2002 NSDL All Projects Meeting   (2-5 December)   **End of Meeting Survey**

Survey Analysis

Prepared by
Casey Jones (caseyj@ucar.edu) on behalf of NSDL CI

Contents

Many readers may find this document most useful if they merely read the summary of findings and Appendices I and II for the ratings of responses as well as the freeform answers. This will allow readers to develop their own conclusions about the responses. Please note that the quantification of qualitative responses in the Detailed Findings is open to interpretation as only one reviewer categorized responses.

Summary of Findings

124 All Projects Meeting attendees completed the end of meeting survey. Representation of all project tracks and funding years is present in survey responses.

Meeting participants expected that the NSDL All Projects meeting would be directly beneficial to themselves and their projects through provision of information (about NSDL, CI, other projects) and of collaborators. In fact, engaging people in other projects and understanding the paths of other projects were much repeated goals of meeting participants. A fear of repeating fruitless activities and not understanding NSDL's current and future progress were recurring comments. Approximately half of respondents indicated that their meeting expectations were fulfilled, but nearly all respondents provided detailed information about making the meeting better.

Informal interactions were listed as the best means for achieving participant expectations. While these interaction opportunities were better than in the previous year (especially through the roundtables in the Tuesday morning session), the commonly held perception was that there was not enough opportunity to meet and discuss with others. The most frequent complaint was that brief breaks were inadequate to locate people and carry on a meaningful conversation. The poster session was key to participants for getting the most information from the meeting as well as locating the most people, yet participants believe that the session was not given appropriate time and space.

The relevance of meeting topics as well as the Tuesday morning session and the breakout sessions rated well. The closing session did not rate as well as the other sessions, and many comments reiterated participant displeasure with this session in that it was too long, confusing and lacked focus. Many respondents included meeting improvements. Among these were more time for networking, more time to view posters, more traditional conference arrangement with tracks, more discussion about common problems and goals, and more information made widely available.

Respondents answered that the realized benefits of the All Projects meeting lay in obtaining knowledge about various aspects of NSDL and its projects. Additional benefits included the contacts made with people as well as direct benefits to a project through better understanding of NSDL's technology and distributed potential and the project's role in NSDL.

After the All Projects meeting, many respondents desired follow up by either CI or PIs. Respondents indicated a desire for communication and contacts established at the meeting to be maintained, including potential additional conferences and workshops. Additionally, several responses stated a need for NSDL to develop clear goals.

Responses may indicate a lack of sense of place for projects and their developers within the NSDL hierarchy as explained through their desire for presenting information about their projects and for an understanding of a greater purpose for their work, that is, how it fits into some sort of overall NSDL plan as well as for receiving help in certain areas of their projects about which they are unsure. Additionally, responses may be indicative of a poor information sharing/ dissemination mechanism for NSDL because many participants indicated a desire to learn what NSDL and CI and other projects are doing.

Discrepancy between mostly good ratings and poor comments can be possibly explained by the fact that people have believed that they lack much information (a fact also observed in the Evaluation Committee's June 2002 survey) and were pleased to be given the opportunity to discover much of the information at the meeting; however, it was not enough information and not in the correct format. Participants expected a certain format for the meeting and certain explicit information provisions from all members of NSDL and were disappointed to not receive as much detail as desired. (This problem is also very likely explained by the isolation of many projects from NSDL and other grantees.)

Detailed Findings

Respondent Demographics
124 attendees responded to the 2002 Annual Meeting Survey out of an approximate 280 attendees. Respondents were segregated into respondent categories such that they were listed in only one category for Project Track and one category for Funding Year.

Project Track respondents – 64 Collections [51.6%], 21 Services [16.9%], 12 Targeted Research [9.7%], 16 Core Integration [12.9%], and 11 Other Track [8.9%]

Funding Year respondents – 06 NSDL, pre-NSDL [4.8%]; 28 NSDL, FY 2000 [22.6%]; 29 NSDL, FY 2001 [23.4%]; 43 NSDL, FY 2002 [34.7%]; and 18 Other Funding [14.5%]

Meeting Expectations
Almost all survey respondents [*question 3, What were your expectations for the All Projects meeting*?; 115 responses] indicated that they expected the meeting to be beneficial to themselves and their projects.

