**ENSE 496ab, Social Software Systems Design. Fall 2019**

**Activity: Community characteristics & orientation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: | Kegan Lavoy |
| Customer Focus: | Office staff |
| Date: | Spetember 20th, 2019 |

**NOTE**: Each student will fill out this file given the responsibilities and deliverables in their “pod.” It might help to include whatever information you find interesting based on our discussion with our key customers on September 20.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Community characteristics** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Community life-cycle (current state)** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Where is your community in its life-cycle?** | | | | | | | | **What you need to focus on:** | | | **Special needs** | |
| **Just forming**  Need basic tools to connect, but not sure from there | | | | | | | | Discuss the potential of some basic tools with members, explore what ideas it might give them, and see what they might bring in with them. | | |  | |
| **Self-designing**  Information stage, but with a strong sense of what it wants to accomplish | | | | | | | | Contribute ideas to the design. Analyze systematically the implications of their community design for technology, infrastructure, and technology skills. | | | EGAD (website) resource to see what other schools are doing and what we have developed. Fairly clear view of what they want and need, but also missed | |
| **Growing & restless**  Ready to add new functionality to its tool configuration | | | | | | | | Try to make this a community reflection and self-design event. Does their restlessness suggest a major change, such as a transition to a new platform? | | | Revise program maps to the 12 attributes. Ethics and equity/life long learning deficient. We have methods for collecting/analyzing the data, but need process to measure and track continual improvement of the faculty (big focus) | |
| **Stable and adapting**  Just needing some new tools | | | | | | | | How much disruption will the community tolerate? How will the new tools be integrated into or affect existing practices? | | |  | |
| **Constitution** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Diversity:** How diverse is the community? | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Topic** | | | | | | | | **Your notes** | | | | |
| What are the different types of members and what are their levels of participation? | | | | | | | | Professors - assess performance of students, biggest group  Lab instructors - same as profs basically  Outcomes based assessment committee - program chairs, lab instructors, dean, associate dean academic  Employers - sent surveys to see how students do in industry  Graduates - also sent surveys (lots of surveys not really used/analyzed/lost)  Non engg classes - hard to get data because they don’t care as much need simpler tool  Programs analyze own data - ENGG data not analyzed nearly as well, some classes taken by multiple programs could benefit from group analysis | | | | |
| How spread apart is it in terms of location and time zones? | | | | | | | | Alumni spread out hard to track down, would like to be able to reach them more. | | | | |
| What language(s) do members speak? | | | | | | | | All speak english | | | | |
| What other cultural or other diversity aspects may affect your technology choices? | | | | | | | | Some barriers with instructions and clarity of documents for professors with weaker English skills. Microsoft office tools used in office currently. | | | | |
| **Openness:** How connected to the outside world is your community? | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Topic** | | | | | | | | | **Your notes** | | | |
| How much do you want to control the boundaries of your community? Does your community need | | | | | To be private/secure  Open boundaries  Both private & public spaces | | | | Data not public to outside view, internal use for program chairs and committee. Possible sub-layer for individual professors. Data can be entered by many parties like co-op office, office staff, profs, surveys, etc. | | | |
| How does your community need to interact with other communities? Do you need common tools for sharing and learning with them? | | | | | | | | | Often give simpler data, not as intensive as what our profs provide so simpler tools can work. | | | |
| **Technology aspirations** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Technology savvy, tolerance, & constraints**: What are your community’s technology interests and skills and patience thereof? What are the constraints imposed by technology factors? | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Topic** | | | | | | | | **Your notes** | | | | |
| How interested is your community in technology? | | | | | | | | Simpler tools that are fast and easy the better | | | | |
| What is their capacity for learning new tools? | | | | | | | | Learning capacity is good, urcourses as example | | | | |
| What is the range of skills? If their interests and/or skills are diverse, could it cause conflict or distraction? | | | | | | | | Skills are fine, but tool needs to be fast because simple tasks that are time consuming still suck | | | | |
| How tolerant are members of the adoption of a wide variety of tools? | | | | | | | | Pretty tolerant not a huge deal to create something new | | | | |
| How many technological boundaries are they willing to cross, e.g. sign in to more than one web-based tool, learn to use new tools, or give up old favorites? This helps you understand what level of integration you need. | | | | | | | | Can be resistance against new technologies because they may have developed their own tools to help them, but if we can integrate past data so that they have it | | | | |
| What are your members’ technology constraints (e.g., bandwidth, operating systems, etc.)? | | | | | | | | Most use windows, Macs or other OS’s would’ve had to be personally bought | | | | |
