eResearch Implementation Committee
Meeting Notes, December 18, 2013

Present:-

Karen Hogenboom, Sarah Shreeves, Sarah Williams, Harriett Green, Peg Burnette, Bethany Anderson, Susan Braxton, Kyle Rimkus, Beth Sandore Namachchivaya, Christie Wiley, Laila Hussein Moustafa (recorder)

Guests: Sue Searing and Jen Chien Yu.

Agenda
• Discussion with Sue and Jen about tracking research data questions in the library
• Announcements/Updates
• Open discussions

Sarah W.: Introduce the mater of tracking research data questions. Desk Tracker is already used in the reference desk at the library. Data customizations haven’t been implemented library wide, so if we get those kinds of questions just we make a note; I know desk tracker isn’t the best at reporting back on key words. The other thing is that I know you had to report back on some metrics to campus and I know some of those metrics were related to research-data interactions

Sue: we did not report back the matrix to campus we promise we will report on the future .This committee gives us various kind of activities we would add together to give us a number that can give approximately a good number of where we at

Sarah W.: report the number to campus is important but we need to start to measure as soon as possible. so we can gaged how quickly things are increasing to report for our own interest and to those who are interest in what we really are doing with researchers. Any one has comment or You Jen and Sue. has any initial thought or question ?

Sue: the assumption that any body in the public service might deal with data research service question so we want some mechanism that any body can get to it. Right ! Integrated it into desk tracker is first to think of it maybe not the best thing

Kyle: Yeah that’s kind of like a public service point and we do not have access to desk tracker

Jen: Explained that she can create any accounts to use the desk tracker at any location and combine what the entire library already use. The other thing could be the type of services, like having individual personal accounts in case somebody moves from here to there. She also suggested to use the same form everyone is using but add customized questions, like the Slavic reference has.
Sarah S.: So what happens when you get a question sitting at ACES?
Sarah W.: I just log in with whatever the general ACES…

Sarah S.: Asked if this become a problem to aggregate them… because we have data management at ACES, Scholarly commons… and if this is going to essentially force everybody fill out the data management question?

Sarah W.: The fears is to create something with a lot more data entry, as a committee we talked about keeping it simple and have two options. one is “managing data” which is those management data questions, and the other is “finding and using data”. Trying to use simple terminology to reduce confusion.

Beth: we committed to provide service and we also work with other unite to see how they are working with this topic.

Sue: That would be a question for training, especially for GA’s to make a distinction Beth. I think one of the bigger questions is that we’ve committed to providing information so figuring out a way to do that so it doesn’t become a lot of overhead for those doing the services. Another issue is we’ll also be working In partnership with other … who will be collecting their own metrics, but we will want them to share those with us

Jen: Explained that if the committee want to add an element, this can be done, as long as the group decides on it

Sarah W.: There is so many different customizations, and we don’t want to just add to the complication, I can envision that some of these questions could be answered by anyone, just because it can be done in desk tracker, I’d like whatever is most effective for input and output. I don’t want to spend all this time inputting numbers if different groups are inputting in different ways

Beth: Because there are questions that will happen across the board

Jen: Do you already have a form or a question you’re already interested in?
Sure, there is five elements

Sarah W.: Just for a quick review here are the five things: the number of pre-award DMP consultations, the number of post-grant award DMP consultations, number of other research data management consultations, then the number of pre-grant consultations that resulted in a grant, the number of data management plans created from the DMP tool. And I don’t even know, number four wouldn’t happen in desk tracker. So they are the first three.

Susan: Yeah tracking back to the individual would be in violation of patron privacy.
Karen: I think that’s the kind of thing we can get at by collecting stories as people come back to us.

Sarah W.: So those are the three that could possibly fit in desk tracker, but we’ve also been tracking finding and using data

Karen: We’ve already been doing that we have separate category for data management and data services, in scholarly commons.

Sarah S.: It would be interesting to know if data questions were coming to the reference desk rather than emailing Sarah S. at her office.