- 63 [54.8% of those responding] wanted to understand (the state of) NSDL and CI – progress and status updates.
- 59 [51.3% of those responding] expected collaborations, meeting people, and networking from the meeting.
- 43 [37.4% of those responding] anticipated learning about other projects – scope and requirements.
- 17 [14.8% of those responding] expected a direct relation to their own project – sharing/ publicizing project's role.
- One respondent indicated community building.

Respondents worded replies such that their expectations of the meeting were that the meeting would directly benefit their own projects through

- provision of collaborators;

- informing them of NSDL and CI such that they would understand their project's relation (what's expected), how to integrate the project into NSDL, the benefits of working with NSDL, and technology requirements and standards;

- learning about other projects' needs (especially in relation to what their project can offer), discovering mutual issues and potential partners, get ideas from other projects, and finding more advanced mentor projects;

- and through understanding of their own work by receiving help or being informed of how to better the project or informing others about the project/ presentation of their work.

Over half of respondents to *question 4, How did the All Projects meeting fulfill or not fulfill those expectations?* [113 responding], seemed satisfied about their expectations being fulfilled. As many of these respondents also indicated additional items that could be made better for the meeting or responded with various degrees of satisfaction such as "mostly fulfilled" or "mostly met" or "very well" or "well" or "excellent" or "met expectations", this number is not directly quantifiable.

Respondents noted problems with the meeting in their responses to *question 4*. Respondent statements indicated strongly that the poster sessions were important and that not enough time was given to the posters. This was the time to circulate and learn about other projects, but if a person was otherwise busy during this time (for example, by maintaining presence at own poster) or missed this session (for example, with a later flight), the person was unfortunate to miss one of the better opportunities of the meeting. Additionally, respondents indicated that roundtable discussions and breakout sessions were good for learning and understanding about NSDL and its community as were more private conversations held with people met during the meeting. These interactions were better interactions than the previous year provided.

Some respondents wrote that it was not easy to find people they wanted to meet and that others did not circulate well but that this problem was compounded by a full schedule (or other meeting structure issues) not allowing much time for networking. Other meeting issues are addressed in the *Perceptions of Meeting* section.

Interesting comments from *question 4*
- "[The meeting] was much easier to navigate the second time around."
- "I see that there are still many unresolved questions and that I should be more active in finding solutions."

Perceptions of Meeting
The rating scale for the following questions was Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent.
- The **relevance of meeting topics** was perceived positively [only 9 of 117, 7.7%, rating it Fair or Poor; *question 9*]. The median and mode of responses was the rating of Very Good.

- The formats of the sessions were also perceived positively. The **Tuesday morning session** had only 14 of 118, 11.9%, rating it Fair or Poor [*question 6*] and the **breakout sessions** had only 10 of 117, 8.5%, rating them Fair or Poor [*question 7*]. The median and mode for both the Tuesday morning session and the breakout sessions was the rating of Very Good.

- The median and mode for the format of the **closing session** was the rating of Good [*question 8*] while 42 of 115, 36.5%, responses rated it with a Fair or Poor.

Question 11 asked to what degree the Meeting aided the respondent in certain areas.
Responses were rated on a scale from 1 – Not at All to 5 – Very Much.
- Discovering relevant meetings hosted by other organizations [*11b*] rated with a median of 2 and mode of 1.

The following categories rated with a median and mode of 4.

- finding new collaborators [*11a*]

- opportunity to meet other collection developers/ discover what other projects are doing [*11c*]

- opportunity to interact with the NSDL CI team and NSDL Committees [*11d*]

- sharing ideas [*11e*]

Question 12 asked how well the meeting enabled participants to obtain information on various aspects of NSDL. Responses were rated on a scale from 1 – Not at All to 5 – Very Much.

The following categories rated with a median and mode of 4.

- NSDL as a whole [*12d*]

- on other projects/grantees [*12e*]

The following category rated with a median of 3 and mode of 4.

- the metadata repository [*12b*]

The following category rated with a median and mode of 3.

- collection and service requirements [*12a*]

The following category rated with a median of 3 and mode of 2.

- portals [*12c*]

All Projects Meeting Improvements

Responses to *question 4, How did the All Projects meeting fulfill or not fulfill those expectations?* [113 responding]; *question 5, What can be done to make the All Projects meeting better?* [103 responding]; and *question 10, What other topics should have been covered that weren't*? [55 responding] included suggestions for improving the meeting.

Topics

23	provide more information (on implementation, on integration into NSDL, on chosen technologies, standards, governance, NSDL vision – especially in opening sessions, current setup of NSDL, future – immediate and long-term – plans for NSDL, comm portal, building on other's work, CI services/ overview/ who to contact/ how to contact, in general – who to contact and how to contact, related DL projects – eg DLI2)
21	more exemplars of projects, specific technology implementations (5 minute quickie presentations of projects) (presentations of research, stories, project status, problems encountered, common issues, services to adapt, technology exchange, user information, communication among content providers and services)
6	Sustainability/ Continuing Support (ideas, information, revenue generation information/ contacts within NSDL, from administrative and development viewpoint)
3	involve educators/ invite teachers
1	focus on education impact
1	focus on users

Meeting Agenda

32	posters (more time, more appropriate session time, larger space, located physically closer to other sessions, second round – maybe split into 2 groups for time to be present at poster)

19	networking time/ discussion time
	(more structured/ roundtable time, more unstructured/ free time – especially for (formal) collaborative work, person-to-person interaction, no lunch speakers, time to talk with CI/ governance representatives, longer breaks, more discussion in breakout sessions)
13	First-year session/ New Projects session (meet mentors)
	also session for more advanced projects – what next
13	structure to breakouts
	(address common issues, small groups addressing specific problems, address general issues not have project showcases, address broader issues, include more open discussion)
10	workshop/ "how-to" sessions
	(OAI – and set up OAI server, authentication, evaluation, Dublin Core training, establishing a PAC, fundraising and development)
6	"birds of a feather" discussions
	(based on project track, collection level)
5	closing session
	(focused, shorter, realistic not idealistic)
3	fewer repeated concurrent sessions
2	computer lab with demonstrations
2	have tracks – with technical parallel sessions
1	"group gripe" sessions

Administrative Details

10	published/ printed material to refer to
	(include all presentations, faqs, message board, abstracts, attendee list, advance schedule posting)
5	internet access (specifically wireless)
5	food
	(it was bad, include vegetarian options, include soda, snacks at breaks)
4	change dates
2	too cold to use AC in winter
1	less expensive venue
1	more central location
1	alcohol at reception for free

Responses from *question 4* indicating possible meeting improvements or additional topics to be covered. (These responses are not as easily scanned as those from *questions 5* and *10* because they are mixed in with the answer to *question 4, fulfillment of meeting expectations*.)

- "collection development"
- "specifics on architecture directions from CI"
- "briefing about what's in the collections and who's doing what with whom and who'd like technology partners"
- "the authentication/ authorization session was [not] equally useful"
- "Plenty of opportunity to hear about Core's Work, but newly funded projects seem to need more help understanding their roles beyond simply meeting goals outlined in proposals – metadata harvesting, sustainability, governance, etc."
- "Core Integration team was not visible enough. What can they do for us, what are they doing?"
- "I wish we had much more time in semi-structured interaction and less time listening to powerpoint presentations. It would have been nice to get more step-by-step instructions for integrations."
- "We could have a focused session for similar projects (eg, collections) for shared lessons learned."
- "Most sessions lacked technical depth"
  "would like to have heard more from Core Integration group on architecture and services"
- "For the second yearers, some presentations repeated with last year. Did not get much updates."

- "more time in breakouts and less in full session"
- "I was disappointed by the weight of talking "at us". Too much session time was wasted have people present instead of interacting. Too much input was discounted with "we've done that".

Overview of Meeting Improvements

Posters were perceived as a time to learn about other projects, and attendees were not given enough time to adequately review all posters and discuss with poster representatives.

Attendees want to understand the path other projects have taken, they want to avoid repeating mistakes or reinventing technology, they want to know about potential collaborators. Basically, they desire an overview of all projects, technologies, services, etc. as well as mentors to learn from or take questions to.

Additionally, projects seem to desire clear support and planning from NSF or the NSDL program.

One of the most repeated items for meeting improvements were longer breaks to use as time for networking and discussion. The strict structure of the meeting, especially considering lunch speakers, prohibited people from taking extra time to talk with others.

Role of Your Project

A majority of respondents [94 of 120; *question 13a*] answered that they understand the role of their project in NSDL. Only 2 respondents answered that they did NOT understand their project's role. Of the 2 No responses, 1 respondent answered that his understanding is Unchanged after the All Projects Meeting, 1 respondent answered that his understanding is better. No respondents [of 120; question 13b] answered that their understanding is worse after the Meeting.

The responses to *question 13c, Comments on role of your project in NSDL.* resulted in mostly answers that addressed the definitions or goals of the project [29 of 42 responses].

Examples of definitions
- "A pretty standard collection project."
- "as a content provider in the area(s) of civil engineering"

Examples of goals
- "I think it will help blaze new directions in community building."
- "needs to mature to broaden"
- "to communicate and to participate regularly"

Additional responses were composed of statements or comments on NSDL infrastructure. For example, "central to it" and "active, exemplary" for the former and "projects are customer of CI" and "looking for better collaboration mechanisms" and "collaboration has been a weak point at NSDL" for the latter.

Meeting Benefits

91 people responded to *question 14, How do you think the All Projects Meeting will benefit your project/work?* Almost all responses took one of 3 formats.

34 people indicated that they were benefited through making contacts/ connections/ collaborations with others. *For Example*
- "get to potential collaborators"
- "contacts made"

32 people indicated that the meeting helped them to learn about other projects/other services/ NSDL/ CI and to obtain information and knowledge about what is available within NSDL.

For Example

- "Better conception of what services are available."
- "learn about other projects"

32 people wrote that the benefits were directly to themselves or their projects. These benefits included informing others of own project; reaffirming or changing the focus/ actions of own project; help develop new ideas or application for next round; better own project through an ability to integrate it within NSDL/ provide a context for own project.

For Example

- "allow us to integrate better with NSDL"
- "situate my project in context of other NSDL projects"
- "Help us leverage the group knowledge to validate our direction and focus, and allow us to make better technical decisions."

After Meeting

73 respondents answered *question 15, What should happen after this meeting*?

24 people indicated that some sort of follow-up should occur as well as information (on specific topics, from specific groups) should be made available.

For Example

- "follow up emails"
- "Powerpoint presentations should be online."
- "follow up by PIs"

16 people responded that communication is a priority. This response took several forms, with NSDL or CI instigating the communication, with projects maintaining contacts, better communication among all projects.

For Example

- "Better communication from CI to projects."
- "Continued contact with other projects."

9 people indicated that NSDL (or CI) needs to develop and promote a clear goal or vision. These responses included growth plans, clear policy decisions, and exploration of (new) ideas.

For Example

- "make clear decisions about policies, standards etc and disseminate those to projects:
- "NSDL needs to figure out what it wants to be and communicate that to us – it's trying to be everything to everyone – too broad – everyone's vision of success is quite different"

3 additional responses stated that NSDL needs to focus specifically on sustainability.

Those Responses

- "create a corporate entity that can do fundraising"
- "focus on sustainability in a more business-like manner"
- "I would like to see outside business Consultants create a revenue-generation Business Plan so that certain aspects of the NSDL collections could create income to support sustainability."

5 responses expounded specific subsequent meeting activities.

- "A conference with project-specific presentations"
- "More regular phone, nsdlib comm. Mtgs of committees and task forces."

- "evaluation workshop:
- "Perhaps meet more often and in smaller groups."
- "Have a workshop on evaluation for other NSDL projects."