| How much time are members able to be online and from where (office, home, field)? Some people have limited online time, or are able to be online only in specific locations. Others are always on. Very diverse situations can affect participation | | | | | | | | Always online | | | | |
| **Community orientation** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevance to community**: Use the range from 0 (no relevance) to 5 (high relevance) to determine what matters most to the community. Look at these from the perspectives of the different types of members (under “constitution”). Also discuss the “value-added” to each member group | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | | **5** | **Orientations** | | | **Variants** | | **Key activities/your notes** |
|  |  |  |  |  | |  | **Meetings**  Many communities place a great emphasis on regular meetings where members engage in shared activities for a specific time. Meetings, and the visible participation of members, assert the community’s existence | | | Face-to-face/blended  Online synchronous  Online asynchronous | | Not too interested in having meetings as long as the data is accessible easily |
|  |  |  |  |  | |  | **Open-ended conversation**  Some communities maintain ongoing conversations as their primary vehicles for learning. Open-ended conversations are common when a community is co-located and people keep the conversation going as they “bump” into each other. | | | Single-stream discussions  Multi-topic conversations  Distributed conversations | | Might be useful to allow professors to provide comments on the data so that it is logged and can be used for continual improvement |
|  |  |  |  |  | |  | **Projects**  In some communities’ members want to focus on particular topics, go deep, and collaborate on projects to solve problems or produce useful artifacts. Learning is not just a matter of sharing knowledge or discussing issues. Members need to do things together in order to develop their practice. Projects usually involve a subgroup within the community | | | Practice groups  Project teams  Instruction | | More focused on information so new professors can learn the attribute maps, etc. Give read access to all and write access to program chairs |
|  |  |  |  |  | |  | **Content**  Some communities are primarily interested in creating, sharing, and providing access to documents, tools, and other content. Valuable and well-organized content is a useful resource for members | | | Library  Structured self-publish  Open self-publish  Content integration | | No outside people needed, basically just data being posted. |
|  |  |  |  |  | |  | **Access to expertise**  Some communities create value by providing focused and timely access to expertise in the community’s domain, whether internally or externally. Communities with this orientation focus on answering questions, fulfilling requests for advice, or engaging in collaborative, just-in-time problem solving | | | Questions & requests  Access to experts  Shared problem solving  Knowledge validation  Apprenticeship & mentoring | | Want internal help with how things work, possible links to associate dean, other colleagues |
|  |  |  |  |  | |  | **Relationships**  Some communities focus on relationship building among members as the basis for both ongoing learning and being available to each other. This orientation emphasizes the interpersonal aspect of learning together. Communities with this orientation place a high value on knowing each other personally, emphasizing networking, trust building, and mutual discovery | | | Connecting  Knowing about people  Interacting informally | | Classes taken by multiple programs lacking in communication, want all programs to have a say in decision making process for those classes |
|  |  |  |  |  | |  | **Individual participation**  Learning together happens in the context of a group, but it is realized in the experience of individuals. People bring different backgrounds, communication styles, and aspirations to their participation in a community. People have different levels of commitment, they take on different roles, and they use tools differently | | | Levels of participation  Personalization  Individual development  Multi-membership | | System should allow professors to add data to any class they are teaching regardless of what program they are part of. (some profs teach outside their specified program, possibly decorator to assign professors access?) |
|  |  |  |  |  | |  | **Community cultivation**  Some communities are happy with loose self-organization and unplanned evolution, while others thrive on attention to community cultivation. They have a need to reflect on the effectiveness and health of the community to make things better, joined with a willingness to work on it | | | Democratic governance  Strong core group  Internal coordination  External facilitation | | Design a dynamic, flexible tool that can be changed/adapted. OBA committee program chairs are the strong core group that makes the majority of the decisions. |
|  |  |  |  |  | |  | **Service context**  In some cases, serving a specific context becomes central to the community’s identity and the ways it operates. They may live inside an organization, whose charter their practice needs to serve. They may have a mission to provide learning resources to the world or to recruit members widely. Or they may seek interactions with other communities whose domain complements their own | | | Organization as context  Cross-organizational  Other related communities  Public mission | | This service is very important to Dave and the program chairs because accreditation is a big deal for the school. Also, the system should be a contained system and not openly viewable by public because of the sensitive data and not being of much use to the outside world, but very useful to the faculty internally. |
| **Scratchpad (other interesting insights, questions/answers, etc.)** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |