESC recognizes the need to pull together its work in some readable account that is disseminated to necessary audience. Whether it appears in NSDL report is a separate issue. Need a more standardized process for coordinating SC work with Core Integration (CI) outreach group. 3. Survey was not concluded, no recommendations
What are the issues in conducting distributed evaluation activities and what could best be done centrally?	Evaluation Workshop	1. Conduct an Evaluation Practices Survey (Casey Jones, Mary Marlino, lead): Distributed 2002 All Projects Meeting (n=46); Responses difficult to characterize (see report); 2. Evaluation Workshop (Mary Marlino, lead): Context: few programmatic evaluations models but nothing really analogous to NSDL; Goal: to develop a framework that accommodates a fleet of projects from small to large; Supplemental funding supported: literature review, handbook for digital library evaluation, position paper, workshop in early October	1. Issues raised from survey: Coordinating NSDL-wide (e.g., online surveys, Annual meeting surveys); Collaborating with other SCs / groups; Data archiving; Reporting and dissemination 2. Begin documenting "Actual NSDL" and "Intended NSDL"; Results: http://eduimpact.comm.nsdlib.org/evalworkshop

2004

Based on the recommendations from the October 2003 EIESC meeting, the following taskforce activities were carried through to 2004, and a new activity was added. Taskforce leads brought everyone up to date (see Table 4) on the first teleconference of the year with new officers Anita Coleman (Chair) and Laura Bartolo (Vice-Chair).

Question	Taskforce	To Do	People
How are people using the libraries?	Users & Usage	1. The 2002 pilot study concluded that it was difficult to provide a consistently high-level data on a monthly basis. The Technology SC has become interested in the technology issues in answering this question. A joint task force between the EIESC and Technology SC would have EIESC providing expertise on types of information to be gathered and the Technology SC addressing the technology issues. A teleconference on Webmetrics will be scheduled for March	1. Tammy Sumner (lead), Bob Downs, Mimi Recker, Jim Dorward
How are the collections growing?	Collections Assessment	1. Controlled vocabulary: Previous approaches to cataloging (in general) resources in NSDL metadata repository: developing standard terms to describe NSDL collection (manual), Lexical Analysis and Support Vector Machines (automated-limited success), and cataloging of "training" resources (manual to instruct further automatic – all not successful; Next steps: Liz Liddy provide recommendations on high-level approach to describing MR; explore hybrid approach to combine existing metadata One possible way forward would be to submit a proposal (a clustering experiment would provide useful input) from someone with a computer science background. 2. Crosswalk: this approach was abandoned because many of the fields were empty.	3. Vocabulary: Judy Ridgway (lead), Liz Liddy, Tammy Sumner
How is the distributed	Annual PI Survey	1. PI Survey: Issues from 2003: synchronizing PI Survey and	1. PI Survey: Sarah Giersch (lead),

Question	Taskforce	To Do	People
library building and community governance processes working?		Annual Report timelines; don't want to ask the same questions year after year; what tool to use; include issues from other SCs in the survey; develop an actionable briefing document for this year's results 2. Annual Report: Ideas of data to provide: highlight textual information as well as data; tap into NSF-collected data to demonstrate impact	Casey Jones, Judy Ridgway 2. Report: Laura Bartolo (lead), Mimi Recker, Anita Coleman follow-up with NSF on data
What are the issues in conducting distributed evaluation activities and what could best be done centrally?	No activity at this time		

By the time of the EIESC meeting at JCDL 2004, another teleconference had been held between EIESC and the Technology SC to discuss common goals and further joint activities. The teleconference resulted in plans for a jointly-sponsored workshop on Webmetrics. Details of EIESC activities discussed at JCDL 2004 are summarized in Table 5 below and in the meeting notes

(<http://eduimpact.comm.nsd.org/events/?pager=230>). Other activities for the EIESC were discussed during the meeting:

- The Four Questions have driven EIESC activities since 2001. However, one question (who are the users?) is missing. Recommended that EIESC work with the soon-to-be-funded Pathways projects to provide guidelines for a structured reporting mechanism to gather this data.
- Develop an NSDL evaluation journal. [Recommendation coming from the Participant Interaction in Digital Libraries Workshop, February 2004] Consensus was that rather than add yet another venue to the digital library literature, focus on making existing EIESC and NSDL evaluation-related publications more visible.
- Establish an evaluation support and feedback network. [Recommendation coming from the Participant Interaction in Digital Libraries Workshop, February 2004] Discussion highlighted projects' different expectations and goals, how previous efforts missed the mark for support, and the difficulties of meeting the needs of projects at various stages. Recommended that an Evaluation SIG at the 2004 NSDL Annual Meeting would be another opportunity to meet projects' evaluation needs.
- Have professional development workshops for sharing of evaluation approaches specific to virtual environments. Realization: NSDL is full of busy people, so there must be an incentive for doing work - the committee can figure that one out.