Appendix I – Quantitative Responses

Respondent Demographics

1. Project Track

CI	18
Services	24
Collections	66
Targeted Research	13
Other	06
TOTAL	**127**

2. Funding Year

NSDL, pre-NSDL	07
NSDL, FY 2000	33
NSDL, FY 2001	35
NSDL, FY 2002	51
NSDL, FY 2003	01
other	03
don't know	00
NA	01
TOTAL	**131**

Meeting Formats

6. The format of the Tuesday morning session was:

Excellent	24
Very Good	47
Good	32
Fair	12
Poor	02
don't know	01
TOTAL	**118**

Median: Very Good
Mode: Very Good

8. The format of the closing session was:

Excellent	06
Very Good	18
Good	46
Fair	28
Poor	14
don't know	03
TOTAL	**115**

Median: Good
Mode: Good

7. The format of the breakout sessions was:

Excellent	17
Very Good	50
Good	40
Fair	07
Poor	03
don't know	0
TOTAL	**117**

Median: Very Good
Mode: Very Good

9. The relevance of the topics covered at the meeting was:

Excellent	25
Very Good	52
Good	31
Fair	08
Poor	01
don't know	0
TOTAL	**117**

Median: Very Good
Mode: Very Good

Appendix I – Quantitative Responses

11. To what degree did the All Projects Meeting aid you in the following:

	a – find new collaborators	b – discover relevant meetings hosted by other organizations	c – opportunity to meet other collection developers/ discover what other projects are doing	d – opportunity to interact with the NSDL CI team and NSDL Committees	e – share ideas
5 – Very Much	21	02	36	29	32
4	55	08	62	39	49
3	25	25	18	36	33
2	11	38	04	12	05
1 – Not at All	06	45	0	02	01
TOTAL	**118**	**118**	**120**	**118**	**120**

	11a	**11b**	**11c**	**11d**	**11e**
Mean	3.63	2.02	4.08	3.69	3.88
Median	4	2	4	4	4
Mode	4	1	4	4	4
Responses rating a 4 or 5	76 of 118 = 64.4%	10 of 118 = 8.5%	98 of 120 = 81.7%	68 of 118 = 57.6%	81 of 120 = 67.5%

12. How well did the meeting enable you to get information on the following:

	a – collection and service requirements	b – metadata repository	c – portals	d – on NSDL as a whole	e – on other projects/ grantees
5 – Very Much	12	17	08	33	13
4	31	37	25	53	58
3	36	33	33	23	30
2	25	17	36	08	12
1 – Not at All	08	08	10	01	02
TOTAL	**112**	**112**	**112**	**118**	**115**

	12a	**12b**	**12c**	**12d**	**12e**
Mean	3.13	3.34	2.87	3.92	3.59
Median	3	3	3	4	4
Mode	3	4	2	4	4
Responses rating a 4 or 5	43 of 112 = 38.4%	54 of 112 = 48.2%	33 of 112 = 29.5%	86 of 118 = 72.9%	71 of 115 = 61.7%

13a. Do you understand the role of your project in NSDL?

Yes	94
Maybe	24
No	02
TOTAL	**120**

13b. How is this understanding after the All Projects Meeting?

Better	79
Unchanged	41
Worse	0
TOTAL	**120**

Respondents answering No to 13a
1 Respondent answered Unchanged to 13b; 1 Respondent answered Better to 13b

16. Ranking of Possible Dates for next All Projects Meeting

13-Oct	56
20-Oct	31
TOTAL	**87**

Appendix I – Quantitative Responses

Quantitative – by Respondent Group

N = 124

C	Collections	64
S	Services	21
TR	Targeted Research	12
CI	Core Integration	16
	Other Track	11

NSDL, pre-NSDL	06
NSDL, FY 2000	28
NSDL, FY 2001	29
NSDL, FY 2002	43
Other Funding	18

6. The format of the Tuesday morning session was:

		C	S	TR	CI	Other Track	pre-NSDL	FY2000	2001	2002	other Funding
Excellent	24	11	06	01	04	02	01	09	02	07	05
Very Good	47	29	04	07	04	03	02	11	14	14	06
Good	32	15	06	02	07	02	01	06	10	12	03
Fair	12	06	04	01	01	0	01	01	02	07	01
Poor	02	01	0	0	0	01	0	0	0	01	01
don't know	01	01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	0
TOTAL	*118*	*63*	*20*	*11*	*16*	*08*	*05*	*27*	*28*	*42*	*16*