Sue: I would support getting it mainstreamed to the basic reference desk maybe will not give us a clean data because people would struggle with how to code it

Beth: Would one of our conversations be with the reference services then?

Jen: No. I think that I would recommend scripting the question you want to ask first so that we can figure out if it should be a question box or what. For example, if you want to know the number of pre-grant awards DMP questions, you wouldn’t ask that question, you would have a check box. You have to have the question before you can figure out the form. Would it be a check box or an option added to the form you already see? So the question is important because it gets to what you want to assess before you go to the reference because they want to know different things than you. You need to have the questions first.

Susan: I’m wondering, would the questions that are already on the scholarly commons form answer or allow us to provide those metrics?

Karen: No they aren’t granular enough, there is data management but it’s just one choice. We wouldn’t capture that.

Jen: suggested that some of the things in the scholarly commons form could capture some of the things that the committee need. There are some that don’t quite work, but we haven’t looked at it in a while

Beth: It sounds like there is some overlap and some things we could use. It would be nice to look at those.

Kyle: I think these five questions are useful for finding out the effectiveness of the program, the success rates, etc.

Sue: The desk tracker has a basic text box, you could train yourself to put something in it, what department you are from

Jen: You could build questions from those descriptions as well, if you gathered them,
Susan: In terms of the implementation for the collection of data in desk tracker there is already the different tabs to record different things, it’s not that big of a deal to click to a data management tab rather than clicking to the regular activity form and filing that out.

Jen: It would not be possible to put a link in the regular form to capture more information, because you need to click the submit button.

Susan: We could do something like that with the sub-disciplines? You wouldn’t be able to answer very many questions though Jan explained, that’s why it’s important to have a question that will capture what you want.

Sarah W.: So your saying at this point you can not change a question type to have to data options added into the question type drop-down

Jen: Yes it is if you want to add to it to be visible you need permission from reference services committee, It shouldn’t be a problem

Sara W.: I want to make sure that were going to come up with something that people will do, so we need to come up with a question type and talk to reference services, then you mentioned a separate tab. Will that be open to anyone who has access?

Jen: access will be up to you. But you should come up with a definition for the question types too for the reference committee.

Sue: those two aren’t mutually exclusive, you could have both for people to do if they have time.

Sarah W.: if we have separate tab, Would that be duplicating numbers? I wouldn’t want to double report our questions.

Jen: Don’t worry about the final reporting line yet.

Sarah W.: I think the scholarly commons has an extra drop down menu, so if we have these extra options we would need to somehow mesh that with what is already there.

Jen: the Scholarly commons is only available to scholarly commons, so if we want to have the capture system-wide then that question will have to be available system-wide.

Karen: I wouldn’t think it would be a separate box or people wouldn’t even see it, it would need to be a longer list.

Jen: You might need another round of training of definition if you want it available to everyone
**Sarah W.**: so what makes the most sense? To have a separate tab or to have a drop down menu?

**Jen**: don’t know if there some standard practice, but it seems better to have a drop down. She over more options like drop down menu, check box, and radio bottom.

**Sarah W.**: remind everyone that we want to keep it simple.

**Sue**: So what we will report to campus is the sum of those

**Beth**: This might be a situation where we have to say that the two very general points…. Once the service is implemented the library will set up a line and will be tracking when grants get submitted and so the service should be proactive like Purdue does and contact those people.

**Beth**: We need to keep it simple so people understand, I think it’s more than the pre and post award, I think it’s more about the third one about consultations that have nothing to do with grants. So we may want to think of options that will go in a drop down menu that will garner all that.

**Sarah W:** So we as a committee can think of what we might like for tracking data management questions, we can all work together before making a proposal, we should think of how that impacts what scholarly commons is doing already, we can then say that as a group this is what we think would best help us internally and also to get us those metrics we need.

**Next Meeting:**
・Will take place January 15, 2014 (Sarah W. will send out an email)