Summary of EIESC Activities in Detail 2001-2005

Table 5: Summary of EIESC Activities from JCDL 2004

Question	Taskforce	Activities / Results	Recommendations
How are people using the libraries?	Users & Usage	1. A workshop on Webmetrics will be held August 2-3, 2004; agenda items include understanding the scope of logging and analysis and re-running the pilot study;	1. View the report: http://www.dlib.org/dlib/october04/coleman/10coleman.html
How are the collections growing?	Collections Assessment	1. Controlled Vocabulary: serves as a means for characterizing NSDL MR (subject, audience, format, learning resource type). Discovered wide variations in consistency. Used human labor and 2 machine methods. Currently stopped because too much effort was expended by volunteers. Aside from time, obstacles include: too broad an issue to be answered concisely, original intent was to inform collection development, which isn't being done currently, shifting funding priorities to Pathways grants (funded for different purposes) that fall outside of this question	1. Group questions whether taskforce should continue to address original question: Judy wants to continue; Susan Jesuroga suggests asking a different question to address the growing, evolving nature of NSDL better
How is the distributed library building and community governance processes working?	Annual PI Survey	1. PI Survey (Sarah Giersch, lead): EIESC is moving to a survey that comes from the SCs; survey instruments from the Tech and Content Standing Committees have been shared with EIESC. 2. Annual Report (EIESC, Carol Minton Morris, lead): Core Integration is now taking the lead to create the report; EIESC is pursuing two projects that gather data for the report: <i>Project Impact</i> : uses automated methods to gather data that indicates impact (e.g., usage statistics); and, <i>Content Analysis of Project websites</i> 3. Exit Survey (Casey Jones, lead): this effort was suspended when funding for the Collaboration Finder was not renewed	1. EIESC is seeking a volunteer from its committee as well as a representative from other SCs to carry forward this work; Possibility of having some money to help with an annual survey 2. Work on these data-gathering projects will inform the Annual Report and contribute to NSDL evaluation efforts overall 3. A final report was not produced from this effort
What are the issues in conducting distributed evaluation activities and what could best be done centrally?	Evaluating Educational Impact Workshop	1. Potential project: Evaluation Case Studies; this is a follow up from the Evaluating Educational Impact Workshop; seeking examples of "lighthouses" and "birds of paradise" (see report for details); also seeking volunteers to help collect case studies from projects that are already collecting case studies (e.g., Mick Khoo has a case study from DWEL)	3. Bethany Carlson (lead), Anita Coleman

During the EIESC meeting at the 2004 NSDL Annual Meeting, two questions were raised during brief discussion, but no conclusion was reached:

- Should the Four Questions be re-framed in light of all the changes that have happened within NSDL?
- What are performance measures for NSDL? This is linked to educational impact, search and retrieval and relevance based on user tasks across disciplines and grade level

Two new directions for EIESC activities were outlined to be accomplished by a Project Impact taskforce:

- Using DLIST as the repository for NSDL evaluation materials (Anita Coleman, lead)
- Aggregated (integrated) Evaluation: NSDL as a testbed for digital library, learning research: follows the TREC model (Anita Coleman, lead)

2005

EIESC held a teleconference in March and then met face-to-face at JCDL in Denver, Colorado. Table 6 summarizes the work to date on from EIESC taskforces. Below there is also a summary of organizational issues the committee discussed.

March teleconference

Participants were invited to discuss online two questions coming out the EIESC meeting from the 2004 Annual Meeting. No conclusion was reached.

- Should we reframe our questions in light of all the changes that have happened within NSDL?
- What are performance measures for NSDL that can be linked to educational impact, such as search, retrieval and relevance based on user tasks across disciplines and grade levels?

JCDL 2005

The EIESC discussed ways to move forward with committee business:

- There is a call for the formation of small working groups as a way to continue EIESC work throughout year as well as an opportunity to work with other projects sharing a similar interest.
- Mimi Recker noted that it would be productive to revisit what this group is about and see where people's energies are. Liz Liddy followed up by saying that she liked the 4 questions at start but as we went on, it seemed that the only thing that mattered was impact - is that still the most important thing? Further discussion was invited via the EIESC listserv; no conclusion was reached

At the end of July 2005, Casey Jones (Core Integration evaluation liaison, 2002-2005) took a job in California. The new Core Integration evaluation liaison to NSDL is Mick Khoo, Evaluation Coordinator. He has developed a wiki (and whitepaper) to describe plans for conducting a program-wide evaluation of NSDL: <http://eval.comm.nsd.org/cgi-bin/wiki.pl>

Summary of EIESC Activities in Detail 2001-2005

Table 6: Summary of EIESC Activities 2005 from telecon & JCDL

Question	Taskforce	Activities / Results	Recommendations
How are people using the libraries?	Users & Usage	1. A webmetrics pilot study was begun after the Webmetrics Workshop in August 2004. Seven sites (CI, SDSC Archives, DLESE, SERC, CSERD, Teachers Domain, ENC.) volunteered to implement code on their websites that tracks user movement via cookies. By March, all sites had implemented the code, and the project was ready to take next step with considering variables to include in the tracking. There will be a session at the Annual Meeting on this pilot.	1. Webmetrics Pilot: EIESC & TSC need to decide what to do with the data at the end of the pilot study, including continuation of pilot or expansion of pilot. The pilot needs volunteers to aid in analyses and to provide suggestions for next steps and additional material to aid in analyses.
How are the collections growing?	Collections Assessment	1. no update available	1. NA
How is the distributed library building and community governance processes working?	Annual PI Survey	1. The Annual Report has become institutionalized within NSDL Core Integration, who takes the lead on organization and writing. EIESC works closely with CI to provide data for the Report. The 2005 Annual Meeting theme is "Examining NSDL's Impact" and the Annual Report will collect narrative and data that tell the story of how NSDL is creating context and meaning around the use of digital resources for learning in classrooms. a. <u>NSDL WorldCat OCLC Survey</u> : The WorldCat OCLC Survey (conducted by the iLumina Digital Library) focused on making resources more discoverable by transferring MARC records to OCLC. Individual DLs can get money for submitting resources to OCLC.	4. The Annual Report will be distributed at the 2005 Annual Meeting a. Not enough data was gathered from the WorldCat OCLC Survey to be included in the Annual Report; the survey did raise the issue of whether NSDL projects would be interested in attending a workshop on how to crosswalk metadata records into MARC and then transfer the records to OCLC as part of a sustainability plan
What are the issues in conducting distributed evaluation activities and what could best be done centrally?	Evaluation Tutorial Workshop (was: Evaluating Educational Impact Workshop)	2. Jim Dorward, Mimi Recker and Sarah Giersch agreed to administer a survey about NSDL projects' evaluation practices and needs and to have that inform the development of an Evaluation Tutorial at the 2005 NSDL Annual Meeting; the Evaluation Practices Survey from 2002 was re-used	4. A tutorial workshop is planned for the 2005 NSDL Annual Meeting; survey results and summary are found on the EIESC site
Evolved, in part, from need to provide data for the Annual Report	Project Impact (New)	1. Evaluation repository: Items are still sought for the DLIST repository; 2. Evaluation Exchange Forum (EEF): EIESC members are invited to share evaluation instruments and results. EEF was inaugurated at NSDL AM 05. 3. TREC-like evaluation: The goal of the study is to apply the learned categorization model to the whole NSDL collection. SDSC is developing a testbed for text mining services for NSDL. The SDSC approach to these services is probabilistic text categorization by scientific discipline, topic, and grade level. Currently, SDSC is using two datasets to develop a classification model: 'golden' files and metadata set (8000 records) from ENC.	1. No project evaluation news was reported. 2. Results from the first EEF are in the DLIST Evaluation clearinghouse. [Available at: http://dlist.sir.arizona.edu/archive/00000609/ .] 3. At JCDL Peter Shin, Tony Fountain, and Reagan Moore prepared and presented a grade level analysis in a sample of Eisenhower National Clearinghouse documents. Available at http://dlist.sir.arizona.edu/859/