7. The format of the breakout sessions was:

		C	S	TR	CI	Other Track	pre-NSDL	FY2000	2001	2002	other Funding
Excellent	17	06	05	02	02	02	0	04	01	08	04
Very Good	50	29	07	0	12	02	03	13	15	13	06
Good	40	19	05	09	02	05	01	08	09	15	07
Fair	07	04	03	0	0	0	0	01	01	05	0
Poor	03	03	0	0	0	0	0	0	02	01	0
don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	*117*	*61*	*20*	*11*	*16*	*09*	*04*	*26*	*28*	*42*	*17*

8. The format of the closing session was:

		C	S	TR	CI	Other Track	pre-NSDL	FY2000	2001	2002	other Funding
Excellent	06	02	02	0	02	0	0	03	01	02	0
Very Good	18	12	02	01	03	0	01	03	09	03	02
Good	46	28	03	05	05	05	0	10	09	19	08
Fair	28	11	06	05	04	02	01	04	07	13	03
Poor	14	07	04	0	02	01	02	03	02	04	03
don't know	03	0	02	01	0	0	0	02	01	0	0
TOTAL	*115*	*60*	*19*	*12*	*16*	*08*	*04*	*25*	*29*	*41*	*16*

9. The relevance of the topics covered at the meeting was:

		C	S	TR	CI	Other Track	pre-NSDL	FY2000	2001	2002	other Funding
Excellent	25	11	05	03	04	02	01	03	05	09	07
Very Good	52	24	08	08	08	04	03	15	13	17	04
Good	31	17	07	01	04	02	01	07	07	12	04
Fair	08	06	01	0	0	01	0	01	03	03	01
Poor	01	01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	0
don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	*117*	*59*	*21*	*12*	*16*	*09*	*05*	*26*	*28*	*42*	*16*

11. To what degree did the All Projects Meeting aid you in the following:

a – find new collaborators

		C	S	TR	CI	Other Track	pre-NSDL	FY2000	2001	2002	other funding
5 – Very Much	21	09	04	02	02	04	0	02	06	06	07
4	55	34	07	05	07	02	02	15	09	26	03
3	25	12	05	04	03	01	01	08	07	06	03
2	11	07	02	0	01	01	0	01	05	03	02
1 – Not at All	06	02	02	0	02	0	02	02	0	01	01
TOTAL	*118*	*64*	*20*	*11*	*15*	*08*	*05*	*28*	*27*	*42*	*16*

b – discover relevant meetings hosted by other organizations

		C	S	TR	CI	Other Track	pre-NSDL	FY2000	2001	2002	other funding
5 – Very Much	02	01	0	0	01	0	0	01	0	01	0
4	08	02	01	02	01	02	0	03	02	01	02
3	25	13	02	04	04	02	01	05	05	10	04
2	38	23	08	02	03	02	02	05	13	13	05
1 – Not at All	45	25	08	03	06	03	02	14	07	16	06
TOTAL	118	64	19	11	15	09	05	28	27	41	17

c – opportunity to meet other collection developers / discover what other projects are doing

		C	S	TR	CI	Other Track	pre-NSDL	FY2000	2001	2002	other funding
5 – Very Much	36	19	04	05	05	03	01	05	15	09	06
4	62	34	12	04	08	04	02	18	10	25	07
3	18	09	04	02	01	02	02	02	02	08	04
2	04	02	01	0	01	0	0	03	01	0	0
1 – Not at All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	120	64	21	11	15	09	05	28	28	42	17

d – opportunity to interact with the NSDL CI team and NSDL Committees

		C	S	TR	CI	Other Track	pre-NSDL	FY2000	2001	2002	other funding
5 – Very Much	29	16	01	03	07	02	02	10	06	06	05
4	39	20	07	05	05	02	02	07	09	17	04
3	36	20	09	03	02	02	01	08	10	11	06
2	12	06	04	0	0	02	0	02	03	06	01
1 – Not at All	02	02	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	02	0
TOTAL	118	64	21	11	14	08	05	27	28	42	16

e – share ideas

		C	S	TR	CI	Other Track	pre-NSDL	FY2000	2001	2002	other funding
5 – Very Much	32	17	04	04	05	02	01	07	11	10	03
4	49	26	10	05	05	03	01	13	09	19	07
3	33	18	05	02	04	04	03	07	07	10	06
2	05	03	01	0	01	0	0	01	01	02	01
1 – Not at All	01	0	01	0	0	0	0	0	0	01	0
TOTAL	120	64	21	11	15	09	05	28	28	42	17

12. How well did the meeting enable you to get information on the following:

a – collection and service requirements

		C	S	TR	CI	Other Track	pre-NSDL	FY2000	2001	2002	other funding
5 – Very Much	12	07	0	01	04	0	0	04	02	04	02
4	31	18	04	05	03	01	01	05	10	13	02
3	36	20	07	03	03	03	01	11	10	10	04
2	25	13	05	01	03	03	0	06	06	10	03
1 – Not at All	08	04	02	0	01	01	01	0	01	03	03
TOTAL	112	62	18	10	14	08	03	26	29	40	14

b – metadata repository

		C	S	TR	CI	Other Track	pre-NSDL	FY2000	2001	2002	other funding
5 – Very Much	17	09	02	01	05	0	0	07	02	06	02
4	37	20	07	05	04	01	01	08	11	14	03
3	33	19	03	02	04	05	02	05	11	09	06
2	17	10	05	01	0	01	0	04	05	07	01
1 – Not at All	08	05	02	0	0	01	0	01	0	04	03
TOTAL	112	63	19	09	13	08	03	25	29	40	15

Appendix I – Quantitative Responses

c – portals

		C	S	TR	CI	Other Track	pre-NSDL	FY2000	2001	2002	other funding
5 – Very Much	**08**	03	0	0	04	01	0	03	01	02	02
4	**25**	15	05	03	02	0	01	03	10	10	01
3	**33**	20	07	04	02	0	01	07	09	13	03
2	**36**	21	05	02	04	04	01	10	09	12	04
1 – Not at All	**10**	04	02	0	01	03	0	02	0	03	05
TOTAL	**112**	63	19	09	13	08	03	25	29	40	15

d – on NSDL as a whole

		C	S	TR	CI	Other Track	pre-NSDL	FY2000	2001	2002	other funding
5 – Very Much	**33**	14	06	05	05	03	0	07	07	12	07
4	**53**	33	08	06	03	03	02	14	16	19	02
3	**23**	12	04	0	04	03	02	03	05	08	05
2	**08**	03	02	0	03	0	0	03	01	03	01
1 – Not at All	**01**	01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01
TOTAL	**118**	63	20	11	15	09	04	27	29	42	16

e – on other projects/ grantees

		C	S	TR	CI	Other Track	pre-NSDL	FY2000	2001	2002	other funding
5 – Very Much	**13**	07	02	02	02	0	0	01	06	04	02
4	**58**	34	09	06	06	03	02	16	12	22	06
3	**30**	15	04	02	05	04	02	06	06	10	06
2	**12**	06	03	0	02	01	01	02	05	03	01
1 – Not at All	**02**	01	01	0	0	0	0	01	0	01	0
TOTAL	**115**	63	19	10	15	08	05	26	29	40	15

13a. Do you understand the role of your project in NSDL?

		C	S	TR	CI	Other Track	pre-NSDL	FY2000	2001	2002	other funding
Yes	**94**	54	13	06	14	07	06	25	22	30	11
Maybe	**24**	09	08	05	02	0	0	03	07	11	03
No	**02**	01	0	0	0	01	0	0	0	01	01
TOTAL	**120**	64	21	11	16	08	06	28	29	42	15

13b. How is this understanding after the All Projects Meeting?

		C	S	TR	CI	Other Track	pre-NSDL	FY2000	2001	2002	other funding
Better	**79**	40	16	08	11	04	04	17	18	32	08
Unchanged	**41**	24	05	03	05	04	02	11	11	10	07
Worse	**0**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	**120**	64	21	11	16	08	06	28	29	42	15